

| Study/ presenting author | Study type | N | Population | Intervention/compara tor | Primary Outcome | Effect Size | Secondary Outcomes |
|--|---|-----|--|--|---|---|--|
| GAP/Mohile Abstract 12009 | Cluster randomized trial of community oncology practices | 718 | Pts aged > 70 with incurable solid tumors or lymphoma and > 1 impaired GA domain starting a new treatment regimen were enrolled | Intervention: Oncologists received Geriatric Assessment summary/recommend ations for impairments Control: usual care | Grade 3- 5 toxicity | 50% vs 71%. relative risk (RR: 0.74 (95% CI: 0.63- 0.87; p=0.0002) | Nonheme toxicity: (RR 0.73; 95% CI: 0.53-1.0, p<0.05). Overall Survival was not significantly different (71% vs 74%, p=0.3). |
| GAIN/ Li Abstract 12010 | RCT | 600 | Patients age ≥65, diagnosed with a solid malignancy, and starting a new chemo regimen at City of Hope | Intervention: a multidisciplinary team led by a geriatric oncologist, nurse practitioner, social worker, physical/occupation therapist, nutritionist, and pharmacist, reviewed GA results and implemented interventions based on predefined triggers built into the GA's various domains. Control: Standard of Care, GA results were sent to treating oncologists to use at their discretion. | Grade 3- 5 chemo- related toxicity | 50.5% vs 60.4% (p = 0.02). Absolute risk reduction 9.9% (95% CI: 1.6- 18.2%) | Advance directive completion: 24.1 vs. 10.4% (p < 0.001). No significant differences in ER visits (27.4% vs. 30.7%), hospitalizations (22.1% vs. 19.3%), or average length of stay (median 4.8 vs. 5.0 days) |
| INTEGERAT E / Soo | RCT | 154 | Patients aged >70 years with cancer | Intervention: integrated | HRQOL (ELFI) | Significan tly better | Significant differences favoring the intervention group over the usual |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|---|---|------------------------|--|---|
| Abstract 12011 | | | planned for chemotherapy, targeted therapy or immunotherapy | oncogeriatric care (geriatrician-led comprehensive geriatric assessment and management) Control: usual care | | ELFI score in the intervention than the usual care group across all followup timepoints, with a maximal difference at week 18 (estimated marginal mean ELFI score 72.0 vs 58.7, $p=0.001$). | care group were seen in HRQOL (domains: physical, role and social functioning; mobility, burden of illness and future worries), unplanned hospital admissions (-1.2 admissions per person-years, $p<0.001$) and early treatment discontinuation (32.9% vs 53.2%, $p=0.01$). |
| Perioperative Intervention/ Nipp Abstract 12012 | RCT | 160 | Patients ≥ 65 with GI cancers planning to undergo surgical resection | Intervention: preoperative meeting with geriatric assessment for GA and recommendations and post-op inpatient consultation Control: usual care | Post-op length of stay | ITT: 7.2 v 8.2 days, $P = .37$ PP: 5.9 v 8.2 days, $P = .02$ | ITT: ICU use (23.3% v 32.4%, $p = .23$) ITT: readmission rates within 90 days of surgery (21.7% v 25.0%, $p = .65$) ITT: lower depression symptoms ($B = -1.39$, $P < .01$) at post-op day 5 and fewer moderate/severe ESAS symptoms at post-op day 60 ($B = -1.09$, $P = .02$) |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | | | PP: post-op ICU use (13.3% v 32.4%, p < .05 PP: readmission 16.7% v 25.0%, p = .36 |
| GA, geriatric assessment; RR, relative risk; CI, confidence intervals; RCT, randomized controlled trials; HRQOL, health-related quality of life; ELFI, elderly functional index; GI, gastrointestinal; ITT, intention to treat; PP, per protocol; ICU, intensive care unit; ESAS, Edmonton Symptom Assessment Scale; ICU, intensive care unit. | | | | | | | |