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Methods: 123 cancer patients hospitalised to receive chemotherapy at the oncology centre of the University Hospital of Marrakech were included from 23 March to 15 May 2020. This group consisted of 68 men and 55 women. Regarding the initial location of the cancer, the distribution was as follows: 10 cancers of breast and gynaecological origin, 19 gastrointestinal, 52 head and neck cancers, 5 urological, 28 pulmonary cancers and 9 sarcoma. Twenty patients had a psychiatric history. Of these, 11 had a history of depression. In 5 patients, there was the notion of alcoholism. Four patients had a history of anxiety disorders. The assessment of psychological distress was carried out using 2 scales: 1. Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS) 2. the Edmonton Symptom Assessment System Scale (ESAS).

Results: The results of HADS showed 77 (62%) patients and 67 (54%) patients had anxiety and depression, respectively. For both anxiety and depression, the gender difference was not statistically significant (chi-square test, \( P = 0.47 \)). There was no difference between patients with a psychiatric history and those without (\( P = 0.39 \)). For the ESAS, the most expressed symptom was financial distress (4; interquartile range 0-7); whereas all ESAS symptom assessment scores were moderate. The majority of patients expressed their worry about being infected themselves (90%) or their family (85%), and of cancer progression due to delayed treatment (95%).

Conclusions: During the outbreak of COVID-19, the vast majority of cancer patients (more than half) in our study developed anxiety, depression and fear of COVID-19 infection. These results imply that cancer patients followed during the epidemic require serious psychosocial support focused on COVID-19-related fears.
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Background: Patients with cancer may be at higher risk for a more severe form of COVID-19. The aim of this study was to evaluate the relationship between potential drug-drug interactions (PDDI) with hospital stays in COVID-19 cancer patients.

Methods: A retrospective study of all COVID-19 cancer patients was performed in the Hospital del Mar (Barcelona, Spain). Demographic and clinical data were obtained from electronic clinical records. Data on concomitant drugs at COVID-19 diagnosis were collected. Drug interactions were checked with Lexicomp database and classified by severity. Comparisons were analysed by Mann–Whitney U-test or Fisher’s exact test. \( P<0.05 \) statistically significant.

Results: Fifty patients were included, consisting of 30 women (60%), with a mean age of 70.1±12.7 years. The main cancer site was gastrointestinal 16 (32%), followed by breast 15 (30%), genitourinary 10 (20%), lung 6 (12%) and gynaecological 3 (6%). A total of 18 (36%) patients had a history of prior treatment. Thirty-eight patients (76%) were discharged from hospital, 11 died (22%) and one (2%) was still in hospital. Four patients (8%) were admitted to ICU. The mean days of hospital stay was 15.8±6.1 days. The average number of concomitant drugs at COVID-19 diagnosis were 7±4.5 and PDDI were detected in 34 patients (68%). There was a mean (range) of 1 (1-4) major PDDI and 5.3 (1-18) moderate PDDI. The most common types of drugs involved in patients with hospital stays of >15 days were psychoanaleptics 31 (12.5 %), anxiolytics 20 (8.0 %) and thiazides 15 (6.0 %), while in patients with hospital stay < 15 days were opioid drugs 14 (8.8 %), blood glucose lowering drugs, excluding insulins 13 (8.2 %) and psychoanaleptics 12 (7.6 %).

Table: 1776P

|                | Hospital stay ≥ 15 days (N = 24) | Hospital stay < 15 days (N = 26) | \( P \)-value |
|----------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------|
| Age, years*    | 71.5 (61.5-80)                   | 71.5 (58-84)                     | 0.749       |
| Female sex**   | 14 (58.3)                        | 16 (61.5)                        | 1.000       |
| Prior treatment** | 15 (62.5)                     | 17 (65.4)                        | 1.000       |
| Concomitant drugs* | 7 (4-12)                       | 5.5 (3-8)                        | 0.267       |
| Potential DDI* | 4 (0.5-6.5)                      | 1.5 (0-6)                        | 0.231       |
| Major DDI†     | 1.5 (0-1.5)                      | 1 (0-1)                          | 0.039       |

* median (Q1-Q3). **n (%) † median (Q1-Q3). **n (%) ‡ median (Q1-Q3). **n (%)

Conclusions: Regardless of the number of hospitalisation days, most of the PDDI were related to drugs of the nervous system. Almost 70% of the patients presented PDDI. A longer hospital stay was associated with a greater number of severe PDDI.
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Background: Treatment of stage IV cancer during COVID-19 pandemic is a challenge, and we need to maintain survival benefit, patient safety, and health care resources at the same time.

Methods: We used the ESMO-MCBS (Forms version 1.1 and cards) and ESMO recommendations for COVID-19 pandemic to launch local guidelines for first-line therapy for ABC, NSCLC and mCRC comparing ESMO-MCBS for the standard therapy (ST) and COVID-19 pandemic therapy (COT). We then compared prices (EGBP) and price changes (PC).

Results: General rules: for PS≥3 patients, chemotherapy was postponed. We applied COVID-19 precautions to all patients. Oral chemotherapy was the preferred option. Every three weeks regimens were preferred over weekly regimens. ABC: Anti CDK4/6 are still the best option for patients with HR+ HER2- in non-visceral crisis, with MCBS 3 or 4. TNBC: carboplatin-containing therapy is still the best option. HER2+3 Addition of carboptatin to combination of trastuzumab and paxlitaxel every three weeks was