

- resistant prostate cancer. In ECCO/ESMO Congress (Abstr P412). Amsterdam, The Netherlands 2013. Available at: <http://oncologypro.esmo.org/>.
74. de Bono JS, Molife LR, Sonpavde G et al. Phase II study of eribulin mesylate (E7389) in patients with metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer stratified by prior taxane therapy. *Ann Oncol* 2012; 23: 1241–1249.
 75. Scher HI, Halabi S, Tannock I et al. Design and end points of clinical trials for patients with progressive prostate cancer and castrate levels of testosterone: recommendations of the Prostate Cancer Clinical Trials Working Group. *J Clin Oncol* 2008; 26: 1148–1159.
 76. Wolchok JD, Hoos A, O'Day S et al. Guidelines for the evaluation of immune therapy activity in solid tumors: immune-related response criteria. *Clin Cancer Res* 2009; 15: 7412–7420.
 77. Hoos A, Eggermont AM, Janetzki S et al. Improved endpoints for cancer immunotherapy trials. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2010; 102: 1388–1397.
 78. de Bono JS, Scher HI, Montgomery RB et al. Circulating tumor cells predict survival benefit from treatment in metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer. *Clin Cancer Res* 2008; 14: 6302–6309.
 79. Scher HI, Heller G, Molina GA et al. Evaluation of circulating tumor cell (CTC) enumeration as an efficacy response biomarker of overall survival (OS) in metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer (mCRPC): planned final analysis (FA) of COU-AA-301, a randomized double-blind, placebo-controlled phase III study of abiraterone acetate (AA) plus low-dose prednisone (P) post docetaxel. *J Clin Oncol* 2011; 29(suppl): abstr LBA4517.

Annals of Oncology 25: 1709–1718, 2014
doi:10.1093/annonc/mdu035
Published online 14 March 2014

Prophylaxis of infectious complications with colony-stimulating factors in adult cancer patients undergoing chemotherapy – evidence-based guidelines from the Infectious Diseases Working Party AGIHO of the German Society for Haematology and Medical Oncology (DGHO)

J. J. Vehreschild¹, A. Böhme², O. A. Cornely^{1,3,4*}, C. Kahl⁵, M. Karthaus⁶, K.-A. Kreuzer¹, G. Maschmeyer⁷, S. Mousset⁸, V. Ossendorf³, O. Penack⁹, M. J. G. T. Vehreschild¹ & J. Bohlius¹⁰

¹1st Department of Internal Medicine, University Hospital of Cologne, Cologne; ²Onkologikum Frankfurt am Museumsufer, Frankfurt a.M.; ³Clinical Trials Centre Cologne (ZKS Köln, BMBF 01KN1106); ⁴Centre for Integrated Oncology CIO KölnBonn, Cologne Excellence Cluster on Cellular Stress Responses in Aging-Associated Diseases (CECAD), University of Cologne, Cologne; ⁵Clinic for Haematology and Oncology, Klinikum Magdeburg gGmbH, Magdeburg; ⁶Haematology-Oncology and Palliative Care, Hospital Neuperlach and Hospital Harlaching, Munich; ⁷Department of Haematology, Oncology and Palliative Care, Klinikum Ernst von Bergmann, Potsdam; ⁸Medizinische Klinik II, University Hospital Frankfurt a.M., Frankfurt a.M.; ⁹Campus Benjamin Franklin; Medical Clinic for Haematology and Oncology, University Hospital Charité, Berlin, Germany; ¹⁰Institute for Social and Preventive Medicine, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland

Received 13 April 2012; revised 18 December 2013; accepted 31 December 2013

Background: Current evidence on myelopoietic growth factors is difficult to overview for the practicing haematologist/ oncologist. International guidelines are sometimes conflicting, exclude certain patient groups, or cannot directly be applied to the German health system. This guideline by the Infectious Diseases Working Party (AGIHO) of the German Society of Haematology and Medical Oncology (DGHO) gives evidence-based recommendations for the use of G-CSF, pegylated G-CSF, and biosimilars to prevent infectious complications in cancer patients undergoing chemotherapy, including those with haematological malignancies.

Methods: We systematically searched and evaluated current evidence. An expert panel discussed the results and recommendations. We then compared our recommendations to current international guidelines.

Results: We summarised the data from eligible studies in evidence tables, developed recommendations for different entities and risk groups.

Conclusion: Comprehensive literature search and expert panel consensus confirmed many key recommendations given by international guidelines. Evidence for growth factors during acute myeloid leukaemia induction chemotherapy and pegfilgrastim use in haematological malignancies was rated lower compared with other guidelines.

Key words: cancer, evidence-based guideline, febrile neutropenia, G-CSF, infection, supportive care

*Correspondence to: Prof. Oliver Cornely, Uniklinik Köln, Klinik I für Innere Medizin, Herderstr. 52-54, 50931 Köln, Germany. Tel: +49-221-478-6494; Fax: +49-221-478-3611; E-mail: oliver.cornely@uk-koeln.de

introduction

Myelosuppression due to cytotoxic drugs is a major limiting factor in the treatment of malignant diseases. Neutropenia places patients at a high risk of fever, infections, sepsis, and ultimately death [1, 2]. These risks are typically encountered with a graduated approach of anti-infective prophylaxis, myelopoietic growth factors, early empiric anti-infective treatment, and standardised diagnostic algorithms. As infection-related mortality is typically low during short-term neutropenia, studies in the field use end points more easily observed but with clinical relevance, such as febrile neutropenia (FN) or diagnosed infection. Apart from higher hospitalisation and mortality [3–5], FN and neutropenia-related infections may result in dose-reduction of cytotoxic drugs or longer intervals between treatment courses [6].

G-CSF was licensed in 1991 by the United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for use in patients undergoing cytotoxic treatment. Like all CSFs available today, it is administered subcutaneously and was approved for decreasing the incidence of FN and reducing the duration of neutropenia and fever following myeloablative chemotherapy [7]. Two different G-CSF preparations are available: non-glycosylated G-CSF filgrastim (Neupogen®; Amgen, Thousand Oaks, CA) and glycosylated G-CSF lenograstim (Granocyte®; Chugai, Utsunomiya, Japan). While data from two open-label randomised studies comparing filgrastim to lenograstim are conflicting [8, 9], and preclinical trials have demonstrated differences between both drugs pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics [10], and a recent systematic review demonstrated comparable efficacy of both drug [11].

The addition of a polyethylene glycol (PEG) molecule to filgrastim increases the serum half-life of filgrastim and allows reducing the frequency of G-CSF applications from a once daily to a once per chemotherapy cycle/three weekly schedule [12]. Pegfilgrastim is approved to decrease incidence of fever and infections in patients with non-myeloid malignancies and acute leukaemia receiving chemotherapy. Pre-clinical and clinical studies suggest that pegfilgrastim and filgrastim have comparable biologic activity and safety profiles [13, 14] as well as clinical efficacy [15–20].

More recently, biosimilar G-CSF (XM02) has been developed [21–23] and is also named with the non-proprietary name filgrastim. Further biosimilars have become available on the market.

Today, the American Society of Clinical Oncology (ASCO), the American National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN), and the European Organisation for Research and Treatment of

Cancer (EORTC) have set-up guidelines for the use of G-CSF and GM-CSF in patients receiving chemotherapy with the objective to prevent fever and infections and to maintain chemotherapy dose intensity [24–27]. Following two landmark trials showing a significant reduction of FN by G-CSF administration even in intermediate- and low-risk patients [28, 29], the ASCO, NCCN, and EORTC [21, 30–32] updated their guidelines and now advocate the use of colony-stimulating factors to prevent FN in patients at a >20% risk for fever [30–34]. Risk factors can be used to identify patients with a particularly high risk to develop FN in ambiguous cases. Recently, validated risk factors for FN include prior chemotherapy, abnormal hepatic and renal function, low white blood count, chemotherapy, and planned delivery of ≥85% of the dose of chemotherapy [35]. A comparison of international guideline recommendations is provided in Table 1.

The aim of this guideline is to identify and assess the evidence for the effects of G-CSF, pegfilgrastim, and biosimilar XM02 to assist in evidence-based clinical decisions on the primary and secondary prevention of infections in adult patients with haematological malignancies or solid tumours undergoing chemotherapy.

methods

We provide a detailed description of the methodology used for this guideline in the guideline report (supplementary File 01, available at *Annals of Oncology* online). In brief, we conducted a systematic literature search for trials using G-CSF, GM-CSF, pegylated filgrastim, or biosimilar filgrastim as prophylaxis of FN or infection during standard chemotherapy regimens in adult patients with solid tumours or haematological malignancies. For the search, we used a predefined search strategy, which is also part of the guideline report (supplementary File 01, available at *Annals of Oncology* online). We conducted all literature searches for the period January 1990 to August 2013.

Data were extracted by one reviewer and checked for accuracy by a second. Studies were categorised into three different groups of myelosuppression based on the risk of FN in the control arm: low risk: 0%–20%, moderate risk: 20%–40%, and intensive therapies with high risk >40% for FN. These cut-offs were chosen to reflect the development and changes of the guidelines provided by ASCO [26, 27] and NCCN [30]. Two recent guidelines used a wider definition for ‘high-risk’ patients (>20% risk for FN)

Table 1. Comparison of international guideline recommendations

Neutropenic event risk	ASCO 2000 [26]	ASCO 2006 [27]	EORTC 2010 [32]	NCCN 2012 [34]	AGIHO 2013
High risk	Use CSF ≥ 40%	Use CSF ≥20%	Use CSF ≥20%	Use CSF ≥20%	Use CSF ≥40%
Moderate to high	CSF not recommended				Use CSF ≥20%
Intermediate	Not further specified	Recommend <20% with risk factors	Consider CSF 10–20% with risk factors	Consider CSF 10–20% with risk factors	Recommend <20% with risk factors
Low	Not further specified	Not further specified	CSF is not recommended <10%	CSF is not recommended for most patients <10%	Not further specified

[32, 34]; however, it was decided to stay with the pre-defined definition used in our analysis.

An expert panel of the AGIHO reviewed all evidence tables and ranked the quality of evidence and strength of recommendation separately for different groups of diseases and FN risk categories (see guideline report for details). Levels of evidence were ranked based on the classification of the Infectious Disease Society of America [36]. With this guidance, the team of authors drafted a manuscript with evidence-based recommendations and presented this document to the panel for further discussion.

All included studies are listed in the evidence tables in supplementary File 02, available at *Annals of Oncology* online. In these evidence tables, studies are listed in the following order: disease entity, CSF used, placebo-controlled study, size of study. If

sufficient data were reported, studies with elderly patients are presented in separate tables. A list of chemotherapeutic regimens and the associated risk of FN were not part of the consensus process. Such lists are available as part of other guidelines [27, 32, 34].

Recommendations have been summarised in Tables 2 and 3.

use of G-CSF for primary prevention of infections

solid tumours

In 12 RCTs, G-CSF was used as primary prophylaxis in patients with solid tumours undergoing myelosuppressive chemotherapy [21, 28, 37–43, 78–84]. One study reported only infection rates

Table 2. Use of colony stimulating factors to prevent febrile neutropenia after myelosuppressive chemotherapy

Setting	Expected fever incidence during neutropenia	SoR	QoE	References	Comment
G-CSF					
Adult patients with solid tumours (e.g. SCLC, sarcoma)	≥20%	A	I	[28, 37–41]	
Adult patients with breast cancer, colorectal cancer, or ovarian cancer	<20%	B	I	[42, 43]	Since the clinical benefit is relatively small, we do not recommend routine use of G-CSF in these circumstances.
Adult and elderly patients with HL/NHL	≥40%	A	I/III ^a	[44–47]	QoE is I for NHL and III for HL.
Adult and elderly patients with HL/NHL	≥20%, <40%	B	II/III ^a	[48, 49]	QoE is II for NHL and III for HL.
Adult patients with myelodysplastic syndrome undergoing palliative chemotherapy	≥20%	D	II	[50, 51]	
Adult patients with ALL undergoing induction or consolidation treatment	≥40%	A	II	[52–54]	
Adult patients with ALL undergoing maintenance treatment	Any	C	III		No data
Adult patients with AML undergoing induction or consolidation chemotherapy	≥40%	C	I/II	[55–61]	Good evidence against a benefit, not generally recommended. QoE is I for induction and II for consolidation chemotherapy.
Elderly patients with AML undergoing induction chemotherapy	≥40%	C	I	[62–69]	Good evidence against a benefit, not generally recommended.
Other tumours and/or other risk categories	Any	B	III	[35]	Decision for G-CSF depending on individual patient risk factors
Pegfilgrastim					
Adult patients with solid tumours (e.g. breast cancer)	≥20%	A	I	[15–17, 29, 70]	Non-inferior to G-CSF
Adult patients with malignant lymphoma	≥20%	B	II	[18–20]	No studies testing for non-inferiority
Other tumours and/or other risk categories	Any	B	III	[35]	Decision for pegfilgrastim depending on individual patient risk factors
XM02					
Adult patients with NHL, breast, or lung cancer	≥20%	A	I	[21–23]	Non-inferior to filgrastim

^aNote further comments in the text.

SoR, strength of recommendation; QoE, quality of evidence.

Table 3. Other recommendations

Setting	Recommendation	SoR	QoE	References	Comment
G-CSF					
Adult patients with solid tumours	Start G-CSF early after chemotherapy	A	I	[28, 37–41]	
Adult patients with solid tumours	Start G-CSF at onset of neutropenia	C	II	[71]	Starting G-CSF after onset of neutropenia may be equally effective, but is not generally recommended due to lack of data
Adult and elderly patients with HL/NHL	Start G-CSF early after chemotherapy	A	I	[44–47]	
Adult patients with ALL undergoing induction or consolidation treatment	Start G-CSF early after chemotherapy	A	II	[52–54]	
Adult patients with ALL undergoing induction or consolidation treatment	Delay G-CSF until onset of neutropenia (max. d12)	C	II	[72]	Starting G-CSF after onset of neutropenia may be equally effective, but is not generally recommended due to lack of data
Elderly patients with AML undergoing induction chemotherapy	G-CSF delayed until 7 days after chemotherapy	C	II	[73]	No difference between starting G-CSF 1 day or 7 days after chemotherapy. G-CSF not generally recommended in this setting.
Adult patients developing FN after receiving chemotherapy without G-CSG support	Use G-CSF in following cycles	B	III	[74]	
Pegfilgrastim					
Adult patients with breast cancer	Use weight adapted dosing	B	II	[16]	Not generally recommended, confirmatory trials required
Adult patients with breast cancer	Start pegfilgrastim on day 2 of chemotherapy	A	I	[29, 75]	
Elderly patients with NHL, breast, or other cancer	Start with first cycle of chemotherapy, not wait until first febrile episode	A	I	[76]	
Elderly patients with NHL	Delay pegfilgrastim to day 4	B	II	[77]	

SoR, strength of recommendation; QoE, quality of evidence.

but not FN and was assigned to the high-risk group based on a 54% infection rate in the control group [41].

high risk for FN: >40%. Seven studies assessed G-CSF in high-risk patients (FN >40%) [37–41, 78, 80, 81, 83, 84]. Of these, five trials demonstrated a statistically and clinically significant reduction of FN or infection in the G-CSF group compared with the control group [37–41]. Three of these trials were placebo-controlled [37–39], and four were conducted in patients with SCLC [38–41], while one study assessed patients with sarcoma [37]. In the remaining two studies, the reduction of FN or infection in the G-CSF arm was not statistically significant [78, 84].

moderate risk for FN: 20%–40%. Three studies assessed G-CSF in moderate risk patients with SCLC [28], breast cancer [21], or metastatic germ-cell tumour [79]. In the study with SCLC patients (N = 186) [28], the risk for FN was significantly reduced from 32% in the control group to 18% in the G-CSF group (P = 0.01). In the studies in patients with germ-cell tumour [79] and breast cancer [21], the difference between treatment groups did not reach statistical significance.

low risk for FN: <20%. Two studies assessed G-CSF in patient with low-risk FN [42, 43]. In one large (N = 506) study with early-stage breast cancer patients, the risk for FN was reduced from 6.6% in the control group to 1.2% in the G-CSF group, P = 0.004 [43]. Another trial with ovarian cancer patients (N = 80) did not show a clinically or statistically significant difference in the incidence of FN between the treatment groups [42].

start of CSF in patients with solid tumours: In four RCTs, the influence of CSF timing was investigated [43, 71, 85, 86]. We excluded two of these studies published in Japanese only [85, 86]. One study compared three different schedules for administration of G-CSF in 33 patients with non-small-cell lung cancer [71]. No significant differences in terms of infectious complications were noted. One trial tested five different dosing regimens for G-CSF in breast cancer patients [43]. The authors reported no significant differences between any of these schedules. However, most landmark trials started G-CSF administration between 1 and 6 days after chemotherapy, and there are currently no sufficiently powered clinical trials to allow definite conclusions on the optimal timing of CSFs.

non-Hodgkin's lymphoma

We evaluated seven RCTs testing G-CSF as primary prophylaxis in patients with non-Hodgkin's lymphoma (NHL) undergoing myelosuppressive chemotherapy [44–46, 48, 87–89]. Two studies reported infection rates but not FN [46, 48]. One study [46] was rated high-risk study based on personal communication published elsewhere [90]. Another study lacking information on FN was categorised as reporting on intermediate risk patients given the 24% incidence rate of documented infection in the control group [48].

high risk for FN: >40%. Six RCTs were conducted in patients with high FN risk [44–46, 87–89]. Of these, two demonstrated a significant reduction of FN for patients receiving G-CSF (33% versus 50%, $P < 0.001$ [44], and 23% versus 44%, $P = 0.04$ [45]). Another two studies demonstrated a trend towards a reduced incidence of FN in the G-CSF group [87, 88]. Two relatively large ($N = 149$ and $N = 162$) RCTs with elderly (age >60 years) and adult NHL patients demonstrated a significantly reduced risk to develop documented infections [46, 87].

intermediate risk for FN: 20%–40%. One trial did not report the actual incidence of FN, but a 24% (41 of 168 cycles) to 4% (7 of 172) reduction of documented infections by G-CSF administration [48]. The P value was not reported.

Hodgkin's lymphoma

We identified one RCT assessing G-CSF [47] in patients with Hodgkin's lymphoma (HL). This study was conducted in patients with high risk (43%) for FN [47], but failed to prove a reduction of infectious complications in HL patients undergoing standard chemotherapy, probably due to the low power. There were no RCTs in elderly HL patients.

comment on recommendation. There are no RCTs demonstrating a benefit of G-CSF usage in HL. However, based on panel opinion, results from the NHL trials probably apply to HL as well. G-CSF use was recommended for patients with a high ($\geq 40\%$) or intermediate risk (20%–40%) of FN.

start of CSF in malignant lymphoma: No study was identified that compared different starting points in patients with malignant lymphoma. Most landmark trials started G-CSF administration between 2 and 6 days after chemotherapy, and there are currently no sufficiently powered trials to allow definite conclusions on the optimal timing of CSFs.

myelodysplastic syndrome

One RCT exploring the use of G-CSF in patients receiving palliative chemotherapy was identified. In this trial, severe infections (WHO III, IV) occurred more frequently in G-CSF recipients compared with controls; however, the difference was not significant (30% versus 19%, P not reported) [50]. The incidence of FN was not reported.

acute lymphoblastic leukaemia

limitations. In several studies evaluating G-CSF in patients with acute leukaemia, the effects of G-CSF are reported

separately for induction and consolidation therapy. We have therefore reported both single-study cycles and summary results separately in the evidence tables.

induction and consolidation therapy: Five RCTs using G-CSF as primary prophylaxis in patients with acute lymphoblastic leukaemia (ALL) during induction or consolidation therapy were identified [52–54, 91, 92]. Only one of the analysed studies reported the incidence of FN (42% in the control arm, high risk) [53]. Another three studies were classified as high-risk group (FN $>40\%$) based on the incidence of fever and infections [52, 53, 91, 92].

high risk for FN: >40%. Of the above-mentioned G-CSF trials, only one open-label RCT demonstrated significant reduction of documented infections for patients receiving G-CSF (40% versus 77%, $P = 0.017$) [53]. The same study was the only to report FN, which was significantly reduced in the G-CSF arm (12% versus 42%, $P = 0.035$) [53]. One RCT demonstrated a significant reduction of the total incidence of infections for patients receiving G-CSF during induction (3% versus 28%, $P = 0.01$) [54]. A third trial did not demonstrate a significant reduction of infections during induction or consolidation; however, the overall number of infections was significantly reduced (61% versus 84%, $P < 0.05$) [52]. Fever was reported in two studies, both studies failed to show a statistically significant reduction of fever in the G-CSF group [91, 92].

start of CSF in ALL during induction and consolidation: In two small controlled clinical studies, the influence of CSF starting time was investigated [72, 93]. One of these studies demonstrated a significantly reduced incidence of documented infections for patients receiving G-CSF at day 4 compared with day 15 of induction therapy (35% versus 71%, $N = 80$, $P = 0.007$) [72]. A second RCT ($N = 55$) did not demonstrate a difference between starting 12 versus day 17 of consolidation therapy [93]. Trials comparing G-CSF administration with placebo started treatment between 2 and 9 days after chemotherapy. There are currently no sufficiently powered trials to allow definite conclusions on the optimal timing of CSFs.

acute myeloid leukaemia

elderly patients. We evaluated three studies comparing G-CSF [62–64] to placebo or control in elderly patients undergoing induction therapy for acute myeloid leukaemia (AML). Definitions for elderly patients were inconsistent across studies and ranged from ≥ 55 years [62] to ≥ 65 years [63]. On average, the mean/median age of the included patients was 68 years, range 56–88 years. No study on consolidation therapy alone was identified. None of the studies reported the incidence of FN.

high risk for FN: >40%. There were two RCTs comparing G-CSF with placebo [62, 63]. Both studies failed to demonstrate a reduced incidence of severe infection, bacteraemia, mycoses, or pneumonia in patients receiving G-CSF compared with controls [62, 63]. Fever or FN rates were not reported.

moderate risk for FN: 20%–40%. One open-label RCT [64] did not provide evidence for a reduced incidence of severe

infections in patients receiving G-CSF compared with controls. Fever or FN rates were not reported.

start of CSF: There was one study directly comparing different starting points for prophylactic application of G-CSF in elderly AML patients undergoing induction therapy [94]. The study included 66 elderly patients with risk factors who were receiving remission–induction chemotherapy with a reduced dose. Patients were randomised to receive G-CSF 1 day after end of chemotherapy (early), or 7 days after end of chemotherapy (late). During the first cycle of induction chemotherapy, there was no difference between the percentage of patients with FN (early 83% versus late 69%, $P = 0.22$). There was no difference in the duration of neutropenia and the number of febrile days between the two groups.

adult patients or patient groups with AML not restricted to elderly

We evaluated eight RCTs comparing G-CSF [55–61, 95] prophylaxis during induction or consolidation chemotherapy for treatment of AML. None of the studies reported FN; all but one study were categorised based on the reported incidences of infections [55–60]. The remaining study could not be categorised [61].

high risk for FN: >40%. Five studies evaluated G-CSF prophylaxis during aggressive remission induction [55–58, 60]. None of the trials showed a reduction of infection rates. Two studies assessed G-CSF during consolidation [55, 59]. Among a number of variables tested, Harousseau et al. demonstrated a possible reduction of septicaemia for patients receiving G-CSF during the second consolidation (25% versus 31%, $P = 0.05$) [59]. Heil et al. analysed the incidence of fever by multiple testing after each chemotherapy cycle and reported a statistically significant reduction in the G-CSF group only during the first consolidation, but not after the induction chemotherapies or after the second consolidation [55].

pegfilgrastim compared with filgrastim—solid tumours

Three trials investigated the effectiveness of pegfilgrastim in patients with breast cancer compared with filgrastim [15–17]. We excluded another study for not reporting data for FN or infections [14]. For all three trials, FN rate for categorisation into one of the FN risk groups was extrapolated from the literature for lack of a placebo control arm. Given a FN rate of 24% [95% confidence interval (CI) 18% to 30%] in a comparable trial [96], the patients from the identified studies can approximately be categorised as moderate FN risk [15–17].

Of the included breast cancer studies, none reported infections, but all reported FN rates. One non-inferiority trial assessing 296 breast cancer patients undergoing chemotherapy with or without a weight-based dose of 100 µg/kg pegfilgrastim per cycle versus daily G-CSF demonstrated a significant ($P = 0.029$) reduction of FN compared with filgrastim (9% versus 18%) [15]. A second smaller trial with a similar study design found similar FN rates in patients receiving pegfilgrastim and in patients receiving filgrastim [16]. The third trial assessing 152 breast

cancer patients undergoing chemotherapy with fixed dose of pegfilgrastim (6 mg per cycle subcutaneous) compared with G-CSF, showed a lower rate of FN in pegfilgrastim recipients; however, the difference was not statistically significant (13% versus 20%, $P = NS$) [17].

pegfilgrastim compared with placebo—solid tumours

One trial assessed 928 breast cancer patients receiving intensified docetaxel (100 mg/m²) chemotherapy supported with 6 mg pegfilgrastim per cycle or placebo [29]. Patients who developed FN were allowed to take antibiotic prophylaxis for the subsequent cycles. The incidence of FN was significantly reduced from 17% in the control arm to 1% in the pegfilgrastim arm ($P < 0.001$). Given the rate of FN close to 20%, it was decided to categorise this study as moderate FN risk. Another trial reported on 252 patients receiving FOLFOX, FOLFIRI, or FOIL chemotherapy for colorectal cancer received with pegfilgrastim 6 mg or placebo [70]. Across all cycles, the incidence of FN was reduced from 8% to 2% by pegfilgrastim ($P = 0.04$).

start of pegfilgrastim—solid tumours

A randomised trial in 351 female node-positive breast cancer patients receiving chemotherapy compared administration of pegfilgrastim 6 mg with weight adaptation for obese patients on day 2 versus day 4 of chemotherapy [75]. The authors reported no difference between both strategies along a number of infection-related end points, including FN.

pegfilgrastim compared with filgrastim—haematological malignancies

Three RCTs analysed the effectiveness of pegfilgrastim compared with G-CSF in patients with haematological malignancies [18–20]. For lack of a control arm without CSF prophylaxis, FN rate in the Vose study [18] was extrapolated as moderate risk from a study published by Velasquez et al. [97], in which the FN rate was 30%. By the same approach, the study published by Grigg et al. [19] was categorised as reporting on high-risk chemotherapy based on observations by Ösby et al. [44]. The study by Sierra et al. [20] was also categorised as high risk. For all three trials, FN rates, but no infection rates, were reported.

high risk for FN: >40%. Two studies [19, 20] investigated the effect of pegfilgrastim versus filgrastim in patients with high risk for FN. Grigg et al. investigated the effect of pegfilgrastim (60 µg/kg or 100 µg/kg per cycle) compared with filgrastim (5 µg/kg/day) in 49 elderly patients with NHL [19]. The observed rates of FN were not significantly different. Sierra et al. investigated the effect of 6 mg pegfilgrastim once per cycle versus 5 µg/kg filgrastim daily in 84 adult AML patients [20], also with no significant differences observed.

moderate risk for FN: 20%–40%. In one moderate risk trial, 60 patients with relapsed and refractory malignant lymphoma (HL and NHL) underwent myelosuppressive chemotherapy [18]. Patients received one weight-based dose of 100 mg/kg of pegfilgrastim per cycle sc or daily G-CSF injections. Cumulative incidences of FN were not significantly different between

treatment arms (21% in pegfilgrastim arm, 19% in G-CSF arm, $P = \text{NS}$).

start of pegfilgrastim—haematological malignancies

One trial in 109 elderly patients with aggressive lymphomas receiving R-CHOP-14 chemotherapy randomised administration of pegfilgrastim 6 mg between day 2 and day 4. Grade 3 or 4 infections were 9.4% after day 2 administration and 6.0% after day 4 administration (not significant) [77].

biosimilar G-CSF XM02

We identified three RCTs [21–23] investigating the efficacy of identical doses of XM02 and filgrastim in patients with NHL receiving CHOP chemotherapy [22], lung cancer patients receiving a platinum-based chemotherapy [23], and breast cancer patients receiving doxorubicin and docetaxel [21]. XM02 was non-inferior to filgrastim in all three trials [21–23].

use of GM-CSF for primary prevention of infections

In contrast to G-CSF, GM-CSF is acting on macrophages as well. G-CSF and GM-CSF are probably comparable regarding tolerability and efficacy in decreasing incidence and duration of neutropenia and fever after standard dose chemotherapy, although there is a lack of formal comparisons between both drugs [73, 98–102]. Numerous clinical trials have been conducted using GM-CSF for the primary prophylaxis of FN by GM-CSF administration. Clinical trials in patients with solid tumours, NHL, MDS, ALL, AML, and MDS were identified and evaluated. Taken together, the overall quality of evidence was lower than for G-CSF, and none of the trials demonstrated a marked benefit of GM-CSF compared with G-CSF. However, GM-CSF is no longer commercially available in Germany and several other European countries. For these reasons, GM-CSF has not received a recommendation in this guideline. The reviewed evidence is detailed in supplementary File 03, available at *Annals of Oncology* online.

other treatment strategies

We identified one RCT that compared ‘proactive’ versus ‘reactive’ pegfilgrastim prophylaxis in 862 elderly (aged >65 years) patients with breast cancer, NHL, or other cancer undergoing chemotherapy [76]. Patients were randomised to ‘proactive’ management starting pegfilgrastim in the first cycle of chemotherapy or ‘reactive’ management, i.e. not giving pegfilgrastim in the first cycle and based on the discretion of the attending physician in the subsequent chemotherapy cycles. After six cycles of chemotherapy, the incidence of FN in patients with solid tumours was 4% in the proactive study arm and 10% in the reactive study arm ($P = 0.01$). In the considerably smaller group of NHL patients, 15% in the proactive arm and 37% in the reactive arm contracted FN ($P = 0.004$).

conclusion

In our review, we found convincing evidence from numerous randomised, controlled trials that G-CSF, biosimilar G-CSF, and pegfilgrastim reduce the risk to develop FN and infections. As a rule of thumb, it seems the relative benefit is highest for patients with an intermediate risk of infections. For patients with long-term neutropenia, e.g. after induction-chemotherapy for AML, the slightly shorter duration of the at-risk period does not seem to translate into a clinical benefit [55–64]. On the other hand, in patients with a low baseline risk in whom infections often can be treated in an outpatient setting [5], the number needed to treat to achieve a meaningful benefit is probably high [70].

Our comprehensive literature search and expert panel consensus confirmed many key recommendations given guidelines of other working groups [32, 34]. However, compared with other guidelines, we rated the evidence for growth factors during AML induction chemotherapy and pegfilgrastim use in haematological malignancies lower.

Treatment with G-CSF is associated with substantial costs [103] and some adverse events. The long-term safety of G-CSF remains a matter of debate [104, 105]. Although not formally part of this review, both factors must be weighed against the potential benefits of G-CSF treatment. While preventing fever and infection may reduce the need for hospitalisation and antibiotic treatment [106] as well as promote timely continuation of following chemotherapy cycles [70], a clear benefit for overall survival or tumour response has not been demonstrated, and data on cost-effectiveness is controversial [103, 107].

Taken together, G-CSF is a supportive drug that can improve overall conduct of chemotherapy and patient care in certain scenarios, though probably not vital for treatment success in most cases.

funding

The AGIHO is supported by unrestricted grants from Amgen, Pfizer, MSD, and Gilead. AB has received research sponsoring from TEVA. JJV has received research grants from Astellas, Gilead, Merck, and Pfizer. OAC is supported by the German Federal Ministry of Research and Education (BMBF grant 01KN1106) and has received research grants from Actelion, Astellas, Basilea, Bayer, Biocryst, Celgene, F2G, Genzyme, Gilead, Merck/Schering, Miltenyi, Optimer, Pfizer, Quintiles, and Viropharma. MJGTV received research funding from 3M. OP has received research funding from Bio Rad, Fresenius biotech, Gentium, Genzyme, Gilead, Pierre Fabre. This review was carried out and written by academic authors without external support or funding.

disclosure

JJV has been a speaker for Astellas, Gilead, Merck, and Pfizer, has been a consultant to Astellas, Merck, and Pfizer, and has received travel grants from Astellas, Gilead, Merck, and Pfizer. OAC is a consultant to Astellas, Basilea, F2G, Gilead, Merck/Schering, Optimer, and Pfizer, and received lecture honoraria from Astellas, Gilead, Merck/Schering, and Pfizer. MJGTV has served at the speakers’ bureau of Pfizer, Merck, Gilead Sciences,

and Astellas Pharma. OP has been a consultant to MSD, and received lectures and travel grants from Astellas, Gilead, Pfizer, and MSD. CK, MK, KAK, GM, SM, VO, and JB have no conflicts of interest to declare.

references

- Bodey GP, Buckley M, Sathe YS et al. Quantitative relationships between circulating leukocytes and infection in patients with acute leukemia. *Ann Intern Med* 1966; 00: 328–340.
- Bodey GP. Infection in cancer-patients—a continuing association. *Am J Med* 1986; 81: 11–26.
- Weissinger F, Auner HW, Bertz H et al. Antimicrobial therapy of febrile complications after high-dose chemotherapy and autologous hematopoietic stem cell transplantation—guidelines of the Infectious Diseases Working Party (AGIHO) of the German Society of Hematology and Oncology (DGHO). *Ann Hematol* 2012; 91: 1161–1174.
- Talcott JA, Siegel RD, Finberg R et al. Risk assessment in cancer-patients with fever and neutropenia—a prospective, 2-center validation of a prediction rule. *J Clin Oncol* 1992; 10: 316–322.
- Klastersky J, Paesmans M, Rubenstein EB et al. The Multinational Association for Supportive Care in Cancer risk index: a multinational scoring system for identifying low-risk febrile neutropenic cancer patients. *J Clin Oncol* 2000; 18: 3038–3051.
- Lyman GH, Dale DC, Culaikova E et al. The impact of the granulocyte colony-stimulating factor on chemotherapy dose intensity and cancer survival: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Ann Oncol* 2013; 24: 2475–2484.
- Snider S. G-CSF Approved to Protect Cancer Chemo Patients P91–6 Food and Drug Administration. 1991.
- de Arriba F, Lozano ML, Ortuno F et al. Prospective randomized study comparing the efficacy of bioequivalent doses of glycosylated and nonglycosylated rG-CSF for mobilizing peripheral blood progenitor cells. *Br J Haematol* 1997; 96: 418–420.
- Orciulo E, Buda G, Marturano E et al. Lenograstim reduces the incidence of febrile episodes, when compared with filgrastim, in multiple myeloma patients undergoing stem cell mobilization. *Leuk Res* 2011; 35: 899–903.
- Mattii L, Battola B, Azzara A et al. Glycosylation interference on RhoA activation: focus on G-CSF. *Leuk Res* 2011; 35: 265–267.
- Sourgens H, Lefrere F. A systematic review of available clinical evidence—filgrastim compared with lenograstim. *Int J Clin Pharmacol Ther* 2011; 49: 510–518.
- Lord BI, Woolford LB, Molineux G. Kinetics of neutrophil production in normal and neutropenic animals during the response to filgrastim (r-metHu G-CSF) or filgrastim SD/01 (PEG-r-metHu G-CSF). *Clin Cancer Res* 2001; 7: 2085–2090.
- Molineux G, Kinstler O, Briddell B et al. A new form of filgrastim with sustained duration in vivo and enhanced ability to mobilize PBPC in both mice and humans. *Exp Hematol* 1999; 27: 1724–1734.
- Johnston E, Crawford J, Blackwell S et al. Randomized, dose-escalation study of SD/01 compared with daily filgrastim in patients receiving chemotherapy. *J Clin Oncol* 2000; 18: 2522–2528.
- Holmes FA, O'Shaughnessy JA, Vukelja S et al. Blinded, randomized, multicenter study to evaluate single administration pegfilgrastim once per cycle versus daily filgrastim as an adjunct to chemotherapy in patients with high-risk stage II or stage III/IV breast cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2002; 20: 727–731.
- Holmes FA, Jones SE, O'Shaughnessy J et al. Comparable efficacy and safety profiles of once-per-cycle pegfilgrastim and daily injection filgrastim in chemotherapy-induced neutropenia: a multicenter dose-finding study in women with breast cancer. *Ann Oncol* 2002; 13: 903–909.
- Green MD, Koelbl H, Baselga J et al. A randomized double-blind multicenter phase III study of fixed-dose single-administration pegfilgrastim versus daily filgrastim in patients receiving myelosuppressive chemotherapy. *Ann Oncol* 2003; 14: 29–35.
- Vose JM, Crump M, Lazarus H et al. Randomized, multicenter, open-label study of pegfilgrastim compared with daily filgrastim after chemotherapy for lymphoma. *J Clin Oncol* 2003; 21: 514–519.
- Grigg A, Solal-Celigny P, Hoskin P et al. Open-label, randomized study of pegfilgrastim vs. daily filgrastim as an adjunct to chemotherapy in elderly patients with non-Hodgkin's lymphoma. *Leuk Lymphoma* 2003; 44: 1503–1508.
- Sierra J, Szer J, Kassis J et al. A single dose of pegfilgrastim compared with daily filgrastim for supporting neutrophil recovery in patients treated for low-to-intermediate risk acute myeloid leukemia: results from a randomized, double-blind, phase 2 trial. *BMC Cancer* 2008; 8: 195.
- Del Giglio A, Eniu A, Ganea-Motan D et al. XM02 is superior to placebo and equivalent to Neupogen in reducing the duration of severe neutropenia and the incidence of febrile neutropenia in cycle 1 in breast cancer patients receiving docetaxel/doxorubicin chemotherapy. *BMC Cancer* 2008; 8: 332.
- Engert A, Griskevicius L, Zyuzgin Y et al. XM02, the first granulocyte colony-stimulating factor biosimilar, is safe and effective in reducing the duration of severe neutropenia and incidence of febrile neutropenia in patients with non-Hodgkin lymphoma receiving chemotherapy. *Leuk Lymphoma* 2009; 50: 374–379.
- Gatzemeier U, Ciuleanu T, Dediu M et al. XM02, the first biosimilar G-CSF, is safe and effective in reducing the duration of severe neutropenia and incidence of febrile neutropenia in patients with small cell or non-small cell lung cancer receiving platinum-based chemotherapy. *J Thorac Oncol* 2009; 4: 736–740.
- American Society of Clinical Oncology. Recommendations for the use of hematopoietic colony-stimulating factors: evidence-based, clinical practice guidelines. *J Clin Oncol* 1994; 12: 2471–2508.
- Ozer H. American Society of Clinical Oncology guidelines for the use of hematopoietic colony-stimulating factors. *Curr Opin Hematol* 1996; 3: 3–10.
- Ozer H, Armitage JO, Bennett CL et al. 2000 update of recommendations for the use of hematopoietic colony-stimulating factors: evidence-based, clinical practice guidelines. American Society of Clinical Oncology Growth Factors Expert Panel. *J Clin Oncol* 2000; 18: 3558–3585.
- Smith TJ, Khatcheressian J, Lyman GH et al. 2006 Update of recommendations for the use of white blood cell growth factors: an evidence-based clinical practice guideline. *J Clin Oncol* 2006; 24: 1–19.
- Timmer-Bonte JN, de Boo TM, Smit HJ et al. Prevention of chemotherapy-induced febrile neutropenia by prophylactic antibiotics plus or minus granulocyte colony-stimulating factor in small-cell lung cancer: a Dutch Randomized Phase III Study. *J Clin Oncol* 2005; 23: 7974–7984.
- Vogel CL, Wojtukiewicz MZ, Carroll RR et al. First and subsequent cycle use of pegfilgrastim prevents febrile neutropenia in patients with breast cancer: a multicenter, double-blind, placebo-controlled phase III study. *J Clin Oncol* 2005; 23: 1178–1184.
- National Comprehensive Cancer Network. Critical Guidelines in Oncology. Myeloid Growth Factors in Cancer Treatment. [v.2.2005]. 2005.
- Aapro MS, Cameron DA, Pettengell R et al. EORTC guidelines for the use of granulocyte-colony stimulating factor to reduce the incidence of chemotherapy-induced febrile neutropenia in adult patients with lymphomas and solid tumours. *Eur J Cancer* 2006; 42: 2433–2453.
- Aapro MS, Bohlius J, Cameron DA et al. 2010 update of EORTC guidelines for the use of granulocyte-colony stimulating factor to reduce the incidence of chemotherapy-induced febrile neutropenia in adult patients with lymphoproliferative disorders and solid tumours. *Eur J Cancer* 2011; 47: 8–32.
- National Comprehensive Cancer Network. National Comprehensive Cancer Network Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Myeloid Growth Factors. 2009.
- National Comprehensive Cancer Network. National Comprehensive Cancer Network Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Myeloid Growth Factors Version 1.2012. 2012.
- Lyman GH, Kuderer NM, Crawford J et al. Predicting individual risk of neutropenic complications in patients receiving cancer chemotherapy. *Cancer* 2011; 117: 1917–1927.
- Kish MA. Guide to development of practice guidelines. *Clin Infect Dis* 2001; 32: 851–854.
- Bui BN, Chevallier B, Chevreau C et al. Efficacy of lenograstim on hematologic tolerance to MAID chemotherapy in patients with advanced soft tissue sarcoma and consequences on treatment dose-intensity. *J Clin Oncol* 1995; 13: 2629–2636.

38. Crawford J, Ozer H, Stoller R et al. Reduction by granulocyte colony-stimulating factor of fever and neutropenia induced by chemotherapy in patients with small-cell lung cancer. *N Engl J Med* 1991; 325: 164–170.
39. Trillet-Lenoir V, Green J, Manegold C et al. Recombinant granulocyte colony stimulating factor reduces the infectious complications of cytotoxic chemotherapy. *Eur J Cancer* 1993; 29A: 319–324.
40. Fukuoka M, Masuda N, Negoro S et al. CODE chemotherapy with and without granulocyte colony-stimulating factor in small-cell lung cancer. *Br J Cancer* 1997; 75: 306–309.
41. Gatzemeier U, Kleisbauer JP, Drings P et al. Lenograstim as support for ACE chemotherapy of small-cell lung cancer: a phase III, multicenter, randomized study. *Am J Clin Oncol* 2000; 23: 393–400.
42. Hidalgo M, Mendiola C, Lopez-Vega JM et al. A multicenter randomized Phase II trial of granulocyte-colony stimulating factor-supported, platinum-based chemotherapy with flexible midcycle cisplatin administration in patients with advanced ovarian carcinoma. PSAMOMA Cooperative Group, Spain. *Cancer* 1998; 83: 719–725.
43. Papaldo P, Lopez M, Cortesi E et al. Addition of either lonidamine or granulocyte colony-stimulating factor does not improve survival in early breast cancer patients treated with high-dose epirubicin and cyclophosphamide. *J Clin Oncol* 2003; 21: 3462–3468.
44. Osby E, Hagberg H, Kvaloy S et al. CHOP is superior to CNOP in elderly patients with aggressive lymphoma while outcome is unaffected by filgrastim treatment: results of a Nordic Lymphoma Group randomized trial. *Blood* 2003; 101: 3840–3848.
45. Pettengell R, Gurney H, Radford JA et al. Granulocyte colony-stimulating factor to prevent dose-limiting neutropenia in non-Hodgkin's lymphoma: a randomized controlled trial. *Blood* 1992; 80: 1430–1436.
46. Zinzani PL, Pavone E, Storti S et al. Randomized trial with or without granulocyte colony-stimulating factor as adjunct to induction VNCOP-B treatment of elderly high-grade non-Hodgkin's lymphoma. *Blood* 1997; 89: 3974–3979.
47. Dunlop DJ, Eatock MM, Paul J et al. Randomized multicentre trial of filgrastim as an adjunct to combination chemotherapy for Hodgkin's disease. West of Scotland Lymphoma Group. *Clin Oncol (R Coll Radiol)* 1998; 10: 107–114.
48. Aviles A, Diaz-Maqueo JC, Talavera A et al. Effect of granulocyte colony-stimulating factor in patients with diffuse large cell lymphoma treated with intensive chemotherapy. *Leuk Lymphoma* 1994; 15: 153–157.
49. Aglietta M, Montemurro F, Fagioli F et al. Short term treatment with *Escherichia coli* recombinant human granulocyte-macrophage colony stimulating factor prior to chemotherapy for Hodgkin disease. *Cancer* 2000; 88: 454–460.
50. Ossenkoppele GJ, van der HB, Verhoef GE et al. A randomized study of granulocyte colony-stimulating factor applied during and after chemotherapy in patients with poor risk myelodysplastic syndromes: a report from the HOVON Cooperative Group. Dutch-Belgian Hemato-Oncology Cooperative Group. *Leukemia* 1999; 13: 1207–1213.
51. Zwierzina H, Suci S, Loeffler-Ragg J et al. Low-dose cytosine arabinoside (LD-AraC) vs LD-AraC plus granulocyte/macrophage colony stimulating factor vs LD-AraC plus Interleukin-3 for myelodysplastic syndrome patients with a high risk of developing acute leukemia: final results of a randomized phase III study (O6903) of the EORTC Leukemia Cooperative Group. *Leukemia* 2005; 19: 1929–1933.
52. Holowiecki J, Giebel S, Krzemien S et al. G-CSF administered in time-sequenced setting during remission induction and consolidation therapy of adult acute lymphoblastic leukemia has beneficial influence on early recovery and possibly improves long-term outcome: a randomized multicenter study. *Leuk Lymphoma* 2002; 43: 315–325.
53. Geissler K, Koller E, Hubmann E et al. Granulocyte colony-stimulating factor as an adjunct to induction chemotherapy for adult acute lymphoblastic leukemia—a randomized phase-III study. *Blood* 1997; 90: 590–596.
54. Thomas X, Boiron JM, Huguet F et al. Efficacy of granulocyte and granulocyte-macrophage colony-stimulating factors in the induction treatment of adult acute lymphoblastic leukemia: a multicenter randomized study. *Hematol J* 2004; 5: 384–394.
55. Heil G, Hoelzer D, Sanz MA et al. A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase III study of filgrastim in remission induction and consolidation therapy for adults with de novo acute myeloid leukemia. *Blood* 1997; 90: 4710–4718.
56. Ohno R, Naoe T, Kanamaru A et al. A double-blind controlled study of granulocyte colony-stimulating factor started two days before induction chemotherapy in refractory acute myeloid leukemia. *Blood* 1994; 83: 2086–2092.
57. Lowenberg B, van Putten W, Theobald M et al. Effect of priming with granulocyte colony-stimulating factor on the outcome of chemotherapy for acute myeloid leukemia. *N Engl J Med* 2003; 349: 743–752.
58. Usuki K, Urabe A, Masaoka T et al. Efficacy of granulocyte colony-stimulating factor in the treatment of acute myelogenous leukaemia: a multicentre randomized study. *Br J Haematol* 2002; 116: 103–112.
59. Harousseau JL, Witz B, Lioure B et al. Granulocyte colony-stimulating factor after intensive consolidation chemotherapy in acute myeloid leukemia: results of a randomized trial of the Groupe Ouest-Est Leucemies Aigues Myeloblastiques. *J Clin Oncol* 2000; 18: 780–787.
60. Bradstock K, Matthews J, Young G et al. Effects of glycosylated recombinant human granulocyte colony-stimulating factor after high-dose cytarabine-based induction chemotherapy for adult acute myeloid leukaemia. *Leukemia* 2001; 15: 1331–1338.
61. Bernasconi C, Alessandrino EP, Bernasconi P et al. Randomized clinical study comparing aggressive chemotherapy with or without G-CSF support for high-risk myelodysplastic syndromes or secondary acute myeloid leukaemia evolving from MDS. *Br J Haematol* 1998; 102: 678–683.
62. Godwin JE, Kopecky KJ, Head DR et al. A double-blind placebo-controlled trial of granulocyte colony-stimulating factor in elderly patients with previously untreated acute myeloid leukemia: a Southwest oncology group study (9031). *Blood* 1998; 91: 3607–3615.
63. Dombret H, Chastang C, Fenaux P et al. A controlled study of recombinant human granulocyte colony-stimulating factor in elderly patients after treatment for acute myelogenous leukemia. *N Engl J Med* 1995; 332: 1678–1683.
64. Amadori S, Suci S, Jehn U et al. Use of glycosylated recombinant human G-CSF (lenograstim) during and/or after induction chemotherapy in patients 61 years of age and older with acute myeloid leukemia: final results of AML-13, a randomized phase-3 study. *Blood* 2005; 106: 27–34.
65. Stone RM, Berg DT, George SL et al. Granulocyte-macrophage colony-stimulating factor after initial chemotherapy for elderly patients with primary acute myelogenous leukemia. *N Engl J Med* 1995; 332: 1671–1677.
66. Witz F, Sadoun A, Perrin M-C et al. A placebo-controlled study of recombinant human granulocyte-macrophage colony-stimulating factor administered during and after induction treatment for de novo acute myelogenous leukemia in elderly patients. *Blood* 1998; 91: 2722–2730.
67. Rowe JM, Andersen JW, Mazza JJ et al. A randomized placebo-controlled phase III study of granulocyte-macrophage colony-stimulating factor in adult patients (>55 to 70 years of age) with acute myelogenous leukemia: a study of the Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group (E1490). *Blood* 1995; 86: 457–462.
68. Lowenberg B, Suci S, Archimbaud E et al. Use of recombinant GM-CSF during and after remission induction chemotherapy in patients aged 61 years and older with acute myeloid leukemia: final report of AML-11, a phase III randomized study of the Leukemia Cooperative Group of European Organisation for the Research and Treatment of Cancer and the Dutch Belgian Hemato-Oncology Cooperative Group. *Blood* 1997; 90: 2952–2961.
69. Lofgren C, Paul C, Astrom M et al. Granulocyte-macrophage colony-stimulating factor to increase efficacy of mitoxantrone, etoposide and cytarabine in previously untreated elderly patients with acute myeloid leukaemia: a Swedish multicentre randomized trial. *Br J Haematol* 2004; 124: 474–480.
70. Hecht JR, Pillai M, Gollard R et al. A randomized, placebo-controlled phase II study evaluating the reduction of neutropenia and febrile neutropenia in patients with colorectal cancer receiving pegfilgrastim with every-2-week chemotherapy. *Clin Colorectal Cancer* 2010; 9: 95–101.
71. Soda H, Oka M, Fukuda M et al. Optimal schedule for administering granulocyte colony-stimulating factor in chemotherapy-induced neutropenia in non-small-cell lung cancer. *Cancer Chemother Pharmacol* 1996; 38: 9–12.
72. Bassan R, Lerede T, Di Bona E et al. Granulocyte colony-stimulating factor (G-CSF, filgrastim) after or during an intensive remission induction therapy for adult acute lymphoblastic leukaemia: effects, role of patient pretreatment characteristics, and costs. *Leuk Lymphoma* 1997; 26: 153–161.
73. Beveridge RA, Miller JA, Kales AN et al. A comparison of efficacy of sargramostim (yeast-derived RhuGM-CSF) and filgrastim (bacteria-derived RhuG-

- CSF) in the therapeutic setting of chemotherapy-induced myelosuppression. *Cancer Invest* 1998; 16: 366–373.
74. Kaku K, Takahashi M, Moriyama Y et al. Recombinant human granulocyte-macrophage colony-stimulating factor (rhGM-CSF) after chemotherapy in patients with non-Hodgkin's lymphoma; a placebo-controlled double blind phase III trial. *Leuk Lymphoma* 1993; 11: 229–238.
 75. Loibl S, Mueller V, von Minckwitz G et al. Comparison of pegfilgrastim on day 2 vs. day 4 as primary prophylaxis of intense dose-dense chemotherapy in patients with node-positive primary breast cancer within the prospective, multi-center GAIN study: (GBG 33). *Support Care Cancer* 2011; 19: 1789–1795.
 76. Balducci L, Al-Halawani H, Charu V et al. Elderly cancer patients receiving chemotherapy benefit from first-cycle pegfilgrastim. *Oncologist* 2007; 12: 1416–1424.
 77. Zwick C, Hartmann F, Zeynalova S et al. Randomized comparison of pegfilgrastim day 4 versus day 2 for the prevention of chemotherapy-induced leukocytopenia. *Ann Oncol* 2011; 22: 1872–1877.
 78. Chevallier B, Chollet P, Merrouche Y et al. Lenograstim prevents morbidity from intensive induction chemotherapy in the treatment of inflammatory breast cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 1995; 13: 1564–1571.
 79. Fossa SD, Kaye SB, Mead GM et al. Filgrastim during combination chemotherapy of patients with poor-prognosis metastatic germ cell malignancy. European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer, Genito-Urinary Group, and the Medical Research Council Testicular Cancer Working Party, Cambridge, United Kingdom. *J Clin Oncol* 1998; 16: 716–724.
 80. Masuda N, Fukuoka M, Furuse K. CODE chemotherapy with or without recombinant human granulocyte colony-stimulating factor in extensive-stage small cell lung cancer. *Oncology* 1992; 49(Suppl 1): 19–24.
 81. Negoro S, Masuda N, Furuse K et al. Dose-intensive chemotherapy in extensive-stage small-cell lung cancer. *Cancer Chemother Pharmacol* 1997; 40(Suppl): S70–S73.
 82. Papaldo P, Lopez M, Marolla P et al. Impact of five prophylactic filgrastim schedules on hematologic toxicity in early breast cancer patients treated with epirubicin and cyclophosphamide. *J Clin Oncol* 2005; 23: 6908–6918.
 83. Trillet-Lenoir V, Green JA, Manegold C et al. Recombinant granulocyte colony stimulating factor in the treatment of small cell lung cancer: a long-term follow-up. *Eur J Cancer* 1995; 31A: 2115–2116.
 84. Woll PJ, Hodgetts J, Lomax L et al. Can cytotoxic dose-intensity be increased by using granulocyte colony-stimulating factor? A randomized controlled trial of lenograstim in small-cell lung cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 1995; 13: 652–659.
 85. Itamochi H, Irie T, Okada M et al. An optimal regimen of G-CSF (granulocyte colony-stimulating factor) treatment after anticancer chemotherapy for patients with gynecologic malignancy. *J Jpn Soc Cancer Ther* 1995; 30: 776–780.
 86. Katakami N, Hasegawa T, Umeda B et al. Effect of timing of granulocyte-colony stimulating factor administration on leukopenia induced by systemic chemotherapy in patients with non-small-cell lung cancer—multi-center randomized crossover study. *Jpn J Thorac Dis* 1996; 34: 520–528.
 87. Gisselbrecht C, Haioun C, Lepage E et al. Placebo-controlled phase III study of lenograstim (glycosylated recombinant human granulocyte colony-stimulating factor) in aggressive non-Hodgkin's lymphoma: factors influencing chemotherapy administration. *Groupe d'Etude des Lymphomes de l'Adulte. Leuk Lymphoma* 1997; 25: 289–300.
 88. Fridrik MA, Greil R, Hausmaninger H et al. Randomized open label phase III trial of CEOP/IMVP-Dexa alternating chemotherapy and filgrastim versus CEOP/IMVP-Dexa alternating chemotherapy for aggressive non-Hodgkin's lymphoma (NHL). A multicenter trial by the Austrian Working Group for Medical Tumor Therapy. *Ann Hematol* 1997; 75: 135–140.
 89. Doorduijn JK, van der Holt B, van Imhoff GW et al. CHOP compared with CHOP plus granulocyte colony-stimulating factor in elderly patients with aggressive non-Hodgkin's lymphoma. *J Clin Oncol* 2003; 21: 3041–3050.
 90. Bohlius J, Reiser M, Schwarzer G et al. Granulopoiesis-stimulating factors to prevent adverse effects in the treatment of malignant lymphoma. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2004; CD003189.
 91. Larson RA, Dodge RK, Linker CA et al. A randomized controlled trial of filgrastim during remission induction and consolidation chemotherapy for adults with acute lymphoblastic leukemia: CALGB study 9111. *Blood* 1998; 92: 1556–1564.
 92. Ottmann OG, Hoelzer D, Gracien E et al. Concomitant granulocyte colony-stimulating factor and induction chemoradiotherapy in adult acute lymphoblastic leukemia: a randomized phase III trial. *Blood* 1995; 86: 444–450.
 93. Hofmann WK, Seipelt G, Langenhan S et al. Prospective randomized trial to evaluate two delayed granulocyte colony stimulating factor administration schedules after high-dose cytarabine therapy in adult patients with acute lymphoblastic leukemia. *Ann Hematol* 2002; 81: 570–574.
 94. von Lilienfeld-Toal M, Hahn-Ast C, Kirchner H et al. A randomized comparison of immediate versus delayed application of G-CSF in induction therapy for patients with acute myeloid leukemia unfit for intensive chemotherapy. *Haematologica* 2007; 92: 1719–1720.
 95. Wheatley K, Goldstone AH, Littlewood T et al. Randomized placebo-controlled trial of granulocyte colony stimulating factor (G-CSF) as supportive care after induction chemotherapy in adult patients with acute myeloid leukaemia: a study of the United Kingdom Medical Research Council Adult Leukaemia Working Party. *Br J Haematol* 2009; 146: 54–63.
 96. Evans TR, Yellowlees A, Foster E et al. Phase III randomized trial of doxorubicin and docetaxel versus doxorubicin and cyclophosphamide as primary medical therapy in women with breast cancer: an anglo-celtic cooperative oncology group study. *J Clin Oncol* 2005; 23: 2988–2995.
 97. Velasquez WS, McLaughlin P, Tucker S et al. ESHAP—an effective chemotherapy regimen in refractory and relapsing lymphoma: a 4-year follow-up study. *J Clin Oncol* 1994; 12: 1169–1176.
 98. Morstyn G, Souza LM, Keech J et al. Effect of granulocyte colony stimulating factor on neutropenia induced by cyto-toxic chemotherapy. *Lancet* 1988; 1: 667–672.
 99. Yoshida T, Nakamura S, Ohtake S et al. Effect of granulocyte colony-stimulating factor on neutropenia due to chemotherapy for non-Hodgkin's lymphoma. *Cancer* 1990; 66: 1904–1909.
 100. Hovgaard DJ, Nissen NI. Effect of recombinant human granulocyte-macrophage colony-stimulating factor in patients with Hodgkin's disease: a phase I/II study. *J Clin Oncol* 1992; 10: 390–397.
 101. Alvarado Ibarra ML, Borbolla Escoboza JR, Lopez-Hernandez MA et al. Neutrophil recovery time and adverse side effects in acute leukemia patients treated with intensive chemotherapy and concomitant G or GM-CSF. *Rev Invest Clin* 1999; 51: 77–80.
 102. Beveridge RA, Miller JA, Kales AN et al. Randomized trial comparing the tolerability of sargramostim (yeast-derived RhuGM-CSF) and filgrastim (bacteria-derived RhuGM-CSF) in cancer patients receiving myelosuppressive chemotherapy. *Support Care Cancer* 1997; 5: 289–298.
 103. Aarts MJ, Grutters JP, Peters FP et al. Cost effectiveness of primary pegfilgrastim prophylaxis in patients with breast cancer at risk of febrile neutropenia. *J Clin Oncol* 2013; 31: 4283–4289.
 104. Hershman D, Neugut AI, Jacobson JS et al. Acute myeloid leukemia or myelodysplastic syndrome following use of granulocyte colony-stimulating factors during breast cancer adjuvant chemotherapy. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2007; 99: 196–205.
 105. Patt DA, Duan Z, Fang S et al. Acute myeloid leukemia after adjuvant breast cancer therapy in older women: understanding risk. *J Clin Oncol* 2007; 25: 3871–3876.
 106. Renner P, Milazzo S, Liu JP et al. Primary prophylactic colony-stimulating factors for the prevention of chemotherapy-induced febrile neutropenia in breast cancer patients. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2012; 10: CD007913.
 107. Chan KK, Siu E, Krahn MD et al. Cost-utility analysis of primary prophylaxis versus secondary prophylaxis with granulocyte colony-stimulating factor in elderly patients with diffuse aggressive lymphoma receiving curative-intent chemotherapy. *J Clin Oncol* 2012; 30: 1064–1071.