WORLD JOURNAL OF PHARMACEUTICAL RESEARCH
SJIF Impact Factor 8.453
Volume 13, Issue 7, 258-271. Review Article ISSN 2277–7105

BOOSTING THE FIGHT: "THE ROLE OF COLONY STIMULATING FACTORS IN FEBRILE NEUTROPENIA TREATMENT"

Mahalakshmi Kancharla[1]*, Kaarunya Gadde[1], Prasanna Kumari Merakanapalli[2], Satish Kumar Amarthaluri[3], Tabitha Sharon M.[4] and Padmalatha Kantamaneni[5]

[1,2]Pharm D 5th year, Department of Pharmacy Practice, Vijaya Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences for Women, Enikepadu, Vijayawada- 521108, Andhra Pradesh, India.

[3]Associate Professor, MD, Department of Radiation Oncology, Government General Hospital, Siddhartha Medical College, Vijayawada-520008, Andhra Pradesh, India.

[4]Assistant Professor, Department of Pharmacy Practice, Vijaya Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences for Women, Enikepadu, Vijayawada- 521108, Andhra Pradesh, India.

[5]Professor, Department of Pharmacology, Vijaya Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences for Women, Enikepadu, Vijayawada- 521108, Andhra Pradesh, India.

Article Received on
09 February 2024,

Revised on 29 Feb. 2024,
Accepted on 20 March 2024

DOI: 10.20959/wjpr20247-31802

***Corresponding Author**
Mahalakshmi Kancharla
Pharm D 5th year,
Department of Pharmacy Practice, Vijaya Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences for Women, Enikepadu, Vijayawada- 521108, Andhra Pradesh, India.

ABSTRACT

Patients with Febrile Neutropenia are more vulnerable to life-threatening infections and possibly death, especially if their severe neutropenia lasts longer than 10 to 14 days. Febrile Neutropenia [FN] is characterized by a fever above 38.5°C and an absolute neutrophil count of less than 500 cells per cubic millimetre. Neutropenia lasting six to eight days is a common side effect of most standard-dose chemotherapy regimens. Endogenous cytokines, such as interleukin-6 and tumour necrosis factor, are triggered when chemotherapy-induced leukopenia occurs. This can lead to fever even when there is no infection. The possibility of infection, however, is the main worry in a patient with febrile neutropenia. In 25 to 40 percent of patients who have never had chemotherapy, conventional chemotherapy regimens can cause febrile neutropenia (FN). To prevent potentially fatal FN, colony-stimulating factors (CSFs) like granulocyte colony-stimulating factor (G-CSF) and granulocyte-macrophage colony-stimulating factor (GM-CSF) are now essential. Only G-CSF is approved by the US Food

and Drug Administration for use in chemotherapy-induced neutropenia. Colony-stimulating factors (CSFs) are cytokines that stimulate and expedite the production of one or more cell lines in the bone marrow. Primary prophylaxis with G-CSF, or the administration of G-CSF immediately following cycle 1 of chemotherapy, was found to reduce the risk of febrile neutropenia in patients with solid tumours by 50%, without affecting the rates of tumour response, infection-related death, early treatment-related death, or overall survival, according to several meta-analyses. The use of G-CSF has been recognized by the American Society of Clinical Oncology (ASCO) as one of the top five ways to enhance patient outcomes and cut expenses. It was advised against using G-CSF or Pegylated G-CSF for primary prophylaxis in cancer patients receiving chemotherapy if there is less than a 20% chance of chemotherapy-induced febrile neutropenia. Most frequently, Filgrastim and Peg-filgrastim are given as a preventative measure following chemotherapy regimens that are linked to a higher risk of febrile neutropenia. Filgrastim should be started 24 to 72 hours later, and Peg-filgrastim should be given once, 24 hours later. As this strategy has been proven to be safe and successful in phase 2 clinical studies, some doctors choose to start treatment on the day that chemotherapy is finished. After giving chemotherapy, although it shortened hospital stays and increased neutrophil recovery, the administration of CSF in addition to antibiotics did not affect overall mortality in patients with chemotherapy-induced febrile neutropenia. The length of neutropenia was shorter in those receiving CSFs, and they recovered from fevers faster and used antibiotics for shorter periods of time. To prevent and manage this Febrile Neutropenia, Clinical Pharmacist interventions play a vital role.

KEYWORDS: Febrile Neutropenia [FN], Colony-Stimulating Factor [CSF], Granulocyte Colony-Stimulating Factor [G-CSF], Granulocyte-Macrophage Colony-Stimulating Factor [GM-CSF], American Society of Clinical Oncology (ASCO), National Cancer Institute (NCI), Food and Drug Administration (FDA), White Cell Count [WBC], Randomized Controlled Trials (RCTs).

INTRODUCTION

Febrile neutropenia, characterized by a fever above 38.5°C and an absolute neutrophil count of less than 500 cells per cubic millimetre, is the most dangerous side effect of chemotherapy. Six to eight days of neutropenia are commonly associated with standard-dose chemotherapy regimens.[1] Over 60,000 people are admitted to the National Cancer Institute (NCI) each year for the treatment of febrile neutropenia, which equates to about 8 cases for every 1000

patients undergoing cancer chemotherapy.[2] The logistics of the oncologist's resources (pharmacy, imaging department, bacteriological laboratory, critical care unit, and access to an infectious disease specialist) can make managing febrile neutropenia an extremely challenging undertaking. A significant advancement in the natural history, prognosis, and life-saving care of cancer patients experiencing severe post chemotherapy toxicity—which may develop into a therapeutic emergency such as profound febrile neutropenia—has been made possible by the identification of granulocyte colony-stimulating factor, or G-CSF. According to current standards, G-CSF is recommended for patients receiving systemic chemotherapy because of its well-established role in avoiding aplasia.[30] Since, 1960s, febrile neutropenia (FN) has been recognized as a serious side effect of myelosuppressive chemotherapy. By the 1980s, hospitalization and intravenous antibiotics were the usual treatments for FN, and the death rate was high (around 10%). The discovery of myeloid growth factors, which stimulate the development and maturation of progenitors of white blood cells and improve the functionality of adult leukocytes, dates back to the 1960s. These growth factors were isolated, purified, and biosynthesised using recombinant DNA technology in the 1980s as a result of intensive research on them. These growth factors are known as colony-stimulating factors (CSFs) because they cause single progenitor cells to divide into colonies of cells.[4] When cancer patients get chemotherapy, febrile neutropenia (FN) is a comparatively common occurrence. Broad-spectrum antibiotics and supportive care are part of the typical treatment regimen. The literature cannot agree on which antibiotic or combination of antibiotics is best for these patients. A family of cytokines known as hematopoietic growth-stimulating factors controls the division, proliferation, and other properties of hematopoietic cells. Hematopoietic growth factor molecules number more than twenty range, and several of these have been investigated in human clinical trials for various purposes. These include the granulocyte macrophage colony-stimulating factor and granulocyte colony stimulating factor (G-CSF). Since (GM-CSF) may have an impact on neutropenia, studies on cancer patients have been conducted. Humans receiving G-CSF have a dose-dependent increase in circulating neutrophils, primarily due to a shortened timeframe for stem cells to develop neutrophils. The growth of granulocyte, macrophage, and eosinophil colonies is stimulated by GM-CSF. When individuals are given GM-CSF, blood neutrophils, eosinophils, macrophages, and occasionally lymphocytes grow in a dose-dependent manner. There are various G-CSF and GM-CSF varieties on the market that have undergone clinical trial testing. Filgrastim and lenograstim are two of the most commonly used G-CSFs, and sargramostim and molgramostim are two of the most commonly used GMCSFs. When given

as supportive therapy to patients undergoing bone marrow transplantation and right after chemotherapy, G-CSF and GM-CSF have both been shown to be beneficial in lowering the incidence of FN. Clinical trials aimed at evaluating the role of G-CSF and GM-CSF as an adjuvant therapy to antibiotics in patients with FN were informed by their known ability to increase the number of circulating neutrophils. Conflicting findings emerged from randomized trials conducted in this context; two trials found no significant impact of colony-stimulating factors (CSFs) in preventing prolonged hospital stays, while a third study found a significant effect on hospital stay duration. In certain studies, CSF appears to have a positive impact on the recovery period following fever, but not in others.[5] Based on a phase 3 trial including 211 patients with small-cell lung cancer receiving cyclophosphamide, doxorubicin, and etoposide and randomly allocated to receive either filgrastim or placebo, filgrastim was approved by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) in 1991. Following the identification of complementary DNA sequences for G-CSF and GM-CSF in 1985 and 1986, recombinant proteins were created and were ushered into clinical trials. To date, four CSFs have been approved by regulations: GM-CSF derived from yeast (sargramostim); GMCSF developed from Escherichia coli (molgramostim); and pegylated G-CSF (pegfilgrastim), in which the inclusion of polyethylene glycol enhances the half-life of the agent.[6] A class of glycoproteins known as colony-stimulating factors (CSFs) regulates the survival, proliferation, and differentiation of myeloid hematopoietic cells. From the pluripotent stem cells' survival and multiplication to the adult granulocytes and monocytes' ultimate differentiation and mobilization from the bone marrow to the blood, these cytokines are involved at different phases of these processes. Additionally, via boosting phagocytic activity, antimicrobial killing, and antibody-dependent cell-mediated cytotoxicity, G-CSF improves the lifespan and functionality of mature neutrophils. The use of CSFs in cancer treatment has a number of important restrictions. When severe hypoplasia or severe marrow suppression are present, they have a limited effect. A restricted impact could manifest for a few days following hem transplantation, in cases of aplastic anemia, and during AML induction treatment.[7] Growth factors help hematopoietic cells differentiate and survive. Granulocyte–macrophage CSF (GM-CSF) is used to stimulate most types of mature cells, but its primary effect is on neutrophils. GM-CSF also supports the survival and proliferation of several target cells in culture, including neutrophils, eosinophils, basophils, monocytes, and dendritic cells.[8] Growth factor support has been shown to have a positive impact on infection rates or duration as well as neutrophil recovery. The G-CSF-mediated reduction in the time to neutrophil recovery does translate into significant cost savings for antibiotics. For

all patients undergoing induction and consolidation therapy, G-CSF reduces the length of time that they experience neutropenia.[7] Most frequently, prophylactic administration of filgrastim and pegfilgrastim follows chemotherapy regimens that are linked to a high rate of febrile neutropenia.[6] The majority of oncologists administer G-CSF to patients in order to reduce their maximal risk of infection, hospitalization, and antibiotic use, even though there is a paucity of evidence supporting its survival benefit in aplastic patients with severe clinical conditions like grade 4 neutropenia.[3] For every chemotherapy cycle, 6 mg of pegfilgrastim is given subcutaneously as a single dose. Current recommendations state that pegfilgrastim should be taken once, 24 hours after chemotherapy finish, and filgrastim should be administered commencing 24 to 72 hours following chemotherapy completion. By subcutaneous injection, filgrastim is given daily at a dose of 5 μg per kilogram of body weight, and the treatment is continued until the white cell count [WBC] returns to levels that are almost normal. The ability of the chemotherapeutic drugs to induce myelosuppression will determine how long the treatment lasts.

When administering dose-dense chemotherapy to women with estrogen-receptor-negative, node-positive breast cancer, the use of CSF support is especially crucial.[6] Additionally, CSFs are given following chemotherapy for individuals with acute leukemia or following autologous peripheral blood cell transplantation, as these treatments shorten the duration of neutropenia and reduce hospitalization and antibiotic use rates. Nevertheless, due to the higher risks of severe graft-versus-host disease, transplantation-related death, and death from other causes, CSFs are not given following allogeneic stem-cell transplantation.[9] Reducing the dosage of chemotherapy has not shown to be as effective as using CSFs, especially filgrastim. Filgrastim has the potential to increase overall survival by reducing the length of time that chemotherapy-induced neutropenia lasts, lowering the risk of infection, shortening the duration of hospital stays, and enabling the maintenance of chemotherapy dose intensity. About lowering the morbidity linked to FN and other types of neutropenia, filgrastim and the other CSFs have enormous promise in common. One dose of peg filgrastim every cycle may make preventative control of neutropenia caused by chemotherapy easier. Additionally, by minimizing the number of daily injections and clinic visits, it will enhance the quality of life for cancer patients.[7]

DISCUSSION

We conducted a literature review to show the "Role of Colony Stimulating Factors in Febrile Neutropenia Treatment". We conducted an electronic database search from the time 2001-2021, in PubMed, Research Gate, Wiley Online Library, Research Square, and Science Direct databases for relevant material and included 10 articles.

According to **CALIN CAINAP** *et al.,*[3] **[2021]** who conducted a study on **"Continuous Intravenous Administration of Granulocyte Colony-Stimulating Factors-A Breakthrough in the treatment of cancer patients with Febrile Neutropenia".**In this prospective analysis, 96 patients receiving chemotherapy for proven cancer who also developed FN while receiving oncological therapy and required hospitalization were included. In addition to receiving conventional care, they got an IV continuous infusion of 16 µg/Kg/day of G-CSF. There was no significant difference in the gender distribution with 51.04% female patients and 48.96% male patients, with respect to recovery from FN ($p = 1.00$). Although 20.21% of the patients had received prophylactic G-CSF, this did not indicate or predict the length of time it would take for the aplasia to heal ($p = 0.34$).The number of chemotherapy cycles prior to FN was three, and the median number of lines in which patients with FN were included was two. During FN, the median serological counts of leucocytes (WBC) were 1875/mm3 and neutrophils (PMN) were 450/mm3. PMN < 100/mm3 is present in 10 individuals. With one failure where the patient had grade 5 FN, the median time to recovery for the 96 patients who were included was 25.5 hours. Shorter recovery times were predicted by lower procalcitonin ($p = 0.002$) and C reactive protein ($p < 0.001$) levels at hospital admission and greater WBC ($p = 0.006$) and PMN ($p < 0.001$) throughout the FN-inducing cycle of chemotherapy. Continuous IV G-CSF injection has the potential to be a very quick neutrophil recovery treatment for patients with significant febrile neutropenia.

According to **ZAHIDE ORHAN** *et al.,*[10] **[2020]** who conducted a study on **"COMPARISION OF DIFFERENT DOSES OF GRANULOCYTE COLONY-STIMULATING FACTORS IN THE TREATMENT OF HIGH-RISK FEBRILE NEUTROPENIA IN CHILDREN WITH CANCER".** This study assessed how various G-CSF dosages (5 to 10 mcg/kg/day) affected the course of treatment for patients with high-risk FEN. Between June 2017 and October 2018, 62 individuals with a total of 124 high-risk FEN episodes were enrolled in the study. The G-CSF treatment doses for the episodes were split

into two groups; each group got 5–10 mcg/kg/day. Records were kept on the patients' clinical traits, the therapies they underwent, the results of laboratory tests, the microbiologic results, and the cost analysis. Regarding the duration of the fever, the length of the hospital stay overall, the length of the FEN episode, the duration of G-CSF use, the expenses, the frequency of bacteraemia, and other therapies, there was no statistically significant difference seen between the two groups. Filgrastim was substantially more expensive in the high-dose G-CSF group of patients with solid tumours. The clinical and treatment outcomes were not affected differently using varying dosages of G-CSF in high-risk FEN episodes. When treating FEN, a daily dosage of 5 mcg/kg might be more suitable.

According to **YONG WANG** *et al.*[11] **[2019]** who conducted a study on **"Efficacy and Tolerability of Granulocyte Colony-Stimulating Factors in cancer patients after Chemotherapy- A Systematic review and Bayesian network meta-analysis".** After chemotherapy, 11 G-CSF medications were evaluated for their effectiveness and tolerability in patients using a systematic review and Bayesian network meta-analysis. For the final network meta-analysis, 73 randomized controlled trials (RCTs) with 15,124 cancer patients were included. Filgrastim was associated with a higher risk of febrile neutropenia (FN) (OR [95% CI]: 1.63 [1.07, 2.46]) compared to Peg filgrastim. The three G-CSF medications that reduced FN the best were Mecapegfilgrastim, Lipegfilgrastim, and Balugrastim (cumulative probabilities: 58%, 15%, and 11%, respectively).The most effective G-CSF medications for lowering severe neutropenia (SN) were Empegfilgrastim, long-acting G-CSF (L-G-CSF) biosimilar, and S-G-CSF biosimilar (cumulative probabilities: 21%, 20%, 15%, respectively). The most effective G-CSF medications for lowering blood pressure were Mecapegfilgrastim, Balugrastim, Lipegfilgrastim, and the L-G-CSF biosimilar (cumulative probabilities: 20%, 14%, 8%, 8%, respectively). The most well-liked G-CSF medications are likely Mecapegfilgrastim, Lipegfilgrastim, and Balugrastim, which have good tolerability and efficacy in treating cancer patients following cytotoxic chemotherapy.

According to **MITCHELL** *et al.*,[12] [2017] who conducted a study on **"Granulocyte Colony-Stimulating Factor in Established Febrile Neutropenia: A Randomized study of Paediatric Patients".** Paediatric patients with fever and severe neutropenia were randomly assigned to receive antibiotics together with granulocyte colony-stimulating factor ([G-CSF] filgrastim; 5 /ig/kg/d) or a placebo in double-blind research. Hospital discharge was contingent upon both a remission of fever and a neutrophil count greater than 0.2 x 109 /L.

Up to four separate febrile bouts could occur in randomized patients. A total of 186 febrile neutropenia instances were examined. Patients who were randomly assigned to G-CSF saw a reduction in antibiotic use days (median, 5 vs. 6 days; P =.02) and a shorter hospital stay (median, 5 vs. 7 days; P =.04). Patients receiving G-CSF also showed increased neutrophil counts upon discharge and a quicker rate of neutrophil recovery. The median bed cost per patient admission decreased by 29% with a 2-day reduction in hospital stay (P =.04). Children who had established familial neutropenia and were receiving G-CSF had a minor but noteworthy decrease in the amount of time they needed to be admitted to the hospital and take antibiotics, potentially saving money.

According to **SHI GUANG YE *et al.*,**[13] **[2015]** who conducted a study on **"Colony Stimulating Factors for Chemotherapy-related Febrile Neutropenia are associated with improved prognosis in adult acute lymphoblastic leukemic".** A thorough search approach was implemented, encompassing PubMed, Web of Science, and the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials. A total of 753 patients from seven randomized controlled trials are included in the outcome. In addition to lowering the number of patients with infection or severe infections (RR, 0.8; 95% CI, 0.7-0.9 and RR, 0.48; 95% CI, 0.3-0.75), the administration of CSF also significantly decreased death at day 30 (RR, 0.41; 95% CI, 0.23-0.74) and the end of follow-up (RR, 0.85; 95% CI, 0.75-0.95).Additionally, the number of patients obtaining CR was modestly increased by the inclusion of CSF (RR, 1.14; 95% CI, 1.05-1.23). Additionally, the duration of neutropenia was decreased by using CSF (median days, 8–17 to 12.5–24). In conclusion, CSFs can be given to ALL patients, especially during the induction phase of myelosuppressive chemotherapy.

According to **RAHUL MHASKAR *et al.*,**[14] **[2014]** who conducted a study on **"COLONY-STIMULATING FACTORS FOR CHEMOTHERAPY INDUCED FEBRILE NEUTROPENIA".** In March 2014, we searched all the main electronic databases, including MEDLINE, Embase, LILACS, SCI, and the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL). In addition to scanning the citations from the pertinent journals, we spoke with experts in cancer and hematology. To support a Brief Economic Commentary (BEC), we additionally searched for economic assessments in May 2015 using the NHS Economic Evaluation Database, Embase, MEDLINE(R) In-Process &amp, Other Non-Indexed Citations, and CENTRAL. To treat chemotherapy-induced febrile neutropenia in adults and children, we looked for randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and economic evaluations that

contrasted CSF plus antibiotics with antibiotics alone. The Cochrane Collaboration wanted us to follow established methodological techniques. To investigate the role of CSF with antibiotics in febrile neutropenia, a total of 1553 patients from 14 RCTs (15 comparisons) were included. For infection-related mortality, a similar result was seen (HR 0.75 (95% CI 0.47 to 1.20). Hospital stays longer than ten days were less common in those who received CSF in addition to antibiotics (risk ratio (RR) 0.65 (95% CI 0.44 to 0.95). The duration of neutropenia was also shorter in patients receiving CSF plus antibiotics (standardized mean difference [SMD] „1.70 (95% CI „2.65 to „0.76) P = 0.0004; 9 RCTs; 1135 participants; moderate quality evidence), and fever recovery was quicker (SMD „0.49 (95% CI -0.90 to 0.09) 9 RCTs; P value = 0.02. In patients treated with CSF plus antibiotics, there was no statistically significant difference in the incidence of deep vein thromboembolism (RR 1.68 (95% CI 0.72 to 3.93). In patients treated with CSF with antibiotics, we detected a greater incidence of bone or joint pain or flu-like symptoms (RR 1.59 (95% CI 1.04 to 2.42) P = 0.03. Patients with chemotherapy-induced febrile neutropenia did not see an increase in overall mortality when receiving CSF + antibiotics. Individuals who received CSFs recovered from fever faster, experienced shorter bouts of neutropenia, and used antibiotics for shorter periods of time.

According to **JASON D. WRIGHT** *et al.*,[15] **[2013]** who conducted a study on **"Deviations from Guideline-Based Therapy for Febrile Neutropenia in cancer patients and their effect on outcome".** From January 1, 2000, to March 31, 2010, the therapy of cancer patients with FN was examined using the Perspective database. They looked at treatment within 48 hours of hospital admission to record early decision-making. They assessed the use of vancomycin, granulocyte colony-stimulating factors (GCSF), and antibiotics that follow guidelines vs those that don't. To study the treatment-related aspects, hierarchical models were created. The impact of the initial treatment on the outcome (nonroutine hospital discharge and mortality) was assessed after stratifying the patients into low- and high-risk groups. A total of 25,231 solid tumour patients were admitted to the hospital due to neutropenia. Of the 25 231 patients admitted with FN, 79% received antibiotics based on guidelines, 37% received vancomycin, and 63% received GCSF. Guidelines-based antibiotics were more likely to be prescribed to patients treated at high FN-volume hospitals (odds ratio [OR], 1.56; 95% CI, 1.34-1.81) by high FN-volume physicians (OR, 1.19; 95% CI, 1.03-1.38) and patients under hospitalists' care (OR, 1.49; 95% CI, 1.18-1.88) (P<.05). Promptly starting guideline-based antibiotics reduced death (OR, 0.63; 95% CI, 0.42-0.95) and

discharge to a nursing facility (OR, 0.77; 95% CI, 0.65-0.92) in low-risk patients with FN. These programs offer more chances to support less expensive and more efficient care for cancer patients with FN.

According to **KATY L COOPER** *et al.*,[16] **[2011]** who conducted a study on **"GRANULOCYTE COLONY-STIMULATING FACTORS FOR FEBRILE NEUTROPENIA PROPHYLAXIS FOLLOWING CHEMOTHERAPY".** The usefulness of G-CSFs (pegfilgrastim, filgrastim, or lenograstim) in lowering the incidence of FN in people after chemotherapy for solid tumors or lymphoma was evaluated by a comprehensive review and meta-analysis. G-CSFs were contrasted with each other and with no primary G-CSF prophylaxis. December 2009 saw a search of nine databases. Twenty studies—ten on filgrastim, five on lenograstim, and five on pegfilgrastim—compared primary G- CSF prophylaxis with no primary G-CSF prophylaxis. Relative risks for pegfilgrastim, filgrastim, and lenograstim were 0.30 (95% CI: 0.14 to 0.65), 0.57 (95% CI: 0.48 to 0.69), and 0.62 (95% CI: 0.44 to 0.88), respectively. All three G-CSFs significantly decreased the incidence of FN. Comparing any primary G-CSF prophylaxis to none at all, the overall relative risk of FN was 0.51 (95% CI: 0.41 to 0.62). In five trials, peg filgrastim and filgrastim were examined in terms of differences between the G-CSFs. Peg filgrastim had a relative risk of 0.66 (95% CI: 0.44 to 0.98) for FN incidence, which was considerably lower than filgrastim. & quot; G-CSF primary prophylaxis greatly lowers the incidence of FN in adults receiving chemotherapy for solid tumors or lymphomas. Compared to filgrastim, peg filgrastim considerably lowers the incidence of FN.

According to **CLARK A.C.** *et al.*,[5] **[2005]** who conducted a study on **"COLONY-STIMULATING FACTORS FOR CHEMOTHERAPY-INDUCED FEBRILE NEUTROPENIA".** A thorough review of the literature was conducted, utilizing the Cochrane Controlled Trials Register, MEDLINE, LILACS, EMBASE, SCI, and CANCERLIT, among other important electronic databases. All RCTs comparing CSFs plus antibiotics to antibiotics alone for the management of established familial neglect (FN) in adults and children were sought out. The chosen studies underwent a meta-analysis. 13 studies met the eligibility requirements for inclusion out of over 8,000 screened references. The use of CSF had no discernible effect on overall mortality (odds ratio [OR] = 0.68; 95% CI, 0.43 to 1.08; P =.1). Regarding the effectiveness of CSF in lowering infection-related mortality, a marginally significant outcome was found (OR = 0.51; 95% CI, 0.26 to 1.00; P

=.05). Hospital stays were shorter for patients receiving CSF treatment (hazard ratio [HR] = 0.63; 95% confidence interval [CI], 0.49 to 0.82; P =.0006), and neutrophil recovery occurred faster (HR = 0.32; 95% confidence interval, 0.23 to 0.46; P <.00001). Patients with established FN brought on by cancer chemotherapy benefit from using CSFs since it shortens their hospital stay and neutrophil recovery time.

According to **ROCIO GARCIA-CARBONERO** *et al.*,[17] **[2001]** who conducted a study on **"GRANULOCYTE COLONY- STIMULATING FACTOR IN TREATMENT OF HIGH –RISK FEBRILE NEUTROPENIA".** The trial was deemed eligible for 210 patients with solid tumors treated with conventional-dose chemotherapy who also had fever and grade IV neutropenia. They satisfied at least one of the following high-risk requirements: severe co morbidity, performance status of 3–4 on the Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group scale, prior inpatient status, sepsis or clinically documented infection at presentation, short latency from previous chemotherapy cycle (<10 days), profound neutropenia (absolute neutrophil count <100/mm3), or short latency from previous chemotherapy cycle. G-CSF (5 µg/kg per day) and the medicines ceftazidime and amikacin were randomly assigned to eligible patients. Patients in the control arm experienced significantly longer durations of grade IV neutropenia (median, 2 days versus 3 days; P =.0004), antibiotic therapy (median, 5 days versus 6 days; P =.013), and hospital stays (median, 5 days versus 7 days; P =.015) than did patients randomly assigned to receive G-CSF. There were five deaths in each trial arm and 10% in the G-CSF group and 17% in the control group (P =.12). In patients with high-risk febrile neutropenia, adding G-CSF to antibiotic therapy shortens the length of the illness, shortens the duration of antibiotic therapy and hospitalization, and lowers hospital expenditures.

CONCLUSION

Regarding lowering the morbidity linked to FN and other types of neutropenia, filgrastim and the other CSFs have a great deal in common. When given to the right patients as a main treatment, G-CSF shows significant clinical advantages. In clinical practice, its optimal use may not always correspond to its actual use. One dosage per cycle of peg filgrastim could make preventative control of neutropenia caused by chemotherapy easier. The quality of life for cancer patients will also be enhanced by the reduction in the number of daily injections and clinic appointments. G-CSF primary prophylaxis greatly lowers the incidence of FN in adults receiving chemotherapy for solid tumours or lymphomas. Compared to filgrastim, peg

filgrastim considerably lowers the incidence of FN. G-CSF products (long- and short-acting) have been shown to be effective in promoting bone marrow regeneration after standard-dose chemotherapy, reducing FN and other problems associated to neutropenia. The current guidelines state that G-CSF should not be utilized following myelotoxic chemotherapy, FN risk exceeding 20% or falling between 10% and 20%, and other risk factors such as advanced age, disease stage, low performance status, Malnutrition, history of neutropenia. The choice of either short- or long-acting G-CSF product is currently unguidelined. Given that short-acting medications are frequently given insufficient dosages and have short half-lives, phenylated long-acting drugs seem to be more convenient and simpler to dose. Long-acting G-CSF medications have therefore been shown to be more effective in certain trials because of the better adherence. The safety profiles of G-CSF medicines are similar for both the short- and long-acting varieties, and they are generally well tolerated. The most important thing is that G-CSF medications be taken as prescribed, that is, from the very first treatment cycle onward, to avoid neutropenia and FN in high-risk patients following myeloablative chemotherapy. Such prophylaxis may optimize the effectiveness of anti-cancer treatment while also improving the patient's quality of life.

REFERENCES

1. Smith TJ, Khatcheressian J, Lyman GH, et al. Update of recommendations for the use of white blood cell growth factors: an evidence-based clinical practice guideline. *J Clin Oncol*, 2006; 24: 3187–3205.
2. Caggiano V, Weiss RV, Rickert TS, Linde-Zwirble WT. Incidence, cost and mortality of neutropenia hospitalization associated with chemotherapy. *Cancer*, 2005; 103: 1916–1924.
3. Căinap, C., Cetean-Gheorghe, S., Pop, L. A., Leucuta, D. C., Piciu, D., Mester, A., & Căinap, S. Continuous intravenous administration of granulocyte-colony-stimulating factors—a breakthrough in the treatment of cancer patients with febrile neutropenia. *Medicina*, 2021; *57*(7): 675.
4. Edelsberg, J., Weycker, D., Bensink, M., Bowers, C., & Lyman, G. H. Prophylaxis of febrile neutropenia with colony-stimulating factors: the first 25 years. *Current medical research and opinion*, 2020; *36*(3): 483-495.
5. Clark, O. A., Lyman, G. H., Castro, A. A., Clark, L. G., & Djulbegovic, B. Colony-stimulating factors for chemotherapy-induced febrile neutropenia: a meta-analysis of

randomized controlled trials. *Journal of clinical oncology: official journal of the American Society of Clinical Oncology*, 2005; *23*(18): 4198–4214.

6. Bennett, C. L., Djulbegovic, B., Norris, L. B., & Armitage, J. O. Colony-stimulating factors for febrile neutropenia during cancer therapy. *The New England journal of medicine*, 2013; *368*(12): 1131–1139. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMct1210890
7. Dale D. C. Colony-stimulating factors for the management of neutropenia in cancer patients. *Drugs*, 2002; *62*, *1*: 1–15. https://doi.org/10.2165/00003495-200262001-00001
8. Kaushansky K. Lineage-specific hematopoietic growth factors. *N Engl J Med*, 2006; 354: 2034–2045.
9. Ringdén O, Labopin M, Gorin NC, et al. Treatment with granulocyte colony stimulating factor after allogeneic bone marrow transplantation for acute leukemia increases the risk of graft-versus-host disease and death: a study from the Acute Leukemia Working Party of the European Group for Blood and Marrow Transplantation. *J Clin Oncol*, 2004; 22: 416–423.
10. Ok, Zahide Orhan MD; Kupeli, Serhan MD; Sezgin, Gulay MD; Bayram, Ibrahim MD. Comparison of Different Doses of Granulocyte Colony-stimulating Factor in the Treatment of High-risk Febrile Neutropenia in Children With Cancer. Journal of Pediatric Hematology/Oncology, 2020; 42(8): e738-e744. | DOI: 10.1097/MPH.0000000000001940
11. Wang, Y., Chen, L., Liu, F., Zhao, N., Xu, L., Fu, B., & Li, Y. Efficacy and tolerability of granulocyte colony-stimulating factors in cancer patients after chemotherapy: A systematic review and Bayesian network meta-analysis. *Scientific reports*, 2019; *9*(1): 15374.
12. Mitchell, P. L., Morland, B., Stevens, M. C., Dick, G., Easlea, D., Meyer, L. C., & Pinkerton, C. R. Granulocyte colony-stimulating factor in established febrile neutropenia: a randomized study of pediatric patients. *Journal of clinical oncology: official journal of the American Society of Clinical Oncology*, 1997; *15*(3): 1163–1170.
13. Ye, S. G., Ding, Y. I., Li, L., Yang, M., Zhang, W. J., & Liang, A. B. Colony-stimulating factors for chemotherapy-related febrile neutropenia are associated with improved prognosis in adult acute lymphoblastic leukemia. *Molecular and clinical oncology*, 2015; *3*(3): 730–736.
14. Mhaskar, R., Clark, O. A., Lyman, G., Engel Ayer Botrel, T., Morganti Paladini, L., & Djulbegovic, B. Colony-stimulating factors for chemotherapy-induced febrile neutropenia. *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews*, *2014;* (10): CD003039.

15. Wright JD, Neugut AI, Ananth CV, et al. Deviations From Guideline-Based Therapy for Febrile Neutropenia in Cancer Patients and Their Effect on Outcomes. *JAMA Intern Med*, 2013; 173(7): 559–568.
16. Cooper, K.L., Madan, J., Whyte, S. *et al.* Granulocyte colony-stimulating factors for febrile neutropenia prophylaxis following chemotherapy: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Cancer*, 2011; 11: 404.
17. García-Carbonero, R., Mayordomo, J. I., Tornamira, M. V., López-Brea, M., Rueda, A., Guillem, V., Arcediano, A., Yubero, A., Ribera, F., Gómez, C., Trés, A., Pérez-Gracia, J. L., Lumbreras, C., Hornedo, J., Cortés-Funes, H., & Paz-Ares, L. Granulocyte colony-stimulating factor in the treatment of high-risk febrile neutropenia: a multicenter randomized trial. *Journal of the National Cancer Institute*, 2001; *93*(1): 31–38.