

Adapting care for older cancer patients during the COVID-19 pandemic: Recommendations from the International Society of Geriatric Oncology (SIOG) COVID-19 Working Group.

Title: Adapting care for older cancer patients during the COVID-19 pandemic: Recommendations from the International Society of Geriatric Oncology (SIOG) COVID-19 Working Group.

Publication year: 2020

Journal: Journal of geriatric oncology

Authors: Breast Unit, Department of Medicine Department, The Royal Marsden NHS Foundation Trust, Breast Cancer Research Division, The Institute of Cancer Research, London, UK. Electronic address: nicolo.battisti@rmh.nhs.uk.

Society: International Society of Geriatric Oncology (SIOG)

Origin country: International

Target countries: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, France, Ireland, Italy, Mexico, Philippines, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States

DOI: 10.1016/j.jgo.2020.07.008

PMID: 32709495

Source: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32709495/>

pmc J Geriatr Oncol J Geriatr Oncol 3815 pheelsevier 101534770 Journal of Geriatric Oncology 1879-4068 1879-4076 pmc-is-collection-domain yes pmc-collection-title Elsevier - PMC COVID-19 Collection PMC7365054 PMC7365054.1 7365054 7365054 32709495 10.1016/j.jgo.2020.07.008 S1879-4068(20)30366-0 1 Article Adapting care for older cancer patients during the COVID-19 pandemic: Recommendations from the International Society of Geriatric Oncology (SIOG) COVID-19 Working Group Battisti Nicolò Matteo Luca a ■ Mislant Anna Rachelle b ■ Cooper Lisa c O'Donovan Anita d Audisio Riccardo A. e Cheung Kwok-Leung f Sarrió Regina Gironés g Stauder Reinhard h Soto-Perez-de-Celis Enrique i Jaklitsch Michael j Williams Grant R. k O'Hanlon Shane l Alam Mahmood m Cairo Clarito n Colloca Giuseppe o Gil Luiz Antonio Jr p Sattar Schroder q Kantilal Kumud r Russo Chiara s Lichtman Stuart M. t Brain Etienne u Kanavaras Ravindran v Wildiers Hans w a Breast Unit, Department of Medicine Department, The Royal Marsden NHS Foundation Trust, Breast Cancer Research Division, The Institute of Cancer Research, London, UK b Department of Medical Oncology, Flinders Centre for Innovation in Cancer, Bedford Park, SA, Australia c Division of Aging, Department of Medicine, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA d Discipline of Radiation Therapy, Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland e Department of surgery, Sahlgrenska Academy, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden f School of Medicine, University of Nottingham, Royal Derby Hospital Centre, Derby, UK g Department of Medical Oncology, Hospital Universitari i Politècnic La FE, Valencia, Spain h Department of Internal Medicine V (Haematology and Oncology), Innsbruck Medical University, Innsbruck, Austria i Department of Geriatrics, Instituto Nacional de Ciencias Médicas y Nutrición Salvador Zubirán, Mexico City, Mexico j Brigham and Women's Hospital, Dana-Farber Cancer Institute, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA k Institute for Cancer Outcomes and Survivorship, University of Alabama at Birmingham School of Medicine, Birmingham, AL, USA l University College Dublin, St Vincent's University Hospital, Dublin, Ireland m Pfizer Oncology, Asia Pacific Region, Australia n National Integrated Cancer Control Program, Department of Health, Manila, Philippines o Policlinico A. Gemelli, Rome, Italy p Geriatric Division, São Paulo University, São Paulo, Brazil q College of Nursing, University of Saskatchewan, Regina, Canada r School of Pharmacy, University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK s Department of Medical Oncology, Centre Léon Bérard, Regional Comprehensive Cancer Centre, Claude-Bernard Lyon-1 University, Lyon, France t Department of Medicine, Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, New York, NY, USA u Department of Medical Oncology, Institut Curie/Saint-Cloud, Paris, France v Department of Medical Oncology, National Cancer Centre Singapore, Singapore w Department of General Medical

Oncology, University Hospitals Leuven, Leuven, Belgium ■ Corresponding authors. 11 2020 16 7 2020 11 8 361535 1190 1198 29 6 2020 10 7 2020 16 07 2020 17 07 2020 28 03 2026 © 2020 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved. 2020 Elsevier Inc. Since January 2020 Elsevier has created a COVID-19 resource centre with free information in English and Mandarin on the novel coronavirus COVID-19. The COVID-19 resource centre is hosted on Elsevier Connect, the company's public news and information website. Elsevier hereby grants permission to make all its COVID-19-related research that is available on the COVID-19 resource centre - including this research content - immediately available in PubMed Central and other publicly funded repositories, such as the WHO COVID database with rights for unrestricted research re-use and analyses in any form or by any means with acknowledgement of the original source. These permissions are granted for free by Elsevier for as long as the COVID-19 resource centre remains active. The COVID-19 pandemic poses a barrier to equal and evidence-based management of cancer in older adults. The International Society of Geriatric Oncology (SIOG) formed a panel of experts to develop consensus recommendations on the implications of the pandemic on several aspects of cancer care in this age group including geriatric assessment (GA), surgery, radiotherapy, systemic treatment, palliative care and research.

Age and cancer diagnosis are significant predictors of adverse outcomes of the COVID-19 infection. In this setting, GA is particularly valuable to drive decision-making. GA may aid estimating physiologic reserve and adaptive capability, assessing risk-benefits of either providing or temporarily withholding treatments, and determining patient preferences to help inform treatment decisions. In a resource-constrained setting, geriatric screening tools may be administered remotely to identify patients requiring comprehensive GA. Tele-health is also crucial to ensure adequate continuity of care and minimize the risk of infection exposure.

In general, therapeutic decisions should favor the most effective and least invasive approach with the lowest risk of adverse outcomes. In selected cases, this might require deferring or omitting surgery, radiotherapy or systemic treatments especially where benefits are marginal and alternative safe therapeutic options are available.

Ongoing research is necessary to expand knowledge of the management of cancer in older adults. However, the pandemic presents a significant barrier and efforts should be made to ensure equitable access to clinical trials and prospective data collection to elucidate the outcomes of COVID-19 in this population.

The COVID-19 pandemic requires the implementation of individualized approaches for the management of cancer in older adults. As of June 2020, there were more than 10 million cases and over 500,000 deaths worldwide [1 , 2]. The actual cumulative death toll from COVID-19 is expected to be higher as reporting varies within each country. While the virus affects people of all ages, data have consistently shown that mortality is higher with increasing age and comorbidities [3] , [4] , [5] , [6] . The case fatality rates (CFR) in patients aged less than 70 years were reported as 0.3–3.5% [7 , 8]. This is in contrast to the CFR of 8% in patients aged 70–79 years and around 15% in those aged over 80 years in China [7]. In Italy, epidemiological data shows that the mean age of patients dying from COVID-19 was 80 years [9], with CFR rising with increasing age beyond 70 years: 12.5% (70–79), 19.7% (80–89) and 22.7% (over 90) [8]. In the United States, the death rate in New York City among patients aged 75 years or older was more than 1511 per 100,000 population [10].

COVID-19 represents an additional competing risk factor to consider when undertaking therapeutic decisions for older adults with cancer (Fig. 1). The International Society for Geriatric Oncology (SIOG) advocates for integrating geriatric assessment (GA) to drive decision-making in the management of older adults with cancer, especially during the COVID-19 pandemic. . Fig. 1 Factors to consider in treatment decision-making for older patients with cancer during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Older age and comorbidities such as cardiovascular disease, diabetes, chronic respiratory disease, chronic renal impairment, and cancer have been shown to increase risk for worse outcomes from COVID-19. [11 , 12] In many older patients with cancer where management could be challenging, the risks of morbidity and mortality from acquiring COVID-19 must be considered when assessing risks and benefits of the decision to treat. Currently, personalized care should be the norm in treating older patients with cancer; with COVID-19, it becomes even more imperative that such an approach is followed to avoid the risk of over- or under-treatment [13] and minimize the risk of adopting an ageist approach.

In order to mitigate the negative impact of COVID-19 on the management of cancer in older adults. SIOG has brought together a COVID-19 Working Group including members from different continents and with different specialties (surgery, radiation oncology, medical/geriatric oncology, geriatrics, haematology, nursing, pharmacy) to develop recommendations and an action plan based on expert opinion and evidence related to geriatric oncology and applied to these circumstances.

Cancer is a disease of older adults. On the other hand, baseline information from epidemiological data on specific cancer types, stage, and treatment at the time of COVID-19 infection are lacking. In the recently published COVID-19 and Cancer Consortium (CCC19) cohort, the median age of patients with cancer and COVID-19 was 66 years, and 56% were aged 65 years and older [14]. Mortality was found to be closely associated with age, with patients aged 65–74 and over 75 years having a relative risk of death of 11% and 25% respectively, compared to 6% for patients below the age of 65 years. In the TERA-VOLT cohort of patients with thoracic malignancies and COVID-19, age was also closely associated with increased risk of death, with patients aged 65 years and older (OR 1.88, 95% CI 1.0–3.6) [15].

In general, COVID-19 is acquired by transmission of a respiratory virus via close contact, droplet spray or aerosol, with the duration of viral stability and viability maintained depending on various objects or surfaces [16]. Most local and national health organizations worldwide have implemented various means to mitigate viral transmission and allocate resources appropriately. Primary and secondary prevention measures have included home confinement and social distancing of patients with cancer, limiting their hospital visits where the risk of acquiring COVID-19 is high, and reducing iatrogenic immunosuppression and treatment-related toxicities, which often leads to inpatient admissions that could put pressure on already stretched resources [17]. Goals of care should be established early and documented clearly. These should be revisited periodically and must also include individualized discussions on advance care planning that should be based on the individual circumstances, particularly in the context of a pandemic.

Several geriatric-focused issues have been identified as a result of imposed quarantine and social distancing, including: 1) feelings of estrangement and neglect due to limited access to news or information, friends and family, particularly when access to digital technology is lacking; 2) decline in communication and comprehension not only due to isolation but also from wearing masks and face shields, more particularly so for hard-of-hearing patients who rely on lip reading and non-verbal cues; 3) loss of autonomy and ensuing dependency on others to provide basic needs such as medicines, food and other home supplies due to travel restrictions or lack of access to transportation; 4) disruption of established community support for seniors such as cleaning, shopping, and home maintenance to aid them to cope with daily life; 5) increased risk of deconditioning in the outpatient setting and following acute medical admissions. In addition, social restrictions and shielding can lead to significant decrease in physical activity which, in turn, can contribute to or accelerate loss of muscle mass and bone density, as well as mobility and functional impairment in older adults; [18 , 19] and 6) institutionalized patients, such as those in a nursing care facility are at higher risk of acquiring COVID-19 infection, increased feelings of abandonment, as well as mental health problems [20 , 21].

The risk of delirium is especially important and underestimated, called by some experts the “silent epidemic within the pandemic.” [22 , 23] Leading authorities on delirium have found that altered mental status may be one of the first signs of COVID-19 infection among vulnerable older adults,

and that the current state of hospitals and other healthcare settings is becoming more “deliriogenic” as they restrict visitors, require all staff members to wear personal protective equipment (PPE), and minimize patient interaction to avoid exposure [24]. In these times, it is paramount to evaluate in the out-patient setting and stratify the risk of delirium in patients prior to administering any anticancer therapy. Hence, the impact of social isolation as a result of recommendations on physical distancing, risk of delirium, and decisions regarding anticancer treatment are important issues to assess and pro-actively address [25].

Older patients with underlying comorbidities have increased disease severity and mortality from COVID-19 [26]. Chronological age alone should not drive decisions on whether or not to provide life-saving treatments during the pandemic [27], and yet, older patients with cancer are likely to be doubly disadvantaged as health systems are overwhelmed.

Prior to this pandemic, frailty had been increasingly adopted as a superior predictor of adverse outcomes over chronologic age for older adults in multiple clinical settings. In the oncology setting, frailty has been proven to predict toxicity from treatment and mortality, and leading cancer societies have recommended GA to gauge frailty prior to treatment in older adults to assess such risks [[28] , [29] , [30]]. The decision to treat older patients with cancer is best guided with GA and discussed in a multidisciplinary setting to help care providers determine the best treatment options, predict treatment-related toxicities, and establish ongoing management for cancer and other competing risks [31]. GA is particularly valuable in a context where competing risks are more prevalent. GA may estimate physiologic reserve and adaptive capability, assess risk-benefits of either providing or temporarily withholding treatments, and determine patient preference to help inform treatment decisions.

Different tools, such as the Clinical Frailty Scale and the Frailty Index have been proposed to screen and stratify frailty in the setting of COVID-19 [32 , 33]. However, others have highlighted that their use has not been validated in these circumstances, and advocate for cautious implementation in the context of the pandemic as clear evidence is limited [34 , 35]. Additional concerns about the widespread use of these tools include the need for standardized training to ensure accuracy in the assessment as well as a clear understanding of limitations and appropriateness of using these tools to inform, and not replace personalized discussions and care recommendations for older adults. In the majority of cases, in the interest of time to limit visits and infection exposure for professionals and patients, geriatric screening may be sufficient to identify the risk of frailty in some way. The selection of patients most likely to benefit from a multi-domain GA is a major challenge.

We recommend using screening tools that can be self-administered by patients, such as the G8 screening tool or Vulnerable Elders-13 Survey (VES13) [36]. Once patients are identified as high-risk for frailty, we recommend further assessment by clinicians with geriatric expertise via telemedicine for assessment of function, cognitive reserve, mood and delirium, nutritional status, and social support using validated tools.

Telehealth has been implemented widely across settings in the midst of the current pandemic, and has been shown to be an effective modality [37] even for vulnerable populations [38]. Oncology-specific GA can also be conducted via telemedicine. One example was outlined by the University of Rochester Specialized Oncology Care and Research in the Elderly (SOCARE) and the Ohio State University group. They presented a framework for multi-domain GA that can be conducted mostly by telephone. This telemedicine version of the GA includes a pre-visit phone screen to identify areas of vulnerability and help guide decision-making for older adults with cancer (Table 1) [39]. Table 1 The modified telehealth University of Rochester Specialized Oncology Care and Research in the Elderly (SOCARE) geriatric assessment.

Abbreviations: GA: geriatric assessment; OARS: Older Americans Resources and Services; MOS: Medical Outcomes Survey; PHQ-2: Patient Health Questionnaire 2.

More research on conducting GA in a time-efficient manner is needed and decision-making should incorporate patients' preferences and goals, especially in these times of heightened risk and uncertainty. Paired with the information derived from a GA, goal-concordant care is paramount in partnership with patients and caregivers in weighing the risks of COVID-19 exposure and anticancer treatments against the risks of delaying such treatment.

Decision-making should be individualized and take into account the potential risk of pursuing, delaying or omitting surgery or choosing different surgical approaches. (Table 2). For example, open and endoscopic techniques have different intensive care requirements, whereas some operations may avoid or delay the need of alternative treatments (e.g., neoadjuvant chemotherapy) which may be less safe in the context of the pandemic. Along with patients' fitness and comorbidities that may influence postoperative outcomes, clinicians should consider factors related to the tumor, such as its morbidity and mortality and the presence or absence of ongoing cancer-related symptoms, and those associated with the planned surgical procedure being considered, in order to ensure the most secure and safest approach to achieve local disease control. Table 2 Summary of the International Society of Geriatric Oncology (SIOG) COVID-19 Working Group recommendations on various domains of cancer care.

Maintain physical distancing to reduce risk of exposure and viral transmission

Implement strict infection control policies in residential care facilities and hospitals, and minimize or discourage all non-essential visits

Deploy telehealth care via telephone or video link to protect both the patient and the clinician and provide continuity of care despite social containment

Encourage digital literacy and provide access to online technologies to maintain social network with family, friends, support workers and care providers

Implement a coordinated and pragmatic treatment journey to rationalize and/or minimize hospital appointments

Identify early, periodically re-evaluate and clearly document the goals of care

Consider advance care planning discussions where appropriate

Implement remote geriatric screening as a more time- and resource-efficient strategy to select older patients requiring a more comprehensive assessment

Conduct geriatric assessments by implementing telehealth via platforms in compliance with local electronic health care regulations

Adopt a "virtual" geriatric-focused multidisciplinary team approach through the use of videoconferencing platforms to enable tumor board meetings in compliant with local regulations

Self-administered screening tools: G8, VES-13

SOCARE team telehealth-geriatric assessment

Prioritize surgical management based on patients' global health status and wishes, setting (curative versus palliative), type of surgery and risk of complications, need for general or local anesthetics, expected recovery time, availability of hospital resources, presence of cancer-related symptoms

Defer noncritical surgery especially if neoadjuvant non-myelosuppressive systemic treatment options are available and while ensuring adequate disease behavior monitoring

Consider omitting surgery in selected cases if no clear survival or symptom control benefit especially if safe systemic or radiotherapy options are available

Consider neoadjuvant endocrine therapy to defer breast cancer surgery for HR-positive, HER2-negative breast cancer

Consider primary endocrine therapy instead of surgery for HR-positive, HER2-negative breast cancer

Prioritize radiation therapy approaches based on patients' global health status and wishes, setting (curative versus palliative), fractionation and dosing, risk of side effects, availability of hospital resources, presence of cancer-related symptoms

Delay noncritical radiotherapy within disease-specific safe time intervals in the adjuvant setting especially if systemic treatment options are available

Omit radiotherapy if no clear survival or symptom control benefit

Short- course neoadjuvant radiotherapy for rectal cancer

Single-fraction radiotherapy for palliative purposes

Intraoperative radiotherapy for breast cancer

Stereotactic radiotherapy for early non-small cell lung cancer or central nervous system metastases

Consider ADT to delay radiotherapy for early prostate cancer

Avoid radiotherapy boost for early breast cancer

Prioritize systemic treatments based on patients' global health status and wishes, setting (curative versus palliative), class of agents, expected toxicities, availability of hospital resources, presence of cancer-related symptoms

Implement the use of chemotherapy toxicity prediction tools

Implement home delivery services for oral agents, home blood service and home treatment administration if available

Prescribe primary G-CSF prophylaxis to limit risk of myelosuppression

Delay noncritical systemic treatments within disease-specific safe time intervals in the adjuvant setting

Omit systemic therapy if no clear survival or symptom control benefit

CARG or CRASH chemotherapy toxicity prediction tools

Neoadjuvant endocrine therapy for HR-positive, HER2-negative early breast cancer, particularly for those with lobular histology or Luminal-A like subtype

Primary endocrine therapy for HR-positive, HER2-negative early breast cancer

Substitute oral for intravenous preparation, i.e. oral vinorelbine for day 8 treatment; capecitabine for fluorouracil for the treatment of GI malignancies

Consider omitting adjuvant chemotherapy for patients with low-risk HR-positive, HER2-negative breast cancer and in low-risk Stage II colorectal cancer

Consider 3 over 6 months adjuvant treatment for Stage 3 colorectal cancer

Omit oxaliplatin in Stage 3 colorectal cancer where the benefit in older patients is lacking

Consider ADT to delay surgery and/or radiotherapy for early prostate cancer

Preference for a less frequent treatment dosing schedule, i.e. CAPOX vs. FOLFOX; 6-weekly vs. 3-weekly pembrolizumab

Discuss advance care plans to determine care preferences and goals, such as do not attempt cardiopulmonary resuscitation orders, endotracheal intubation, or dialysis

Use telemedicine and videoconferencing to facilitate communications with older persons in home settings and institutions as appropriate and evaluate their efficacy

Use palliative care techniques to communicate with families and support older patients dying in critical and palliative care settings

Provide WHO recommended infection control procedures and other guidance on PPE, as well as psycho-social and spiritual support to staff in hospitals, nursing homes, hospices and community settings to ensure well-being and resilience

Avoid sedentary lifestyle by integrating home-based physical exercises into daily routine

Either or a combination of 150 min of moderate intensity or 75 min of vigorous intensity of physical activity per week, depending on the pre-existing level of function

Schedule short active breaks during the day, which may include standing every hour, walk around the block or walk several times inside the house, or follow regimen from online exercise class

Practice meditation, mindfulness and deep breathing exercise

Integrate cognitively stimulating activities, i.e. puzzles, reading, or board games

Monitor nutrition, avoid substance abuse, and control comorbidities by coordinating with the primary care provider

Abbreviations: VES-13: Vulnerable Elders Survey-13; HR: hormone receptor; HER2: human epidermal growth factor receptor 2; CARG: Cancer and Aging Research Group; CRASH: Chemotherapy Risk Assessment Scale for High age; G-CSF: granulocyte colony-stimulating factor; ADT: androgen deprivation therapy; SOCARE: University of Rochester Specialized Oncology Care and Research in the Elderly; WHO: World Health Organization.

Elective surgical procedures scheduled at inpatient facilities may be delayed [40 , 41]. Nonetheless, the definition of “elective” is sometimes debatable. Apart from emergency operations, any essential procedures may include those where a delay by two or three months can significantly

impact on outcomes and/or those where surgery is a crucial component of cancer management, such as for breast, colon, gastric, pancreatic, liver, bladder, renal, lung and brain tumors [42 , 43]. Selected procedures aiming for rapid symptomatic relief and minimizing neurological complications should also be prioritized. Surgical management of non-invasive tumors, such as breast ductal in-situ carcinoma, can also be delayed since they are unlikely to impact on survival outcomes in this age group.

The risk of tumor progression with delayed radical surgery should also be balanced with the availability of resources. These include the availability of operating theatres that may have been converted to intensive care units (ICUs), the local ICU and anesthetist capacity, the risk of surgical complications, and the expected recovery time [44]. The presence of pre-existing lung conditions that can increase the risk of complications should also be considered, along with the need to perform aerosol-generating procedures. For patients who require surgery, measures should be put in place to mitigate risks, such as preoperative testing and isolation, use of PPE and cohorting operations in COVID-19-free areas.

An observational study of 1128 patients undergoing surgery and who had a confirmed COVID-19 infection within 7 days before or 30 days after the procedure reported more than 2-fold increase in 30-day mortality for those aged 70 and older (OR 2.30) [45]. Consequently, the most effective surgical procedures with minimal invasiveness, least post-operative morbidity, and fastest recovery time should be prioritized in this age group.

Delaying surgery may be appropriate for selected older patients while monitoring the cancer behavior until the outbreak is under control. For example, a 60-day delay to surgery for stage I-II breast cancer patients had no detrimental impact on outcomes in a retrospective analysis from a single academic hospital [46]. Less toxic systemic treatment such as endocrine therapy or radiotherapy may be considered means to delay surgery in selected cases, as discussed below. Nonetheless, predicting when the outbreak will end, even at a local level remains a significant challenge.

As surgery gets delayed, prehabilitation may be adopted during pandemic to ensure that fitness to treatment is achieved or maintained while waiting, to minimize post-op morbidity and mortality, which may include physical exercise, nutritional support, as well as management of comorbidities, health risks and psychosocial factors [47]. However, such intervention should be implemented in the context of the recommended strategies to minimize the risk of COVID-19 transmission.

In certain circumstances, omitting surgery may be appropriate when the impact on symptoms and survival is minimal or if a safe and effective alternative systemic treatment is available. For example, the use of primary endocrine therapy for older patients with early-stage ER-positive, HER2-negative breast cancer is supported by evidence demonstrating no positive impact of surgery on overall survival (OS) [[48] , [49] , [50]].

Similarly, the use of radiation therapy (RT) in older patients should be prioritized based on its intent, expected benefits, and tumor characteristics in the context of patients' fitness and preference (Table 2). In the older age group, social issues, traveling constraints, daily hospital visits, and patients' concerns regarding exposure may represent significant challenges requiring careful consideration.

Furthermore, radiation dose, fractionation and techniques should be optimized and adapted to the emergency context. In the curative setting, hypofractionated regimens and shorter schedules might be preferable [51]. For example, a short course of neoadjuvant RT should be favored over a more prolonged course of chemoradiotherapy for older patients with locally advanced rectal cancer, with the aim of minimizing the need for hospital attendance and the chances of myelosuppression [52]. For early breast cancer, 15% of patients enrolled in the FAST-Forward study experimental arm were aged 70 years and older and this trial confirmed non-inferiority of a shorter course of adjuvant

RT (26 Gy in 5 fractions) compared with a standard regimen of 40 Gy in 15 fractions [53]. Modest hypofractionation can also be considered for patients with early prostate cancer [54]. Such regimens are appropriate alternatives to minimize the risk of infection exposure in older patients. Despite its role still being debated, intraoperative RT may be considered to spare older adults undergoing surgery from having subsequent outpatient appointments [55 , 56]. Specific guidance is available on RT regimens for patients with hematological malignancies. [57]

In the palliative setting, patients should be offered the smallest number of fractions to minimize the need to attend the hospital and potential exposure to infection. For bony pain relief, a single 8 Gy fraction should be favored as equally effective as multiple fractions [58]. A single fraction also can be offered in case of metastatic cord compression [59]. The role of whole brain RT for the management of brain metastases remains controversial as medical treatments might already be beneficial with regard to symptom control [60]. In contrast, stereotactic body RT (SBRT) might still be appropriate in the context of its better safety profile, which is particularly relevant in frail and older individuals [61].

RT should be delayed in the absence of any significant impact on cancer management outcomes. On the other hand, in cases of curative intent or rapidly progressive disease, the risks of delaying RT might outweigh the risks of COVID-19 exposure and infection [62]. Patients already undergoing RT should be offered a discussion about the risks and benefits of continuing it based on individual goals of care [51 , 63].

For patients with early-stage breast cancer, RT can be safely delayed for up to five months for those receiving chemotherapy followed by endocrine therapy [64]. RT can be delayed by 3–6 months for patients with early prostate cancer in case of low-risk disease while aiming for either active surveillance or upfront androgen deprivation therapy (ADT) [65 , 66]; in cases of high-risk disease, RT can be delayed for up to 2–3 months while starting patients on ADT [67].

In the curative setting, survival gains may be modest in older patients in the context of competing risks of mortality including COVID-19 and careful consideration should be given to balancing risks and benefits. Treatments reducing the risk of locoregional recurrence in the absence of any survival improvement may be appropriately omitted [68]. For older patients with low-risk disease, breast radiotherapy can be safely omitted [69 , 70]. Also, adding a RT boost for patients with early-stage breast cancer does not improve survival outcomes and might cause additional toxicities in older patients. In the palliative setting, RT should be pursued when any other options, including medical treatment (such as analgesia and bisphosphonates for bone pain), have been exhausted.

Finally, in the context of the pandemic, RT in the form of either SBRT or conventional fractionation may represent a reasonable alternative to surgery in selected cases, such as older patients with stage I-II non-small cell lung cancer [71]. SBRT may be valuable in this setting in view of the limited number of fractions required (usually 1–5) to spare patients potentially prolonged admission and postoperative complications. Combined data from two trials comparing SBRT with surgery showed better 3-year overall survival for SBRT and no differences in locoregional and distant recurrence, although this analysis should be interpreted with caution in view of the small number of patients enrolled [72]. The practicalities of reducing infection risk within the radiotherapy department and educating patients on appropriate safety measures is discussed in detail elsewhere [68 , 73].

The potential benefits of systemic treatments (including chemotherapy, targeted therapy, endocrine therapy and immunotherapy) in terms of tumor control are unchanged during a pandemic. However, risks may be higher especially for treatments causing myelosuppression or requiring frequent hospital visits and increased infection exposure. Nonetheless, the balance of risks and benefits remains uncertain as there is no evidence suggesting that changing or withholding systemic treatment is beneficial during a pandemic (Table 2) [74]. Therefore, decision-making should again be individualized based on consideration of tumor biology, type of systemic therapy, patients' general health status and preferences in the context of the presence of cancer-related symptoms

(in cases of active disease), local prevalence of COVID-19, the availability of healthcare system resources, and the risk of infection exposure. Guidelines focusing on delivering specific systemic treatments during the pandemic are also available [63].

Models based on GA have been developed to predict chemotherapy toxicity and may aid therapeutic decisions in older patients. Therefore, their implementation is particularly appropriate in the context of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. The Cancer and Aging Research Group (CARG) model takes into account age, type of cancer, proposed chemotherapy regimen, renal and hematologic function, hearing, along with GA domains such as ability to take medications, physical activity and social activity [75 , 76]. The Chemotherapy Risk Assessment Scale for High age (CRASH) is based on the specific chemotherapy regimen being considered as well as laboratory values (creatinine, albumin, hemoglobin, lactate dehydrogenase, liver function tests) and assessments of functional, mental, and nutritional status [77].

In the curative setting, chemotherapy should be considered if indicated and in the presence of clear survival benefits, which may be less established in the older age group [78]. If possible, a shorter treatment duration should also be considered. In the palliative setting, shared decision-making should also take into account the hazards of worsening symptoms and functional status, which may lead to losing the opportunity to treat [79]. Discontinuing chemotherapy may be an option for some patients with low volume disease or after attaining ongoing disease, especially if alternative non-myelosuppressive agents are available, such as endocrine therapy for hormone receptor-positive breast cancer patients.

In general, evidence-based chemotherapy regimens that require less frequent dosing should be favored in order to minimize the need for hospital attendance, especially in cases of high local prevalence of COVID-19. If available and appropriate, oral agents should be considered in place of intravenous treatments, as long as there is evidence to support this change. For example, capecitabine can substitute for fluorouracil in managing colorectal malignancies without compromising outcomes [80]. Whenever possible, physicians should attempt to utilize existing evidence to choose strategies shown to be of similar efficacy (in both the younger and older population) over more intensive and/or toxic regimens. Relevant examples include offering three instead of six months of adjuvant chemotherapy for patients with stage III colon cancer [81], utilizing a 40% dose reduction of combined oxaliplatin and capecitabine chemotherapy for frail or older patients with metastatic gastric cancer [82], or opting for best supportive care alone over chemotherapy for vulnerable/frail patients with advanced lung cancer [83].

Primary prophylaxis with granulocyte colony-stimulating factors is advisable for patients receiving chemotherapy in view of the higher risk of myelosuppression in older individuals [84] , [85] , [86] . Home-drawn blood service can also be considered, along with setting up courier drug delivery and home treatment administration systems to minimize the need to travel to the hospital. The National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN) has issued a toolkit to facilitate the shifting of systemic anticancer treatments for hematologic malignancies from inpatient to outpatient setting [87].

In older patients with hematological malignancies, the risk of disease and treatment-related lymphopenia and neutropenia should also be considered and integrated in decision-making [88]. Likewise, the need for anti-CD20 monoclonal antibodies should be critically evaluated in view of the adverse impact of lymphopenia on COVID-19 outcomes [88]. Data are limited on the impact of immunotherapy on COVID-19 and potential risks and benefits should be balanced and personalized in older patients. Nonetheless, the less frequent dosing of some immunotherapy agents is particularly attractive in this context to minimize the need for hospital visits.

Systemic treatment given in the adjuvant setting can be delayed within the accepted timing for each tumor type. For example, for patients with colorectal or lung cancer, it can be safely postponed for up to 8 weeks [89 , 90], and for those with breast cancer for up to 12 weeks after surgery [91]. Older patients should not be denied systemic treatments on the basis of chronological age alone. Instead, the decision to treat should consider individual circumstances that are likely to influence a

significant impact on survival or symptom control, including life expectancy, comorbidities and tumor biology, in the context of patients' preferences.

Systemic therapies may also be considered as effective means to delay surgery in selected cases. A neoadjuvant endocrine approach is particularly valuable for older patients with estrogen receptor-positive, human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 (HER2)-negative breast cancer, as aromatase inhibitors are associated with low toxicity and reasonable response rates at 3–4 months [92]. ADT may also be considered preoperatively for selected older adults with prostate cancer, although evidence on its impact on radical resection rates is still scarce [93 , 94]. Despite the benefits, the use of upfront chemotherapy, e.g. taxanes, in the pandemic setting is more questionable in view of the higher risk of myelosuppression and infections in the older age group, the need for more hospital visits and clinician-patient contact, not unless the risks are outweighed by the benefits of rapid disease control to allow a curative resection [84 , 85 , 95], although patients' preferences remain crucial [96].

Despite the scarcity of health resources brought on by the pandemic, attention needs to be paid for the provision and maintenance of palliative care services. COVID-19 restrictions and physical distancing guidelines have resulted in reduced access to available information, care and supports from families and friends, as well as social and personal care services that allow older persons, including those living with disabilities, to cope at home. Older persons with cancer may present with symptoms associated with their malignancy or treatment toxicity, exacerbation of comorbidities or COVID-19 that may require hospital admission for critical care and/or referral to palliative care.

Early discussion of advance care plans should be implemented to determine patients' preferences and treatment goals. Telemedicine can also facilitate communication with older adults in home settings and institutions as appropriate. Clinicians should also ensure prompt and adequate communication with families and support older patients during end of life care in critical and palliative care setting, including psycho-social and spiritual support. Infection control procedures should apply also to palliative care settings. The demand for palliative care services (at home or residential care facilities, in hospitals or hospices) may increase and this should be adapted to respond rapidly and flexibly during the pandemic [97], within the scope of availability of staff and other health-care resources.

Cancer survivors include people who have completed initial treatment with no evidence of active disease or those living with progressive disease who may be receiving cancer treatment but are not in the terminal phase of illness [98]. Older people account for more than two-thirds of cancer survivors [99]. However, COVID-19 may disproportionately impact older cancer survivors' physical health and psychosocial wellbeing, which may lead to unintended consequences in the long-term [100]. Despite social and outdoor activities being on hold due to COVID-19 restrictions, it is recommended to avoid sedentary lifestyle by maintaining physical activity by integrating exercise into the daily routine [101].

Delivery of high-quality, tailored, person-centred survivorship care to address the unique needs of older cancer survivors during the pandemic is challenging. Nonetheless, as evidence here is still lacking, the recommendations valid for the general population should apply also to older cancer survivors.

The COVID-19 pandemic presents a further major barrier to participation in clinical trials for older adults with cancer, who are already under-represented in oncology studies [102]. Screening and/or enrolment for certain clinical trials have been either halted or prioritized in several research programs worldwide [103]. Nonetheless, where feasible, it is imperative to continue facilitating the access of older patients to clinical trials to minimize the impact of the pandemic on the expansion of knowledge relevant for this age group while complying with current regulations and limiting the consequences on study integrity [104 , 105]. The US Food and Drug Administration and the European Medicines Agency have issued specific recommendations on this topic [106 , 107].

In addition, more evidence on the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic in older adults with cancer is warranted. With many preventive (i.e. COVID-19 vaccine) trials underway, inclusion of eligible older patients with cancer should be considered. As recently outlined by the CARG investigators [25], multicenter and international collaborations and novel methods of rapid dissemination will be crucial to elucidate the interaction between global health measures (rather than age alone) and oncological outcomes, along with endpoints particularly meaningful for older adults, such as function and quality of life.

COVID-19 is an emerging and rapidly evolving condition that warrants tailored care and assessment depending on the disease prevalence. As society grapples with the pandemic and how best to deliver cancer care in older patients, there is an urgent need to act now to protect the vulnerable and mitigate the projected negative outcomes in this age group. As this is unlikely to be the last pandemic that we will encounter, it is imperative to take this unique opportunity to learn and devise management plans for both present and future use. It should also be acknowledged that the previously mentioned recommendations may lead to different implementation depending on the stage of the pandemic. Whilst data are still emerging and median follow-up from published trials is short to make robust conclusions, the SIOG Working Group has developed a number of recommendations on the management of older adults with cancer and future directions, which are outlined in Table 2 .

Organization, WH Novel coronavirus (COVID-19) situation Available from <https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019> 2020 3 Kuderer N.M. Clinical impact of COVID-19 on patients with cancer (CCC19): a cohort study The Lancet 395 10241 2020 1907 1918 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31187-9 Epub 2020 May 28 PMC7255743 32473681 4 Lee L.Y.W. COVID-19 mortality in patients with cancer on chemotherapy or other anticancer treatments: a prospective cohort study Lancet 395 10241 2020 1919 1926 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31173-9 Epub 2020 May 28 32473682 PMC7255715 5 Liang W. Cancer patients in SARS-CoV-2 infection: a nationwide analysis in China Lancet Oncol 21 3 2020 335 337 32066541 10.1016/S1470-2045(20)30096-6 PMC7159000 6 Zhou F. Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study Lancet 395 10229 2020 1054 1062 32171076 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30566-3 PMC7270627 7 The epidemiological characteristics of an outbreak of 2019 novel coronavirus diseases (COVID-19) in China Zhonghua Liu Xing Bing Xue Za Zhi 41 2 2020 145 151 32064853 10.3760/cma.j.issn.0254-6450.2020.02.003 8 Livingston E. Bucher K. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in Italy JAMA 323 14 2020 1335 32181795 10.1001/jama.2020.4344 9 Sanità I.S.D. Characteristics of SARS-CoV-2 patients dying in Italy [Report based on available data on May 28th, 2020] 2020 10 Death rates for COVID-19 in New York City as of June 8, 2020, by age group (per 100,000 people) [cited 2020 11/06/2020]; Available from: <https://www.statista.com/statistics/1109867/coronavirus-death-rates-by-age-new-york-city/> 2020 11 Richardson S. Presenting characteristics, comorbidities, and outcomes among 5700 patients hospitalized with COVID-19 in the New York City area Jama 323 20 2020 2052 2059 10.1001/jama.2020.6775 Online ahead of print 32320003 PMC7177629 12 Wang B. Does comorbidity increase the risk of patients with COVID-19: evidence from meta-analysis Aging (Albany NY) 12 7 2020 6049 6057 32267833 10.18632/aging.103000 PMC7185114 13 DuMontier C. Defining undertreatment and overtreatment in older adults with cancer: a scoping literature review J Clin Oncol 2020 Jco1902809 10.1200/JCO.19.02809 PMC7392742 32250717 14 Kuderer N.M. Clinical impact of COVID-19 on patients with cancer (CCC19): a cohort study Lancet 395 10241 2020 1907 1918 32473681 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31187-9 PMC7255743 15 Garassino M.C. COVID-19 in patients with thoracic malignancies (TERAVOLT): first results of an international, registry-based, cohort study Lancet Oncol 21 7 2020 914 922 10.1016/S1470-2045(20)30314-4 Epub 2020 Jun 12 32539942 PMC7292610 16 van Doremalen N. Aerosol and surface stability of SARS-CoV-2 as compared with SARS-CoV-1 New England Journal of Medicine 382 16 2020 1564 1567 32182409 10.1056/NEJMc2004973 PMC7121658 17 Fratino L. Coronavirus: older persons with cancer in Italy in the COVID-19 pandemic Front Oncol 10 2020 648 32426285 10.3389/fonc.2020.00648 PMC7203468 18 Grimmer M. Mobility related physical and functional losses due to aging and disease - a motivation for lower limb exoskeletons J Neuroeng Rehabil 16

1 2019 2 10.1186/s12984-018-0458-8 PMC6318939 30606194 19 Paterson D.H. Warburton D.E. Physical activity and functional limitations in older adults: a systematic review related to Canada's physical activity guidelines *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* 7 2010 38 20459782

10.1186/1479-5868-7-38 PMC2882898 20 Armitage R. Nellums L.B. COVID-19 and the consequences of isolating the elderly *Lancet Public Health* 5 5 2020 e256

10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30061-X PMC7104160 32199471 21 Petretto D.R. Pili R. Ageing and COVID-19: what is the role for elderly people? *Geriatrics (Basel)* 5 2 2020

10.3390/geriatrics5020025 PMC7345165 32357582 22 Helms J. Neurologic features in severe SARS-CoV-2 infection *New England Journal of Medicine* 382 23 2020 2268 2270 32294339

10.1056/NEJMc2008597 PMC7179967 23 Mao L. Neurologic manifestations of hospitalized patients with coronavirus disease 2019 in Wuhan, China *JAMA Neurol* 77 6 2020 1 9

10.1001/jamaneurol.2020.1127 Online ahead of print 32275288 PMC7149362 24 O'Hanlon S. Inouye S.K. Delirium: a missing piece in the COVID-19 pandemic puzzle *Age Ageing* 49 4 2020 497 498 10.1093/ageing/afaa094 32374367 PMC7239228 25 Mohile S. Perspectives from the Cancer and Aging Research Group: caring for the vulnerable older patient with cancer and their caregivers during the COVID-19 crisis in the United States *J Geriatr Oncol* 11 5 2020 753 760 32340908

10.1016/j.jgo.2020.04.010 PMC7172832 26 Onder G. Rezza G. Brusaferro S. Case-fatality rate and characteristics of patients dying in relation to COVID-19 in Italy *Jama* 2020

10.1001/jama.2020.4683 32203977 27 Balducci L. Colloca G. Natural disaster and rationing of care *J Geriatr Oncol* 11 5 2020 750 752 10.1001/jama.2020.4683 Online ahead of print 32278700

PMC7141625 28 Mohile S.G. Practical assessment and management of vulnerabilities in older patients receiving chemotherapy: ASCO guideline for geriatric oncology *J Clin Oncol* 36 22 2018 2326 2347 29782209 10.1200/JCO.2018.78.8687 PMC6063790 29 Cohen H.J. Frailty as determined by a comprehensive geriatric assessment-derived deficit-accumulation index in older patients with cancer who receive chemotherapy *Cancer* 122 24 2016 3865 3872 27529755

10.1002/cncr.30269 PMC5138076 30 Guerard E.J. Frailty index developed from a cancer-specific geriatric assessment and the association with mortality among older adults with cancer *J Natl Compr Canc Netw* 15 7 2017 894 902 28687577 10.6004/jnccn.2017.0122 31 Goede V. Stauder R. Multidisciplinary care in the hematology clinic: implementation of geriatric oncology *J Geriatr Oncol* 10 3 2019 497 503 30241779 10.1016/j.jgo.2018.09.003 32 COVID-19 rapid guideline: critical care in adults 2020 2020 National Institute for Health and Care Excellence 33497153 33 Bellelli G. Frailty index predicts poor outcome in COVID-19 patients *Intensive Care Med* 2020 1 3

10.1007/s00134-020-06087-2 PMC7246290 32451583 34 Chong E. COVID-19: use of the clinical frailty scale for critical care decisions *J Am Geriatr Soc* 68 6 2020 E30 E32 10.1111/jgs.16528 Epub 2020 May 13 32359076 PMC7267651 35 Moug S. Decision-making in COVID-19 and frailty *Geriatrics (Basel)* 5 2 2020 10.3390/geriatrics5020030 PMC7344473 32384707 36 Decoster L. Screening tools for multidimensional health problems warranting a geriatric assessment in older cancer patients: an update on SIOG recommendations *Ann Oncol* 26 2 2015 288 300 24936581

10.1093/annonc/mdu210 37 Hollander J.E. Carr B.G. Virtually perfect? Telemedicine for covid-19 *N Engl J Med* 382 18 2020 1679 1681 32160451 10.1056/NEJMp2003539 38 Calton B. Abedini N. Fratkin M. Telemedicine in the time of coronavirus *J Pain Symptom Manage* 60 1 2020 e12 e14 10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2020.03.019 Epub 2020 Mar 31 PMC7271287 32240756 39 DiGiovanni G. Development of a telehealth geriatric assessment model in response to the COVID-19 pandemic *J Geriatr Oncol* 11 5 2020 761 763 32327321 10.1016/j.jgo.2020.04.007 PMC7164886 40 CDC guidance for health care facilities 2020 [cited 2020 12/06/2020]; Available from: https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/guidance-hcf.html?CDC_AA_refVal=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.cdc.gov%2Fcoronavirus%2F2019-ncov%2Fhealthcare-facilities%2Fguidance-hcf.html 41 Maintaining essential health services: operational guidance for the COVID-19 context [cited 2020 12/06/2020]; Available from: <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/covid-19-operational-guidance-for-maintainin-g-essential-health-services-during-an-outbreak> 2020 42 Cancer surgery and COVID19 *Ann Surg Oncol* 27 6 2020 1713 1716 32285279 10.1245/s10434-020-08462-1 PMC7153355 43 COVID-19 and surgery [cited 2020 12/06/2020]; Available from: <https://www.facs.org/covid-19> 2020 44 Sud A. Collateral damage: the impact on outcomes from cancer surgery of the COVID-19 pandemic *Ann Oncol* S0923-7534 20 2020 39825 39832 10.1016/j.annonc.2020.05.009 Online ahead of print PMC7237184 32442581 45 Mortality and pulmonary complications in patients undergoing surgery with perioperative SARS-CoV-2 infection: an international cohort study *Lancet* 396 10243 2020 27 38 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31182-X Epub 2020 May 29 32479829 PMC7259900 46 Mansfield

S.A. Timing of breast cancer surgery-how much does it matter? *Breast J* 23 4 2017 444 451 28117507 10.1111/tbj.12758 47 Silver J.K. Prehabilitation may help mitigate an increase in COVID-19 peripandemic surgical morbidity and mortality *Am J Phys Med Rehabil* 99 6 2020 459 463 32324618 10.1097/PHM.0000000000001452 PMC7253050 48 Hind D. Surgery versus primary endocrine therapy for operable primary breast cancer in elderly women (70 years plus) *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 1 2006 Cd004272 16437480 10.1002/14651858.CD004272.pub2 49 Chakrabarti J. A randomised trial of mastectomy only versus tamoxifen for treating elderly patients with operable primary breast cancer-final results at 20-year follow-up *Crit Rev Oncol Hematol* 78 3 2011 260 264 20447833 10.1016/j.critrevonc.2010.04.006 50 Johnston S.J. A randomised trial of primary tamoxifen versus mastectomy plus adjuvant tamoxifen in fit elderly women with invasive breast carcinoma of high oestrogen receptor content: long-term results at 20 years of follow-up *Ann Oncol* 23 9 2012 2296 2300 22357257 10.1093/annonc/mdr630 51 COVID-19 FAQs [cited 2020 12/06/2020]; Available from: <https://www.astro.org/Daily-Practice/COVID-19-Recommendations-and-Information/COVID-19-FAQs> 2020 52 Marijnen C.A.M. International expert consensus statement regarding radiotherapy treatment options for rectal cancer during the COVID 19 pandemic *Radiother Oncol* 148 2020 213 215 32342861 10.1016/j.radonc.2020.03.039 PMC7194592 53 Murray Brunt A. Hypofractionated breast radiotherapy for 1 week versus 3 weeks (FAST-Forward): 5-year efficacy and late normal tissue effects results from a multicentre, non-inferiority, randomised, phase 3 trial *The Lancet* 395 10237 2020 1613 1626 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30932-6 PMC7262592 32580883 54 Dearnaley D. Conventional versus hypofractionated high-dose intensity-modulated radiotherapy for prostate cancer: 5-year outcomes of the randomised, non-inferiority, phase 3 CHHiP trial *Lancet Oncol* 17 8 2016 1047 1060 27339115 10.1016/S1470-2045(16)30102-4 PMC4961874 55 Vaidya J.S. Targeted intraoperative radiotherapy versus whole breast radiotherapy for breast cancer (TARGIT-A trial): an international, prospective, randomised, non-inferiority phase 3 trial *The Lancet* 376 9735 2010 91 102 10.1016/S0140-6736(10)60837-9 20570343 56 Esposito E. Douek M. Update on intraoperative radiotherapy: new challenges and issues *Ecancermedicalscience* 12 2018 793 29434659 10.3332/ecancer.2018.793 PMC5804714 57 Yahalom J. ILROG emergency guidelines for radiation therapy of hematological malignancies during the COVID-19 pandemic *Blood* 135 21 2020 1829 1832 32275740 10.1182/blood.2020006028 PMC7243146 58 Chow R. Single vs multiple fraction palliative radiation therapy for bone metastases: cumulative meta-analysis *Radiother Oncol* 141 2019 56 61 31445837 10.1016/j.radonc.2019.06.037 59 Hoskin P.J. Effect of single-fraction vs multifraction radiotherapy on ambulatory status among patients with spinal canal compression from metastatic cancer: the SCORAD randomized clinical trial *JAMA* 322 21 2019 2084 2094 31794625 10.1001/jama.2019.17913 PMC6902166 60 Mulvenna P. Dexamethasone and supportive care with or without whole brain radiotherapy in treating patients with non-small cell lung cancer with brain metastases unsuitable for resection or stereotactic radiotherapy (QUARTZ): results from a phase 3, non-inferiority, randomised trial *The Lancet* 388 10055 2016 2004 2014 10.1016/S0140-6736(16)30825-X PMC5082599 27604504 61 Davis J.N. Stereotactic body radiotherapy for centrally located early-stage non-small cell lung cancer or lung metastases from the RSSearch(®) patient registry *Radiat Oncol* 10 2015 113 10.1186/s13014-015-0417-5 PMC4443630 25975848 62 Nagar H. Formenti S.C. Cancer and COVID-19 - potentially deleterious effects of delaying radiotherapy *Nat Rev Clin Oncol* 17 6 2020 332 334 32341524 10.1038/s41571-020-0375-1 PMC7184542 63 COVID-19 rapid guideline: delivery of radiotherapy. NICE guideline [NG162] 2020 National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) 33497154 64 Olivetto I.A. Intervals longer than 20 weeks from breast-conserving surgery to radiation therapy are associated with inferior outcome for women with early-stage breast cancer who are not receiving chemotherapy *J Clin Oncol* 27 1 2009 16 23 19018080 10.1200/JCO.2008.18.1891 65 Crook J. Final report of multicenter Canadian phase III randomized trial of 3 versus 8 months of neoadjuvant androgen deprivation therapy before conventional-dose radiotherapy for clinically localized prostate cancer *International Journal of Radiation Oncology*Biophysics* 73 2 2009 327 333 18707821 10.1016/j.ijrobp.2008.04.075 66 Neal D.E. Ten-year mortality, disease progression, and treatment-related side effects in men with localised prostate cancer from the protect randomised controlled trial according to treatment received *Eur Urol* 77 3 2020 320 330 31771797 10.1016/j.eururo.2019.10.030 67 Ghadjjar P. Use of androgen deprivation and salvage radiation therapy for patients with prostate cancer and biochemical recurrence after prostatectomy *Strahlenther Onkol* 194 7 2018 619 626 29383406 10.1007/s00066-018-1269-3 68 Simcock R.

COVID-19: global radiation oncology's targeted response for pandemic preparedness Clin Transl Radiat Oncol 22 2020 55 68 32274425 10.1016/j.ctro.2020.03.009 PMC7102593 69 Hughes K.S. Lumpectomy plus tamoxifen with or without irradiation in women age 70 years or older with early breast cancer: long-term follow-up of CALGB 9343 J Clin Oncol 31 19 2013 2382 2387 23690420 10.1200/JCO.2012.45.2615 PMC3691356 70 Matuschek C. The benefit of adjuvant radiotherapy after breast conserving surgery in older patients with low risk breast cancer- a meta-analysis of randomized trials Radiat Oncol 12 1 2017 60 10.1186/s13014-017-0796-x PMC5364687 28335784 71 Schneider B.J. Stereotactic body radiotherapy for early-stage non-small-cell lung cancer: American society of clinical oncology endorsement of the American society for radiation oncology evidence-based guideline J Clin Oncol 36 7 2018 710 719 29106810 10.1200/JCO.2017.74.9671 72 Chang J.Y. Stereotactic ablative radiotherapy versus lobectomy for operable stage I non-small-cell lung cancer: a pooled analysis of two randomised trials Lancet Oncol 16 6 2015 630 637 25981812 10.1016/S1470-2045(15)70168-3 PMC4489408 73 Tsang Y. Meeting the challenges imposed by COVID-19: guidance document by the ESTRO Radiation Therapist Committee (RTTC) Technical Innovations & Patient Support in Radiation Oncology 15 2020 6 10 32514473 10.1016/j.tipsro.2020.05.003 PMC7242958 74 Russell B. Associations between immune-suppressive and stimulating drugs and novel COVID-19-a systematic review of current evidence Ecanermedicalscience 14 2020 1022 32256705 10.3332/ecancer.2020.1022 PMC7105343 75 Hurria A. Predicting chemotherapy toxicity in older adults with cancer: a prospective multicenter study J Clin Oncol 29 25 2011 3457 3465 21810685 10.1200/JCO.2011.34.7625 PMC3624700 76 Hurria A. Validation of a prediction tool for chemotherapy toxicity in older adults with cancer J Clin Oncol 34 20 2016 2366 2371 27185838 10.1200/JCO.2015.65.4327 PMC5321104 77 Extermann M. Predicting the risk of chemotherapy toxicity in older patients: the chemotherapy risk assessment scale for high-age patients (CRASH) score Cancer 118 13 2012 3377 3386 22072065 10.1002/cncr.26646 78 Giordano S.H. Use and outcomes of adjuvant chemotherapy in older women with breast cancer J Clin Oncol 24 18 2006 2750 2756 16782915 10.1200/JCO.2005.02.3028 79 Ueda M. Managing Cancer care during the COVID-19 pandemic: agility and collaboration toward a common goal J Natl Compr Canc Netw 2020 1 4 10.6004/jnccn.2020.7560 32197238 80 Hofheinz R.D. Chemoradiotherapy with capecitabine versus fluorouracil for locally advanced rectal cancer: a randomised, multicentre, non-inferiority, phase 3 trial Lancet Oncol 13 6 2012 579 588 22503032 10.1016/S1470-2045(12)70116-X 81 Grothey A. Duration of adjuvant chemotherapy for stage III colon cancer New England Journal of Medicine 378 13 2018 1177 1188 29590544 10.1056/NEJMoa1713709 PMC6426127 82 Hall P.S. Optimizing chemotherapy for frail and elderly patients (pts) with advanced gastroesophageal cancer (aGOAC): the GO2 phase III trial J Clin Oncol 37 15_suppl 2019 4006 83 Corre R. Use of a comprehensive geriatric assessment for the management of elderly patients with Advanced non-small-cell lung cancer: the phase III randomized ESO GIA-GFPC-GECP 08-02 study J Clin Oncol 34 13 2016 1476 1483 26884557 10.1200/JCO.2015.63.5839 84 Dees E.C. A prospective pharmacologic evaluation of age-related toxicity of adjuvant chemotherapy in women with breast cancer Cancer Invest 18 6 2000 521 529 10923100 10.3109/07357900009012191 85 Schild S.E. The outcome of combined-modality therapy for stage III non-small-cell lung cancer in the elderly J Clin Oncol 21 17 2003 3201 3206 12874270 10.1200/JCO.2003.12.019 86 Gómez H. Elderly patients with aggressive non-Hodgkin's lymphoma treated with CHOP chemotherapy plus granulocyte-macrophage colony-stimulating factor: identification of two age subgroups with differing hematologic toxicity J Clin Oncol 16 7 1998 2352 2358 9667250 10.1200/JCO.1998.16.7.2352 87 Toolkit Providing oncology treatments in the outpatient setting 2020 88 von Lilienfeld-Toal M. Frequently asked questions regarding SARS-CoV-2 in cancer patients—recommendations for clinicians caring for patients with malignant diseases Leukemia 34 6 2020 1487 1494 32358568 10.1038/s41375-020-0832-y PMC7194246 89 Bos A.C. Timing of adjuvant chemotherapy and its relation to survival among patients with stage III colon cancer Eur J Cancer 51 17 2015 2553 2561 26360411 10.1016/j.ejca.2015.08.016 90 Burdett S. Adjuvant chemotherapy for resected early-stage non-small cell lung cancer Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2015 3 2020 Cd011430 10.1002/14651858.CD011430 PMC10542092 25730344 91 Kupstas A.R. Effect of surgery type on time to adjuvant chemotherapy and impact of delay on breast cancer survival: a national cancer database analysis Ann Surg Oncol 26 10 2019 3240 3249 31332635 10.1245/s10434-019-07566-7 92 Spring L.M. Neoadjuvant endocrine therapy for estrogen receptor-positive breast cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis JAMA Oncol 2 11

2016 1477 1486 27367583 10.1001/jamaoncol.2016.1897 PMC5738656 93 Powell I.J. Neoadjuvant therapy before radical prostatectomy for clinical T3/T4 carcinoma of the prostate: 5-year followup, Phase II Southwest Oncology Group Study 9109 J Urol 168 5 2002 2016 2019 12394698 10.1016/S0022-5347(05)64285-1 94 Scolieri M.J. Altman A. Resnick M.I. Neoadjuvant hormonal ablative therapy before radical prostatectomy: a review. Is it indicated? J Urol 164 5 2000 1465 1472 11025684 95 Crivellari D. Burdens and benefits of adjuvant cyclophosphamide, methotrexate, and fluorouracil and tamoxifen for elderly patients with breast cancer: the International Breast Cancer Study Group Trial VII J Clin Oncol 18 7 2000 1412 1422 10735888 10.1200/JCO.2000.18.7.1412 96 Williams C.P. Importance of quality-of-life priorities and preferences surrounding treatment decision making in patients with cancer and oncology clinicians Cancer 126 15 2020 3534 3541 10.1002/cncr.32961 Epub 2020 May 19 32426870 97 Policy Brief The impact of COVID-19 on older persons 2020 98 Two million reasons - the cancer survivorship agenda: Why we need to support people with or beyond cancer 2008 Macmillan Cancer Support London 99 Bluethmann S.M. Mariotto A.B. Rowland J.H. Anticipating the "Silver tsunami": prevalence trajectories and comorbidity burden among older cancer survivors in the United States Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 25 7 2016 1029 1036 27371756 10.1158/1055-9965.EPI-16-0133 PMC4933329 100 Nekhlyudov L. Addressing the needs of cancer survivors during the COVID-19 pandemic J Cancer Surviv 2020 1 6 10.1007/s11764-020-00884-w PMC7183255 32335850 101 Stay physically active during self-quarantine [27/06/2020]; Available from: <https://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/health-emergencies/coronavirus-covid-19/technical-guidance/stay-physically-active-during-self-quarantine> 2020 102 Scher K.S. Hurria A. Under-representation of older adults in cancer registration trials: known problem, little progress J Clin Oncol 30 17 2012 2036 2038 22547597 10.1200/JCO.2012.41.6727 103 Waterhouse D.M. Early impact of COVID-19 on the conduct of oncology clinical trials and long-term opportunities for transformation: findings from an American society of clinical oncology survey JCO Oncology Practice 0 0 2008 p. OP.20.00275 10.1200/OP.20.00275 32396491 104 de Paula B.H.R. Recommendations from national regulatory agencies for ongoing cancer trials during the COVID-19 pandemic Lancet Oncol 21 5 2020 624 627 32277907 10.1016/S1470-2045(20)30226-6 PMC7252196 105 Fleming T.R. Labriola D. Wittes J. Conducting clinical research during the COVID-19 pandemic: protecting scientific integrity Jama 2020 10.1001/jama.2020.9286 Online ahead of print 32463422 106 FDA Guidance on conduct of clinical trials of medical products during COVID-19 public health emergency: guidance for industry, investigators, and institutional review boards 2020 Food and Drug Administration 107 Guidance on the management of clinical trials during the COVID-19 (coronavirus) pandemic 2020 European Medicines Agency Acknowledgments Dr. Battisti would like to acknowledge the support of the Cridlan Ross Smith Charitable Trust and the NIHR Biomedical Research Centre at The Royal Marsden NHS Foundation Trust and the Institute of Cancer Research, London, UK. Dr. Lichtman is supported by the NCI Cancer Center Support Grant (P30CA008748).