REVIEW



Steroids use and survival in patients with glioblastoma multiforme: a pooled analysis

Fausto Petrelli¹ · Agostina De Stefani² · Antonio Ghidini³ · Lorenza Bruschieri² · Valentina Riboldi² · Lorenzo Dottorini⁴ · Alessandro Iaculli⁴ · Alberto Zaniboni⁵ · Francesca Trevisan²

Received: 13 December 2019 / Revised: 22 January 2020 / Accepted: 24 January 2020 © Springer-Verlag GmbH Germany, part of Springer Nature 2020

Abstract

Introduction Steroids are commonly used for managing brain edema in patients with glioblastoma multiforme (GBM), treated with surgery and concomitant temozolomide-based chemoradiotherapy (CTRT). The adverse effects of glucocorticoids include lymphopenia, hyperglycemia, and risk of infection. We report the results of a meta-analysis evaluating the effects of steroids on outcome when associated with the treatment of GBM.

Methods PubMed, the Cochrane Library, and Embase were searched from inception until September 2019 for observational or prospective studies reporting prognosis of adult patients with GBM and treated or not treated with steroids. Overall survival (OS) was the primary endpoint, and progression-free survival (PFS) was the secondary endpoint. The effect size was reported as hazard ratios (HRs) with a 95% confidence interval (CI), and an HR > 1 associated with the worst outcome in steroid users compared to non-users.

Results Twenty-two publications were retrieved from studies selected for a total of 8,752 patients. In the primary analysis (n = 22 studies reporting data), OS was reduced in GBM patients taking steroids during treatment (HR = 1.54, 95% CI 1.37–1.75; p < 0.01). Similarly, PFS was inferior in steroid users in n = 9 studies with data available (HR = 1.28, 95% CI 1.1–1.49; p < 0.01).

Conclusions In patients with GBM and treated with RT and/or CT, association with steroids significantly reduces survival and PFS. Use of the lowest dose of glucocorticoids for the shortest period needed to achieve the treatment goals and prevention of steroid-associated complications are essential aims of treatment of this disease.

Keywords Glioblastoma · Steroids · Adverse events · Radiotherapy · Survival · Meta-analysis

Fausto Petrelli faupe@libero.it

- ¹ Oncology Unit, Medical Sciences Department, ASST Bergamo Ovest, Piazzale Ospedale 1, 24047 Treviglio, BG, Italy
- ² Radiotherapy Unit, ASST Bergamo Ovest, Treviglio, BG, Italy
- ³ Oncology Unit, Casa Di Cura Igea, Milan, Italy
- ⁴ Oncology Unit, ASST Bergamo Est, Alzano Lombardo, BG, Italy
- ⁵ Oncology Unit, Fondazione Poliambulanza, Brescia, Italy

Introduction

Glioblastoma multiforme (GBM) is a lethal disease that is treated with radical surgery or biopsy and then with concomitant, temozolomide (TMZ)-based, chemoradiation (CTRT).

In patients with brain tumors and in particular in highgrade gliomas (e.g., GBM) steroids are used for the treatment of brain edema and related symptoms. High-dose glucocorticoids reduce cerebral edema and can improve headaches and neurologic deficits caused by vasogenic edema. In patients with moderate to severe symptoms or risk of herniation, the usual initial dose of dexamethasone is 8 mg once/twice per day. For asymptomatic patients, steroids are not required, however, often a minimal dose is offered particularly when antitumor therapy [radiotherapy (RT)] may worsen edema. Glucocorticoids are associated with several side effects on many organ systems (e.g., serious

Fig. 1 Flow diagram of included studies



infections, sepsis, and thrombosis). Long-term glucocorticoid is a significant independent predictor of numerous adverse effects and that the risk is both dose- and durationdependent. One study suggests that even short-term glucocorticoid use may be associated with serious adverse effects. In adult patients, in fact, use of steroids increased the odds of venous thromboembolism and sepsis [1].

We have performed a systematic review and meta-analysis to evaluate if the use of steroids may affect survival in patients with GBM.

Material and methods

Search strategy and inclusion criteria

The present review was conducted according to Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines and recommendations [2]. Electronic searches were performed from inception up to September 2019 using Embase, PubMed, SCOPUS, and The Cochrane Library. The studies were searched using the terms: (glioblastoma OR glioma) AND (steroids or dexamethasone) AND survival. All identified articles were then systematically assessed for inclusion and exclusion criteria independently by two investigators (FT and FP).

The inclusion criteria used to screen articles were (1) confirmed histopathological cases of GBM, (2) evaluation of survival (OS and/or PFS) according to intake of corticosteroids (yes versus no), (3) a hazard ratio (HR) statistic accompanied by 95% confidence interval (CI) from univariate or adjusted Cox multivariate analysis, and (4) cohorts of adult patients. The exclusion criteria were (1) low-grade glioma and (2) cohorts of patients under 18 years of age. When institutions published duplicate studies involving overlapping patients or increased lengths of follow-up, the most updated reports were included for quantitative assessment. Only publications involving human subjects and in English language were considered.

Data extraction

Two investigators (FT and FP) independently extracted data of interest (author and year of publication, number of

Table 1 Characteris	stics of included stud.	ies							
Author/year	Type of study	No of patients	Treatment	Median age	Steroid dose/%	Median follow-up (months)	Type of analysis	Covariates of MVA for OS	Quality (NOS score)
Adeberg/2016	Retrospective	262	Biopsy/S → RT (60 Gy) + TMZ (63%) or RT alone (60 Gy) (36.6%)	NR	NR	NR	MVA (OS) UVA (PFS)	Simultaneous temozolomide therapy, biopsy, persistent hyper- glycemia	9
Bhavsar/2016	Retrospective	841	$S \rightarrow RT (60 Gy) + TMZ$	56.07	NR/73	NR	MVA (OS) UVA (PFS)	Age, gender, BMI, ASA score	9
Carson/2007	Pooled analysis of 10 phase 1–2 studies	333	Systemic ($n = 6$ studies) or locoregional therapy ($n = 4$ studies) after progression of disease	49.8	NR/70.5				Q
Colavolpe /2012	Retrospective	25	$S \rightarrow RT + TMZ \rightarrow Bev$ (recurrent frent GBL)	60.3	44.6 mg (MP)/68	NR	MVA	SUV max	5
Coleman/2018	Retrospective	100	Prior CT TMZ 76% or prior RT (92%)	47.5	NR/63	NR	MVA	Steroid use, poor PS, NRL	6
Darlix/2013	Retrospective	58	$\begin{array}{l} Biopsy/S \rightarrow RT \\ (60 \text{ Gy}) + TMZ \rightarrow TMZ \end{array}$	54	9.6/31	NR	MVA (OS) UVA (PFS)	NR	5
Gorlia/2008	Retrospective	573	Biopsy/S → RT + TMZ	N	NR/71	NR	MVA	Combined treat- ment with TMZ, more extensive tumor resection, age, mini-mental state examination score, corticos- teroid treatment	٢
Gorlia/2012	Retrospective	300	Biopsy/S \rightarrow RT (60 Gy) + TMZ \rightarrow TMZ (46%) or RT alone or RT + another CT (53%) or no RTT (1%)	53.5	NR/65.3	NR	MVA (OS) UVA (PFS)	WHO PS, baseline steroids, number of target lesions, frontal location, tumor size	٢
Grossman/2011 Huang/2013	Retrospective Retrospective	96 91	S→RT+TMZ RT+TMZ→Bev (recurrent GBL)	57.4 56.3	NR/82 4 mg/56	NR NR	UVA MVA	NR Number of recur- rences, change in steroid dose	S
Le Rhun/2018	Prospective and retrospective	1273	RT+TMZ→TMZ	57	NR/40.9	NR	MVA	Age, extent of resection, WHO PS, steroid use, MGMT status	L
Michaelsen/2013	Retrospective	225	Biopsy/S \rightarrow RT (60 Gy) + TMZ \rightarrow TMZ	59.2	NR/73	NR	MVA	Age, corticosteroid therapy, PS	6

Table 1 (continued)									
Author/year	Type of study	No of patients	Treatment	Median age	Steroid dose/%	Median follow-up (months)	Type of analysis	Covariates of MVA for OS	Quality (NOS score)
Munck af Rosen- schold/2019	Retrospective	521	Biopsy/S→RT (60 Gy)+TMZ→TMZ	60	>15 mg day/56	NR	MVA (OS), UVA (PFS)	MGMT status, age, PS, GTV, BTV PET, mean brain dose, mean brainstem dose	9
Pitter/2016	Retrospective	2027	Biopsy/S \rightarrow RT + TMZ \rightarrow TMZ or RT alone*	NR	NR/64	NR	MVA (OS) UVA (PFS)°	MSKCC: RPA class, TMZ; EORTC: age, PS, extent of surgery, GGN: treatment, extent of surgery, age, PS	7
Quillien/2019	Prospective cohort	117	Bev \pm CT or CT	58.6	NR/59	NR	MVA	Neutrophil count	I
Shields/2015	Retrospective	73	$RT + TMZ \pm Bev \rightarrow TMZ \pm Bev$	61	NR/49	15.6	MVA	Bev, extent of resection, age, gender, RT dos- age, smoking status, and BMI	7
Tabouret/2013	Retrospective	100	Bev + CPT11	57.9	NR/83	NR	MVA	Age, gender, PS, n° of prior line of therapy, delay since diagnosis	5
Urup/2016	Retrospective	216	Bev + CPT11	56	37.5 mg/71	7.4	MVA	PS, multifocal diseas, neurocog- nitive deficit	9
Van Linde/2017	Retrospective	299	CT (34.7%), resurgery (18.7%), reirradiation (7%) or BSC (40%)	59	NR/55.7	NR	MVA	Treatment, age, tumor extent, extent of initial resection, RFS, PS	2
Welch/2013	Retrospective	988	S → CT (66%) + RT (87%)	66	NR/85	NR	MVA	Age, PS, metformin, PPAR-gamma, sulfonylurea, biopsy, CT, RT, CTRT	9
Wirsching/2018	Phase 2	75	RT + Bev (67%) vs RT (33%)	70	NR/44	NR	MVA	Treatment arm, age, PS, MGMT status	

Author/year	Type of study	No of patients	Treatment	Median age	Steroid dose/%	Median follow-up (months)	Type of analysis	Covariates of MVA for OS	Quality (NOS score)
Woo/2018	Retrospective	159	S (75%) \rightarrow RT (33.5%) or CTRT (45.4%) or TMZ (7.8%)	56	NR/NR	NR	MVA	Tumor location, extent of resec- tion	S.
<i>S</i> surgery, <i>RT</i> radic mide, <i>Bev</i> bevaciz ratio, <i>GTV</i> gross tu * Analysis of three °Only EORTC and	therapy, <i>CT</i> chemot umab, <i>CP711</i> irinote imor volume, <i>BTV</i> bi retrospective cohorts GGN cohorts	nerapy, <i>MVA</i> multi can, <i>MP</i> methylpr ological target vol MSKCC, EORTC	variate analysis, UVA univariate a ednisolone, BSC best supportive (ume, PPAR-gamma peroxisome p NCIC CE.3 study and GGN	nalysis, <i>OS</i> ov are, <i>BMI</i> body roliferator-acti	erall survival, <i>PF</i> mass index, <i>PS</i> vated receptor ga	S progression-fr performance scc mma, <i>NR</i> not rep	ee survival, <i>RFS</i> rela; ire, <i>GBL</i> glioblastom oorted	pse-free survival, <i>TM</i> a, <i>NRL</i> neutrophil-to	Z temozolo- -ly mphocyte

Table 1 (continued)

'Retrospective analysis of three randomized studies (CENTRIC, CORE AND AVAGLIO)

patients, type of study, treatment received, dose and duration of steroids, median follow-up, and type of analysis). The quality of included studies was assessed by Newcastle–Ottawa Scale (NOS) [3].

Statistical analysis

The outcome of interest was the prognostic effect of steroids intake reported as HR and its respective 95% CI. Overall survival was the primary endpoint and PFS was the secondary endpoint. The HRs of each selected study were pooled together to provide the overall estimate. I^2 statistic was used to estimate the percentage of total variation across studies, owing to heterogeneity rather than chance, with values greater than 50% considered as substantial heterogeneity [4]. A random-effects model was tested, and in the case of $I^2 < 50\%$, a fixed-effects model was also considered. Publication bias was assessed through the generation of funnel plots for OS and assessed for asymmetry by Begg's and Egger's test. All p values were two-sided with significance set at p < 0.05. Statistical analyses were conducted with the Review Manager computer program, Version 5.3 (Copenhagen: The Nordic Cochrane Centre, The Cochrane Collaboration, 2014).

Results

Among 2,440 publications retrieved using electronic search, 22 studies were eligible for meta-analysis (Fig. 1), for a total of 8752 patients [5-26]. Baseline characteristics of included studies and treatments received are presented in Table 1. Nineteen were retrospective series, two were prospective studies, and one was a retrospective series with a prospective validation cohort. The median age was 60.6 years. Steroids were assumed by 55% of patients.

Overall in the primary analysis, use of steroids was associated with a reduced survival (HR = 1.54, 95% CI 1.37–1.75; p < 0.01; Fig. 2). The analysis regarded 22 studies, and for the high heterogeneity ($I^2 = 75\%$), a random-effects model was adopted.

Progression-free survival was also decreased in steroid versus nonsteroid users (HR = 1.28, 95% CI 1.1–1.49; p < 0.01; Fig. 3). The analysis regarded nine studies, and for the high heterogeneity ($I^2 = 82\%$), a random-effects model was adopted.

Risk of bias through Begg's funnel plot was not significant. Egger's test showed conversely evidence of bias (p < 0.01). In sensitivity analyses, the influence of individual studies on the overall risk was carried out. Hazard ratios ranged from 1.5 to 1.58 by sequentially omitting one study at each turn. Meta-regression showed that effect size was not driven or larger in trial with greater numerosity (P=0.22).

				Hazard Ratio		Hazard Ratio
Study or Subgroup	log[Hazard Ratio]	SE	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	Year	IV, Random, 95% Cl
Carson 2007	0.5008	0.1296	6.5%	1.65 [1.28, 2.13]	2007	+
Gorlia 2008	0.2852	0.0698	8.1%	1.33 [1.16, 1.53]	2008	+
Grossman 2011	0.0862	0.3046	2.9%	1.09 [0.60, 1.98]	2011	- +
Gorlia 2012	0.6981	0.1845	5.0%	2.01 [1.40, 2.89]	2012	
Colavolpe 2012	1.1694	0.5527	1.1%	3.22 [1.09, 9.51]	2012	
Tabouret 2013	0.2523	0.3509	2.3%	1.29 [0.65, 2.56]	2013	
Huang 2013	0.0583	0.0368	8.7%	1.06 [0.99, 1.14]	2013	•
Welch 2013	1.1394	2.2237	0.1%	3.12 [0.04, 244.15]	2013	
Michaelsen 2013	0.7561	0.1823	5.1%	2.13 [1.49, 3.04]	2013	
Darlix 2013	1.3558	0.4332	1.7%	3.88 [1.66, 9.07]	2013	
Shields 2015	0.5423	0.2705	3.3%	1.72 [1.01, 2.92]	2015	<u>⊢⊷</u>
Pitter 2016	0.2531	0.0538	8.4%	1.29 [1.16, 1.43]	2016	•
Urup 2016	0.5306	0.1863	5.0%	1.70 [1.18, 2.45]	2016	-
Bhavsar 2016	0.4447	0.1512	5.9%	1.56 [1.16, 2.10]	2016	+
Adeberg 2016	0.4383	0.1595	5.7%	1.55 [1.13, 2.12]	2016	
van Linde 2017	0.6152	0.1684	5.4%	1.85 [1.33, 2.57]	2017	-
Woo 2018	0.5128	0.2319	4.0%	1.67 [1.06, 2.63]	2018	
Le Rhun 2018	0.1823	0.0829	7.7%	1.20 [1.02, 1.41]	2018	+
Wirsching 2018	-0.0954	0.2657	3.4%	0.91 [0.54, 1.53]	2018	
Coleman 2018	0.6098	0.2862	3.1%	1.84 [1.05, 3.22]	2018	
Quillien 2019	1.5518	0.4213	1.8%	4.72 [2.07, 10.78]	2019	
Munck af Rosenschold 2019	0.5625	0.1895	4.9%	1.76 [1.21, 2.54]	2019	
Total (95% CI)			100.0%	1.54 [1.37, 1.75]		•
Hotorogonoity: Tou ² – 0.04: Chi	マー 0 2 C AF - 21 /D	~ 0 0000	1\.12 - 76	:04 :04		
Therefore energy in all $= 0.04$, CHI Therefore everall effect: $7 = 8.064$	n – 02.02, ur – 21 (F. 10 – 0.00001)	~ 0.0000	17. i = 70	i N		0.005 0.1 i 10 200
reación overan enect. Z = 0.30 ((1 ~ 0.00001)					Favours no steroids Favours steroids

Fig. 2 Forest plot for overall survival in steroid-treated patients

				Hazard Ratio		Hazard Ratio
Study or Subgroup	log[Hazard Ratio]	SE	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	Year	IV, Random, 95% Cl
Michaelsen 2013	0.3436	0.1652	10.1%	1.41 [1.02, 1.95]	2013	
Huang 2013	-0.0305	0.0242	17.8%	0.97 [0.93, 1.02]	2013	+
Shields 2015	1.0919	0.3084	4.8%	2.98 [1.63, 5.45]	2015	
Urup 2016	0.3507	0.1789	9.3%	1.42 [1.00, 2.02]	2016	
Pitter 2016	0.198	0.0585	16.5%	1.22 [1.09, 1.37]	2016	+
Wirsching 2018	0.1389	0.2572	6.2%	1.15 [0.69, 1.90]	2018	
Coleman 2018	0.4253	0.2707	5.8%	1.53 [0.90, 2.60]	2018	
Le Rhun 2018	0.131	0.0772	15.4%	1.14 [0.98, 1.33]	2018	+
Munck af Rosenschold 2019	0.3199	0.0972	14.2%	1.38 [1.14, 1.67]	2019	
Total (95% CI)			100.0%	1.28 [1.10, 1.49]		◆
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.03; Ch	r²= 45.63, df = 8 (P <	0.00001); I² = 829	6		
Test for overall effect: Z = 3.12 ((P = 0.002)					Favours no steroids Favours steroids



Discussion

Despite the lack of prospective trials, corticosteroid given for relief of intracranial edema in brain tumors should be given on the basis of an individualized regimen and tapered slowly [27]. In this systematic review and meta-analysis, use of steroids was found to reduce OS and PFS in patients with GBM treated with CTRT or combination CT for primary or relapsed disease.

The results of this meta-analysis are not surprising due to the potentially detrimental effect of steroid use on the immune system (lymphopenia) and metabolism (hyperglycemia) that can explain the direct role on outcome. Clinically, hyperglycemia remains a relevant concern in GBM treated with corticosteroids for the management of clinical neurological symptoms and cerebral edema following surgical intervention and RT. In a meta-analysis evaluating the prognostic effect of hyperglycemia in patients with gliomas, it was found to confer a statistically significant poorer OS outcome (HR 1.671; p < 0.01) [28]. Furthermore, steroids affect the immune system by reducing the number of immune cells in the blood of GBM patients [29]. Dexamethasone appears to promote the development of a glioma stem cell-like phenotype and conferred resistance to physiological stress and CT [30, 31]. Other authors found that dexamethasone-induced leukocytosis decreased OS (HR = 2.25, 95% CI 1.15–4.38; p < 0.01) and PFS (HR = 2.23, 95% CI 1.09–4.59; p < 0.01). Furthermore, patients with dexamethasone-induced leukocytosis had significantly reduced CD15 + granulocytic - (p < 0.05) and CD3 + lymphocytictumor infiltration (p < 0.05) [32]. In a murine PDGFB-driven glioblastoma model, pretreatment with single doses of dexamethasone for 3 consecutive days profoundly decreased the survival advantage provided by a single 10 Gy dose of irradiation or by a fractionated irradiation schedule. Dexamethasone may also compromise cell proliferation in vivo and this may lead to radioresistance of glioma cells [18].

There are several limitations to this study. Most of these data represent a subset analysis of randomized clinical trials or retrospective studies, and thus, the findings must be interpreted with caution because these were not designed to evaluate outcome according to steroid use. The studies varied in the use of systemic therapies, comorbidities, extent of surgery, and size of tumors. Also, median follow-up was underreported in many trials and relatively short observations length could have captured only early deaths, probably those related with advanced age and/or poor performance status patients only. Finally, many patients, due to the extent of tumor and surgery, with related brain edema need steroids as an asymptomatic measure. The burden of disease may dictate the receipt of steroids and so the prognosis. Despite these limitations, we report for the first time a prognostic significance associated with steroid use, and it was mostly independent by age, performance status, the extent of resection, and size or location of GBM.

In conclusion, given that randomized controlled clinical trials to address the utility of steroid in GBM are unlikely to be ever performed, this meta-analysis provides the best evidence that steroid may compromise OS and PFS in patients treated for GBM. Studies exploring other steroid-sparing drugs for treating edema and its complications in brain tumors are awaited.

Compliance with ethical standards

Conflicts of interest None to declare.

References

- Waljee AK, Rogers MAM, Lin P et al (2017) Short term use of oral corticosteroids and related harms among adults in the United States: population based cohort study. BMJ. https://doi. org/10.1136/bmj.j1415
- Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman D (2009) Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and metaanalyses: the PRISMA statement. PLoS Med 6(6):e1000097. https://doi.org/10.1371/ journal.pmed1.1000097
- Wells G, Shea B, O'Connell D, Peterson J (2000) The Newcastle– Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses. Ottawa Hospital Research Institute, Ottawa
- Higgins JPT, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG (2003) Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. BMJ Br Med J 327(7414):557–560. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.327.7414.557
- Adeberg S, Bernhardt D, Foerster R et al (2016) The influence of hyperglycemia during radiotherapy on survival in patients with primary glioblastoma. Acta Oncol (Madr) 55(2):201–207. https ://doi.org/10.3109/0284186X.2015.1043397
- Bhavsar S, Hagan K, Arunkumar R et al (2016) Preoperative statin use is not associated with improvement in survival after glioblastoma surgery. J Clin Neurosci 31:176–180. https://doi. org/10.1016/j.jocn.2016.03.010
- Carson KA, Grossman SA, Fisher JD, Shaw EG (2007) Prognostic factors for survival in adult patients with recurrent glioma enrolled onto the new approaches to brain tumor therapy CNS Consortium phase I and II clinical trials. J Clin Oncol. https://doi.org/10.1200/ JCO.2006.08.1661
- Colavolpe C, Chinot O, Metellus P et al (2012) FDG-PET predicts survival in recurrent high-grade gliomas treated with bevacizumab and irinotecan. Neuro Oncol 14(5):649–657. https://doi. org/10.1093/neuonc/nos012
- Coleman N, Michalarea V, Alken S et al (2018) Safety, efficacy and survival of patients with primary malignant brain tumours (PMBT) in phase I (Ph1) trials: the 12-year royal Marsden experience. J Neurooncol 139(1):107–116. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s11060-018-2847-z
- Darlix A, Baumann C, Lorgis V et al (2013) Prolonged administration of adjuvant temozolomide improves survival in adult patients with glioblastoma. Anticancer Res 33(8):3467–3474
- 11. Gorlia T, Stupp R, Brandes AA et al (2012) New prognostic factors and calculators for outcome prediction in patients with

recurrent glioblastoma: a pooled analysis of EORTC Brain tumour Group phase i and II clinical trials. Eur J Cancer 48(8):1176– 1184. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejca.2012.02.004

- Gorlia T, van den Bent MJ, Hegi ME et al (2008) Nomograms for predicting survival of patients with newly diagnosed glioblastoma: prognostic factor analysis of EORTC and NCIC trial 26981– 22981/CE3. Lancet Oncol 9(1):29–38. https://doi.org/10.1016/ S1470-2045(07)70384-4
- Grossman SA, Ye X, Lesser G et al (2011) Immunosuppression in patients with high-grade gliomas treated with radiation and temozolomide. Clin Cancer Res 17(16):5473–5480. https://doi. org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-11-0774
- 14. Huang RY, Rahman R, Hamdan A et al (2013) Recurrent glioblastoma: volumetric assessment and stratification of patient survival with early posttreatment magnetic resonance imaging in patients treated with bevacizumab. Cancer 119(19):3479–3488. https:// doi.org/10.1002/cncr.28210
- Le Rhun E, Genbrugge E, Stupp R et al (2018) Associations of anticoagulant use with outcome in newly diagnosed glioblastoma. Eur J Cancer 101:95–104. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. ejca.2018.06.029
- 16. Michaelsen SR, Christensen IJ, Grunnet K et al (2013) Clinical variables serve as prognostic factors in a model for survival from glioblastoma multiforme: an observational study of a cohort of consecutive non-selected patients from a single institution. BMC Cancer. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2407-13-402
- Munck Rosenschold P, Law I, Engelholm S et al (2019) Influence of volumetric modulated arc therapy and FET-PET scanning on treatment outcomes for glioblastoma patients. Radiother Oncol. 130:149–155. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.radonc.2018.10.003
- Pitter KL, Tamagno I, Alikhanyan K et al (2016) Corticosteroids compromise survival in glioblastoma. Brain. https://doi. org/10.1093/brain/aww046
- Quillien V, Carpentier AF, Gey A et al (2019) Absolute numbers of regulatory T cells and neutrophils in corticosteroid-free patients are predictive for response to bevacizumab in recurrent glioblastoma patients. Cancer Immunol Immunother 68(6):871–882. https ://doi.org/10.1007/s00262-019-02317-9
- Shields LBE, Shelton BJ, Shearer AJ et al (2015) Dexamethasone administration during definitive radiation and temozolomide renders a poor prognosis in a retrospective analysis of newly diagnosed glioblastoma patients. Radiat Oncol 10(1):4–11. https://doi. org/10.1186/s13014-015-0527-0
- Tabouret E, Barrie M, Thiebaut A et al (2013) Limited impact of prognostic factors in patients with recurrent glioblastoma multiforme treated with a bevacizumab-based regimen. J Neurooncol 114(2):191–198. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11060-013-1170-y
- 22. Urup T, Dahlrot RH, Grunnet K et al (2016) Development and validation of a prognostic model for recurrent glioblastoma patients

treated with bevacizumab and irinotecan. Acta Oncol (Madr) 55(4):418–422. https://doi.org/10.3109/0284186X.2015.1114679

- van Linde ME, Brahm CG, de Witt Hamer PC et al (2017) Treatment outcome of patients with recurrent glioblastoma multiforme: a retrospective multicenter analysis. J Neurooncol 135(1):183– 192. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11060-017-2564-z
- 24. Welch MR, Grommes C (2013) Retrospective analysis of the effects of steroid therapy and antidiabetic medication on survival in diabetic glioblastoma patients. CNS Oncol 2(3):237–246. https://doi.org/10.2217/cns.13.12
- 25. Wirsching HG, Tabatabai G, Roelcke U et al (2018) Bevacizumab plus hypofractionated radiotherapy versus radiotherapy alone in elderly patients with glioblastoma: the randomized, open-label, phase II ARTE trial. Ann Oncol 29(6):1423–1430. https://doi. org/10.1093/annonc/mdy120
- 26. Woo P, Ho J, Lam S et al (2018) A comparative analysis of the usefulness of survival prediction models for patients with glioblastoma in the temozolomide era: the importance of methylguanine methyltransferase promoter methylation, extent of resection, and subventricular zone location. World Neurosurg 115:e375–e385. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wneu.2018.04.059
- Ryken TC, McDermott M, Robinson PD et al (2010) The role of steroids in the management of brain metastases: a systematic review and evidence-based clinical practice guideline. J Neurooncol. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11060-009-0057-4
- Lu VM, Goyal A, Vaughan LS, McDonald KL (2018) The impact of hyperglycemia on survival in glioblastoma: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Clin Neurol Neurosurg. https://doi. org/10.1016/j.clineuro.2018.05.020
- Chitadze G, Flüh C, Quabius ES et al (2017) In-depth immunophenotyping of patients with glioblastoma multiforme: impact of steroid treatment. Oncoimmunology. https://doi.org/10.1080/21624 02X.2017.1358839
- Luedi MM, Singh SK, Mosley JC et al (2017) A dexamethasone-regulated gene signature is prognostic for poor survival in glioblastoma patients. J Neurosurg Anesthesiol. https://doi. org/10.1097/ANA.00000000000368
- Kostopoulou ON, Mohammad AA, Bartek J et al (2018) Glucocorticoids promote a glioma stem cell-like phenotype and resistance to chemotherapy in human glioblastoma primary cells: biological and prognostic significance. Int J Cancer. https://doi. org/10.1002/ijc.31132
- Dubinski D, Won SY, Gessler F et al (2018) Dexamethasoneinduced leukocytosis is associated with poor survival in newly diagnosed glioblastoma. J Neurooncol. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s11060-018-2761-4