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adequate information to prevent misinformation that may affect decision-making for patient care. The Universitas Sebelas Maret Trust and Readiness Assessment for Cancer Patients (UNS — TRACP35) is an instrument designed to assess a patient’s understanding of cancer, confidence in alternative medicine, and a patient’s confidence in medical therapies. This study aims to see the validity and reliability of UNS — TRACP35 in assessing patients’ understanding of cancer, trust in alternative medicine, and trust in medical treatment for cancer patients in Indonesia.

Methods: This is a cross-sectional hospital-based study conducted on 100 patients at Dr. Moewardi Hospital, using UNS-TRACP35. The questionnaire consisted of 35 questions divided into 3 parts: 15 questions regarding patients’ understanding of cancer, 8 questions regarding their belief in alternative medicine, and 12 questions about patients’ trust in medical treatment. Validity and reliability were used using Pearson and Cronbach alpha.

Results: Validity tests showed that the understanding of cancer ($r = 0.236$–$0.456$), the patient’s confidence in alternative medicine ($r = 0.301$–$0.688$) and the patient’s confidence in medical care ($r = 0.324$–$0.765$) had $r > 0.196$. Reliability tests showed that the questions from each section had Cronbach alpha values of 0.712, 0.830, and 0.844, respectively. Alfa Cronbach > 0.60. The values indicate that all questions in the questionnaire are valid, reliable, consistent, and qualified for further analysis for the treatment of cancer patients.

Conclusions: This study shows that UNS — TRACP35 is valid and reliable for assessing patients’ understanding of cancer, trust in alternative medicine, and medical care.
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Background: Since COVID-19 had a dramatic impact on cancer care worldwide. There are numerous of vaccines developed or being developed in order to prevent the spread of the disease. A recombinant adenovirus-based vaccine, Gam-COVID-Vac (Sputnik V), has shown a favorable safety profile and efficacy in Phase 3 trial. Nowadays it is a main SARS-CoV-2 vaccine in Russia, but there is lack of information on its safety in cancer patients. We conducted a retrospective trial to assess safety of Sputnik V in adult patients with cancer.

Methods: We screened N.N. Blokhin NMRC for records for 01.2021-05.2022 timeframe and identified adult cancer patients vaccinated against SARS-CoV-2 with Sputnik V vaccine and contacted them to assess the tolerability and safety of the above-mentioned vaccine. The patients were asked to report any adverse events they experienced up to 28 days after the last dose of the vaccine. All the adverse events were recorded in the database and graded according to CTCAE criteria. Patients were specifically asked to report the following: pyrexia, asthenia, nausea, vomiting, local reactions, abdominal pain, muscle or joint pain and to report any other concerning symptoms. Symptoms were graded according to CTCAE 03 criteria.

Results: We identified 145 patients who received at least dose of vaccine, safety data were available for 141 of them. Median age was 55 years (21-83), 70 (48.9%), 27 (19.2%), 21 (14.9%) and 19 (13.5%) patients had gynecologic, breast, genitourinary, gastrointestinal tumors, respectively; 5 (3.5%) of patients had other types of tumors. Overall, 70 (49.6%) of patients experienced AE of any grade. Most common AEs were injection reactions (40.4%), pyrexia (24.1%), asthenia (22.0%) and arthralgia (13.5%), results are summarized in the table below. Few patients experienced grade 3-4 AEs, however 1 patient developed grade 4 cerebellar ataxia probably related to vaccination. Cancer type and active treatment were not predictors of AEs.

Table: 426P

| AE                  | Grade 1-2 | Grade 3-4 |
|---------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Injection reactions | 55 (39.0%)| 2 (1.4%)  |
| Pyrexia             | 32 (22.7%)| 2 (1.4%)  |
| Asthenia            | 30 (21.3%)| 1 (0.7%)  |
| Arthralgia          | 19 (13.5%)| 0 (0%)    |
| Other               | 5 (3.5%)  | 1 (0.7%)  |

Conclusions: Sputnik V vaccination appears to be safe and tolerable in patients with cancer, however additional studies should be conducted to assess efficacy and safety of the vaccine in cancer setting.
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Background: Combination therapies (CT) are increasingly being developed and used in oncology. They have clinical benefits over and above monotherapies but face challenges in their assessment and pricing, which can delay or prevent access for patients in Asia-Pacific (AP) markets, especially when CTs consist of multiple on-patient constituents with different manufacturers. OHE conducted a study to understand the access landscape for CTs in AP and current access challenges (if any).

Methods: We extracted information on the regulatory approval and reimbursement decisions from the website of regulatory and HTA agencies, and drug listings of 14 free-dose CTs that received EMA marketing authorisation between 2015 and June 2020. All CTs included a constituent therapy that is licensed in another indication or CT. Markets in scope were Hong Kong, New Zealand, Singapore, South Korea and Taiwan. We developed a discussion guide for a series of interviews held by IQVIA with regulatory and HTA experts in the AP markets and analysed the transcripts to identify access challenges specific to CTs in individual markets.

Results: Only 6 out of 14 CTs of interest achieved access in any of the five AP markets. These comprised on-patient molecules produced by a single manufacturer or one on-patient molecule in combination with off-patient molecules. Barriers to access include anti-trust law impeding pricing negotiations between multiple manufacturers, monotherapy-centric focus of regulatory and reimbursement processes, issues with tracking usage by indication to facilitate indication-based pricing, and payers’ focus on budget impact over value assessment.

Conclusions: A multi-faceted collaborative approach by payers and manufacturers is needed with steps to tackle each barrier and improve patient access to CTs in AP.
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Background: Cancer patients are at increased risk of infection due to immunosuppression, poor nutrition, and other health problems. Various studies have shown that cancer patients have a higher risk of severe complications related to Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) than patients without cancer, however, the strength of associated variances significantly across the studies. We aim to analyse the differences in the clinical characteristics, laboratory parameters, and hospital outcomes of COVID-19 among patients with and without cancer.

Methods: This was a retrospective study of 1873 patients including 102 cancer patients who presented with SARS-CoV-2 infection at our hospital. Our primary outcome was the in-hospital mortality rate due to COVID-19 and the secondary outcome was a comparison of demographic, clinical, laboratory, and treatment parameters of cancer patients compared to non-cancer patients. Multivariate logistic regression models
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