

1 **Title:** Intravenous iron and iron deficiency anemia in gastrointestinal cancer patients: a
2 systematic review

3 **Authors:** Shankavi Nandakumar¹, Navreet Singh¹, Alliya Remtulla Tharani¹, Christine Brezden-
4 Masley^{1,2,3*}

5 **Affiliations**

- 6 1. Department of Medicine, Mount Sinai Hospital, Toronto, ON, Canada.
- 7 2. Lunenfeld-Tanenbaum Research Institute, Sinai Health System, Toronto, ON, Canada
- 8 3. Department of Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada.

9

10 *Corresponding author:

11 Christine Brezden-Masley, Department of Medicine, Mount Sinai Hospital, Toronto, ON,
12 Canada. Christine.Brezden@sinaihealth.ca

13 **Email addresses**

- 14 • s4nandakumar@uwaterloo.ca
- 15 • navreet.singh@uwaterloo.ca
- 16 • Alliya.RemtullaTharani@sinaihealth.ca
- 17 • Christine.Brezden@sinaihealth.ca

18 **Acknowledgments**

19 This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial,
20 or not-for-profit sectors.

21 ***Declarations***

22 **Competing Interests**

23 The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

24 **Author Contributions**

25 *Shankavi Nandakumar*: Literature search, figures, study design, data collection, data analysis,
26 data interpretation, writing, conceptualization, data curation, investigation, methodology, project
27 administration, resources, validation, visualization, writing - original draft, writing - review and
28 editing

29 *Navreet Singh*: Literature search, figures, study design, data collection, data analysis, data
30 interpretation, writing, conceptualization, data curation, investigation, methodology, project
31 administration, resources, validation, visualization, writing - original draft, writing - review and
32 editing

33 *Alliya Remtulla Tharani*: Conceptualization, project administration, supervision, writing - review
34 and editing

35 *Christine Brezden-Masley*: Conceptualization, project administration, supervision, writing -
36 review and editing

37 Note: Shankavi Nandakumar and Navreet Singh contributed equally.

38 **Data Availability Statement**

39 Data sharing is not applicable to this review article.

40

41

42 **Abstract**

43 *Background*

44 Iron deficiency anemia (IDA) is a prevalent hematological complication associated with
45 gastrointestinal (GI) cancers due to an increased loss of iron and decreased iron absorption. We
46 estimated the efficacy of parenteral iron on hemoglobin levels, blood transfusion needs and
47 overall quality of life in patients with GI malignancies.

48 *Methods*

49 In this systematic review, we used PubMed, Cochrane, EMBASE, CINHAI and Scopus to
50 conduct an electronic search from January 1, 2010 to March 24, 2022 with no language or study
51 design restrictions. Studies were included if they discussed IDA, GI neoplasms, use of iron
52 supplementation (with or without erythropoietin-stimulating agents [ESAs]), defined anemia and
53 had a patient population of adults. Studies were excluded if were published before 2010. We
54 assessed the efficacy of parenteral iron in comparison to other iron supplementation methods
55 when treating IDA in GI cancer patients. The Cochrane Risk of Bias Tool 2 (RoB 2) and the
56 Risk Of Bias In Non-randomized Studies of Interventions (ROBINS-I) assessment tools were
57 used to assess the quality of the included studies. Moreover, the Cochrane Effective Practice and
58 Organization data collection form was used to collect pertinent study information.

59 *Results*

60 Our search yielded 3,156 studies across all databases. With the exclusion of duplicates, ineligible
61 study designs, as well as studies that did not pass abstract and full-text screening, 17 studies were
62 included in our final analysis (4 randomized control trials; 13 non-randomized studies). Of the 13
63 studies evaluating hemoglobin (Hgb) response, seven studies found an increase in Hgb levels
64 when patients were treated with IV iron. The 8 studies evaluating red blood cell (RBC)
65 transfusion rates found no significant differences in RBC transfusion needs when treated with IV
66 iron. Studies analyzing health related outcomes typically found an increase quality of life and
67 decreased post-operative complications.

68 *Discussion*

69 This review reveals the improved outcomes of IDA in GI cancer patients treated with IV iron
70 instead of other iron supplementation methods. Timely diagnosis and appropriate IDA
71 management can greatly improve quality of life in this patient population, especially if
72 myelosuppressive chemotherapy is required.

73 Our systematic review presents some limitations due to heterogenous interventions in the
74 randomized control trials, the varying time points of data collection in each study, and the use of
75 small sample sizes.

76 **Key Words**

77 Iron deficiency anemia (IDA); Gastrointestinal (GI) cancers; Intravenous (IV) iron

78

80 **Introduction**

81 Luminal gastrointestinal (GI) cancers (i.e., cancers of the esophagus, stomach, large and
82 small intestine) represent 26% of global cancer incidence, and 35% of all cancer-related deaths
83 [1]. A common hematological complication associated with luminal GI cancers both at
84 diagnosis and during treatment is anemia, defined by the World Health Organization (WHO) as
85 hemoglobin (Hgb) of less than 12 g/dL in women, and less than 13 g/dL in men [2,3]. The cause
86 of anemia in cancer patients is multifactorial in nature, and can be attributed to comorbidities
87 such as bleeding, hemolysis and nutritional deficiencies [4], such as iron deficiency. The
88 prevalence of iron deficiency anemia (IDA; defined as anemia associated with iron deficiency) in
89 GI cancer patients ranges from 7% to 42% [5]. The etiology of IDA in patients with GI cancer
90 can be attributed to increased loss of iron (i.e. bleeding) and decreased iron absorption [6].

91 In GI cancer patients, IDA is associated with poor prognosis, fatigue, and poor quality of
92 life (QoL) [7]. Targeted treatment of anemia in patients can both improve prognosis and QoL
93 [8]. Common treatment approaches in this patient population include red blood cell (RBC)
94 transfusions, erythropoietin stimulating agents (ESA), and iron supplementation. However,
95 despite available treatment options, approximately 60% of patients with anemia do not receive
96 any treatment [2]. Potential reasons for patient undertreatment may include: poor optimization of
97 care across the patient journey, unclear guidelines, and inadequate testing for anemia and IDA
98 [2].

99 Treatment of anemia with RBC transfusions should be used cautiously as use is
100 associated with increased risk of morbidity and mortality in cancer patients[9]. ESAs offer a
101 means of reducing the need for RBC transfusions but, only 30-75% of patients may respond to
102 treatment and use may increase the risk of thromboembolic events [9]. Furthermore,
103 intravenous/parenteral (IV) iron alone or in combination with ESAs presents itself as an effective
104 treatment for anemia, while also reducing the need for RBC transfusions [10]. Oral iron
105 supplementation is also commonly prescribed to address IDA in the cancer population; however,
106 evidence suggests oral iron does not reduce the risk of RBC transfusion, most likely due to either
107 malabsorption of oral iron, non-adherence and also slow bioavailability and repletion [11].

108 The 2018 European Society for Medical Oncology (ESMO) clinical practice guidelines
109 recommend that RBC transfusions only be used in patients with severe anemia-related
110 symptoms, and ESAs only be employed when patients undergoing chemotherapy have had their

111 iron deficiency corrected. Additionally, the American Society of Clinical Oncology
112 (ASCO)/American Society of Hematology (ASH) recommends that ESAs be offered only to
113 patients whose cancer treatment is not curative in intent and with Hgb <10 g/dl [12]. However,
114 this recommendation is based on a lack of evidence indicating whether a particular patient
115 population receiving ESAs is at greater or lesser risk of harm particularly in terms of
116 progression/reoccurrence and overall survival [12]. Currently, there are no specific guidelines
117 that can aid physicians in making decisions about treating IDA in patients suffering from GI
118 cancers and, existing guidelines do not provide recommendations regarding the use of parenteral
119 iron supplementation with/without ESAs, and do not discuss when patients are to receive
120 treatment. In addition, existing systematic reviews predominantly focus on the use of parenteral
121 iron supplementation for treating chemotherapy-induced anemia, and the addition of parenteral
122 iron to ESAs in cancer patients more broadly [11,13,14]. To our best knowledge, no systematic
123 review exists to date, that examines the use of IV iron in patients with GI cancers with respect to
124 when patients are being diagnosed with IDA, when they are being treated, how they are
125 optimally treated, and the benefits of treatment.

126 Therefore, given the heightened prevalence of IDA in this patient population, the purpose
127 of this systematic review is to evaluate the use of IV iron to treat IDA in patients with GI cancer.

128

129 **Methods**

130 This systematic review was performed following the Cochrane Training Handbook
131 guidelines, as well as the Preferred Reporting for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses
132 (PRISMA) 2020 checklist [15,16]. This review was not registered, and the review protocol is not
133 available.

134 *Search Strategy*

135 A search using the following databases: PubMed, Cochrane, EMBASE, CINHALL, and
136 Scopus was conducted. The search terms included but were not limited to: “iron deficiency”,
137 “anemia”, “gastric cancer”, “ESA therapy*”, “intravenous iron” and “iron studies”. Randomized
138 control trials (RCTs), systematic reviews, observational studies, case studies, and cohort studies,
139 from January 2010 to April 2022, with no specified language restrictions were retrieved.

140 *Study Selection*

141 Studies were reviewed if they included the following: 1) iron deficient anemia, 2)
142 gastrointestinal neoplasms, 3) iron supplementation alone (i.e. intravenous iron or parenteral
143 iron, oral iron) or in conjunction with ESAs, 4) defined anemia and the symptoms associated
144 with anemia, and 5) an adult (≥ 18 years of age) population. Additionally, literature published
145 before 2010 was excluded from this systematic review as the use of IV iron became readily
146 available for the correction of anemia in 2010 [17].

147 The web-based software, Covidence™, was used by two authors (SN and NS) to screen
148 studies and extract data[18]. A standardized eligibility checklist was used to screen the title,
149 abstract and full-text of studies; removing ineligible studies throughout the process. Any
150 conflicts that arose were discussed and resolved between the authors (SN and NS).

151 *Data Collection and Quality Assessment*

152 The Cochrane Effective Practice and Organization data collection form was used to
153 curate a standardized extraction sheet to collect the study information needed from each
154 extracted article [15].

155 The Cochrane Risk of Bias Tool 2 (RoB 2) was used to assess risk of bias among eligible
156 RCTs [19]. RCTs were assessed and given an overall judgement of low risk-, some concerns-, or
157 high risk of bias [19]. Moreover, the Risk Of Bias In Non-randomized Studies of Interventions
158 (ROBINS-I) tool was used to assess the quality of non-RCT studies [20]. The non-RCT studies
159 were given an overall judgement of low, moderate, serious, or critical risk of bias [20]. The risk
160 assessment for this study was completed individually by reviewers (SN and NS). Visualization of
161 risk-of-bias assessments were generated using the *robvis* online tool [21].

162 *Statistical Analysis*

163 Statistics used in the study were expressed as means, medians, standard deviations (SDs),
164 interquartile ranges (IQRs), and 95% confidence intervals (CI) for any relevant study variables.

165 **Results**

166 Seventeen studies published between January 1, 2010 and March 24, 2022 met the
167 inclusion criteria and were included in the final analysis. A summary of the screening process
168 can be found in Figure 1. Of these studies, four RCTs compared IV iron supplementation to
169 standard of care or compared two IV iron interventions to one another. The remaining 13 studies
170 were of non-randomized design (8 retrospective, 5 prospective).

171

172 Figure 1. PRISMA Diagram for study identification, screening, and inclusion.

173 * Duplicates removed by software program.

174

175 All studies included a comparator arm, except for Bojesen et al. [22], Lima et al.[23] and,
176 Verhaeghe et al. [24] where all patients received IV iron. Of the RCTs, Keeler et al. [25] and
177 Keeler et al. [26] compared ferric carboxymaltose (FCM) to oral iron, while Laso-Morales et al.
178 [27] compared FCM to iron sucrose (IS), and Ng et al. [28] compared iron isomaltoside to
179 standard of care. The comparator arms in eight studies [29–36] were patients who received no
180 specific treatment or oral iron. Of note, Quinn et al.[37] compared the efficacy of a new anemia
181 management intervention in which patients were given FCM, and then retrospectively compared
182 to pre-intervention patients. IV iron treatment was provided preoperatively in 13 studies and
183 postoperatively in four studies. A complete summary of the studies can be found in Table 1.

184

185 **Quality Assessment**

186 Three of four randomized trials had a low risk of bias. Keeler et al.[26] had a high risk of
187 bias as patients were not blinded to the study group that they were in. The complete quality
188 assessment of the included RCTs can be found in Figure 2.

189

190 Figure 2. Risk of bias assessment of randomized studies included in the current review.

191

192 Of the 13 studies, nine studies had a ‘Moderate’ risk of bias, primarily attributable to
193 appropriately controlled baseline confounding factors, missing data, deviations from intended
194 interventions, and lack of information to assess bias within certain domains. Four studies had a
195 ‘Serious’ risk of bias, likely due to the presence of confounding factors without appropriate
196 statistical considerations, as well as a lack of information. A summary of the risk of bias
197 assessment of non-randomized studies can be found in Figure 3.

198

199 Figure 3. The risk of bias assessment completed for non-randomized studies.

200

201 **Outcomes**

202 Key outcomes were determined *a priori* after examination of relevant literature and
203 considerations of the research question. Three key outcomes were identified: Hgb response, RBC
204 transfusion needs, and other applicable health outcomes (e.g., disease free survival (DFS),
205 mortality, morbidity, overall survival (OS), quality of life (QoL), length of hospital stay (LOS),
206 and safety/adverse events).

207 *Hemoglobin Response*

208 All RCTs except Keeler et al.[26], captured Hgb response. Keeler et al. [25] reported a
209 median increase in Hgb of 1.55 g/dL (IQR; 0.93-2.58) in colorectal cancer (CRC) patients who
210 received 1000 mg or 1500 mg of parenteral FCM (Ferinject™) at least 14 days prior to surgery
211 compared to an increase of 0.5 g/dL (IQR; -0.13-1.33) in patients who received oral ferrous
212 sulfate twice daily until surgery ($p<0.001$). In the investigation conducted by Laso-Morales et al.
213 [27] CRC patients either received a single 1000 mg dose of IV FCM on postoperative day two or
214 200 mg of IV Iron sucrose (Feriv™) every 48 hours from postoperative day two to discharge.
215 Esophagogastric adenocarcinoma patients in the investigation conducted by Ng et al. [28]
216 received a single 1000 mg dose of iron isomaltoside (Monofer®) prior to the initiation of
217 chemotherapy or received standard of care. Both, Laso-Morales et al.[27] and Ng et al. [28]
218 found no significant differences in Hgb levels between the intervention and comparator groups.

219 Of the 13 non-randomized studies, ten studies assessed serum Hgb levels. Bojesen et al.
220 [22] reported a mean increase in Hgb of 2.13 g/dL (95% CI: 1.71-2.55 g/dL; $p<0.0001$) after four
221 weeks in CRC patients who received iron isomaltoside prior to surgery. In addition, Lima et al.
222 [23] reported an absolute increase in mean Hgb of 0.9 g/dL (SD 1.3) from baseline to 12-14
223 weeks ($p=0.001$) in CRC patients who received 1000 mg of IV FCM (Ferinject™) every study
224 visit (12-13 weeks) until anemia or ID was corrected. In contrast, Verhaeghe et al. reported no
225 significant increase in Hgb in patients with GI malignancies who received at least one dose of IV
226 FCM preoperatively after a four week follow up period [24].

227 Two studies comparing IV iron to oral iron reported an increase in Hgb. Calleja et al. [29]
228 reported a greater increase in Hgb in colon cancer patients who received IV FCM (median dose
229 of 1000 mg given 28.5 days preoperatively) compared to patients who received varying doses
230 and formulations of oral iron (1.5 g/dL vs. 0.5 g/dL; $p<0.0001$) between diagnosis of anemia and
231 hospital admission for surgery, and between diagnosis and 30 days postoperatively (3.1 g/dL vs.
232 1.5 g/dL; $p<0.0001$). In addition, the percentage of patients with Hgb<10 g/dL was significantly

233 lower in the intervention group at hospital discharge (61.6% vs. 75.7%, $p<0.05$) compared to the
234 oral iron group [29]. Laso-Morales et al. [38] reported a greater increase in Hgb in CRC patients
235 who received IV iron sucrose of varying dose compared to patients who received oral elemental
236 iron (2.0 ± 1.5 g/dL vs. 1.1 ± 1.2 g/dL; $p=0.001$) from postoperative day one to postoperative day
237 30. However, the prevalence of anemia was greater and more severe in the IV iron group
238 ($p=0.027$) [38].

239 Jeong et al. [30], Kam et al. [31], Quinn et al. [37], Titos-Acros [33], and Wilson et al.
240 [34] compared IV iron to no specific treatment or standard of care. Jeong and colleagues [30]
241 observed a mean increase of Hgb of 3.2 g/dL in gastric carcinoma patients who received IV iron
242 sucrose every other day in 300 mg doses until total target dosage was given (target dosage
243 calculation can be found in Table 1) compared to an increase of 2.5 g/dL in the no specific
244 treatment group ($p = 0.029$) six months post-operatively (treatment was initiated post-
245 operatively). Kam et al. [31] reported no difference in mean preoperative Hgb levels in CRC
246 patients who received IV iron or no specific treatment. However, the IV iron groups had a higher
247 median Hgb rise of 1.9 g/dL vs. a rise of 0.6 g/dL in the no specific treatment group ($p<0.001$).
248 In addition, Quinn et al. [37] reported that mean Hgb levels were significantly lower in CRC
249 patients with uncorrected anemia (no treatment or oral iron) compared to patients with corrected
250 anemia (received 1000 mg of IV FCM) on postoperative day three (9.5 g/dL vs. 10.9 g/dL,
251 $p=0.004$). Titos-Acros [33] reported mean Hgb at discharge was lower in colon cancer patients
252 who received 100-200 mg of IV iron saccharose postoperatively, compared to those who did not
253 (10 ± 1.1 g/dL, vs. 10.6 ± 1.2 g/dL; $p=0.012$). Furthermore, Wilson and colleagues [35] reported
254 that patients treated with 1000-2000 mg of IV FCM (Ferinject™) or IV maltoside (Monofer®)
255 less than 6 weeks preoperatively had a significant increase in Hgb compared to the usual care
256 group (1.05 g/dL vs. 0.16 g/dL; $p<0.001$).

257 *RBC transfusion needs*

258 Three randomized studies reported changes in RBC transfusion needs. Two studies,
259 Keeler et al. [25] and Ng et al. [28], reported no significant differences in blood transfusion
260 needs between IV iron and standard of care. Laso-Morales et al. [32] also reported no significant
261 differences in RBC transfusion needs in colorectal cancer patients. However, it is important to
262 note that this study compared two different IV iron products.

263 Five non-randomized studies reported changes in RBC transfusion needs. Of the studies
264 that compared IV iron supplementation to oral iron supplementation, Calleja et al. [29] reported
265 that patients in the IV iron group required less RBC transfusions when compared to patients in
266 the oral iron group (9.9% vs. 38.7% ; OR: 5.9. 95% CI: 2.9-11.1, $p<0.001$). In addition, Laso-
267 Morales et al. [38] reported higher transfusion needs in the IV iron group compared to the oral
268 iron comparator group (15% vs. 4%, $p=0.040$). Furthermore, Quinn et al. [37] reported that prior
269 to the introduction of the anemia management intervention, anemic patients were 17 times more
270 likely to require perioperative RBC transfusions. In addition, postoperative RBC transfusion
271 rates were 38% in patients who received oral iron or no specific treatment, compared to 0% in
272 patients whose anemia had been corrected by IV iron, and 3.5% in non-anemic patients [37].
273 Kangaspunta et al. [36] and Titos-Acros [33] reported no difference in RBC transfusion needs
274 between the IV iron group and no IV iron group in their investigations.

275 *Patient Health Related Outcomes*

276 Three randomized studies collected data on patient health related outcomes. Laso-
277 Morales et al. [27] reported no significant differences between LOS between the IV FCM group
278 and the IV IS group, but did note that the infection rate was lower in the IV FCM group (9.8%
279 vs. 37.2%). Ng et al. [28] reported a marked increase in QoL parameters such as physical and
280 emotional well-being, as well as anemia-specific QoL, with total scores for these indices
281 exceeding the minimum clinically important difference (defined as a difference of one standard
282 deviation from baseline), while no improvement was reported in patients receiving standard of
283 care. In addition, Keeler et al. [26] reported that 11 QoL components (e.g. physical and
284 functional well-being, self-care, pain and disability, general health, etc.) increased by a clinically
285 significant margin in the IV iron group, compared to only one component showing an increase in
286 the oral iron group. Furthermore, patients in the IV iron group had higher median total scores
287 (168, IQR:160-174 vs. 151, IQR:132-170) in the FACT-An than the oral iron group at the time
288 of the outpatient appointment (2-3 months postoperatively) [26].

289 Six non-randomized studies captured data on various health outcomes. Calleja et al. [29]
290 reported that the IV iron group had a significantly shorter mean length of hospital stay compared
291 to the no-IV iron group (8.4 ± 6.8 days vs. 10.9 ± 12.4 days; $p<0.001$). In addition, Calleja and
292 colleagues [29] reported no adverse events (e.g., deaths, hypersensitivity, or other serious
293 reactions) and there was no difference in post-surgical complications (e.g., suture dehiscence,

294 paralytic ileus, hemoperitoneum, rectal bleeding, thromboembolism, etc.) at 30 days
295 postoperatively [29]. Kangaspunta et al. [36] reported that colon cancer patients treated up to 60
296 days preoperatively with 500-1000 mg of IV FCM had less post-operative complications (33.9%
297 vs. 45.9%, $p=0.045$), and no difference in LOS, 30- and 90-day mortality between the two
298 groups. Laso-Morales et al. [38] reported no significant differences in postoperative infections,
299 LOS, and complication rates between the two groups, but did report a significantly lower rate of
300 postoperative infection in patients receiving IV iron compared to standard care patients (18% vs.
301 29%; $p=0.018$). Quinn et al. [37] reported morbidity rates as similar across all groups, but did not
302 provide the data. In addition, LOS was longer for patients with uncorrected anemia compared to
303 patients with corrected anemia (13.2 days vs. 7.2 days; $p=0.019$) [37]. Wilson et al. [34] treated
304 colorectal cancer patients with 1000-2000 mg of IV FCM (Ferinject™) or iron (III) maltoside
305 (Monofer®) and found no significant difference in 1-, 3-, and 5-year OS between the IV iron and
306 non-IV iron groups.

307 **Discussion**

308 Each included study was used to draw conclusions about the following key findings: Hgb
309 levels, RBC transfusion needs, iron parameters and patient QoL.

310 A systematic review by Jones *et al.* reveals an improvement in Hgb levels when anemic
311 surgical patients are treated with IV FCM (Ferinject™) [39]. All 10 RCT studies analyzed in the
312 review found an improvement in Hgb concentration from baseline to the end of the study in both
313 the preoperative FCM (Hgb concentration increase from 1.3 g/dL to 4.7 g/dL) and postoperative
314 FCM setting (Hgb concentration increase from 1.7 g/dL to 3.2 g/dL) [39]. Moreover, a
315 retrospective study by Cancado *et al.*, evaluated the effects of administering IV iron sucrose (IS;
316 Venofer®) infusions in an IDA (as defined by WHO guidelines) patient population by providing
317 patients with a weekly dose of 200 mg IS until patients received a total iron dose (calculated by
318 weight and Hgb levels of the patient) or when they had a Hgb concentration of greater than 14.0
319 g/dL [40]. Hgb concentration in patients increased significantly between the baseline and end of
320 study (Mean change: 3.29 g/dL (women) and 4.58 g/dL (men)) [40]. These results coincide with
321 the findings of this review as most of the studies show a significant increase in Hgb levels in
322 patients receiving IV iron treatment opposed to other iron supplementation methods. These
323 findings reveal the strong efficacy of IV iron in effectively increasing Hgb levels in patients with
324 IDA.

325 Hallet *et al.*, systematically reviewed four studies to assess the effects of perioperative
326 iron supplementation on RBC transfusion needs in patients undergoing elective GI surgeries
327 [41]. The study found that although fewer patients required transfusions when given iron
328 supplementation, the observations were statistically insignificant [41]. However, the findings of
329 their systematic review may be biased, as the results were based on four studies with small
330 sample sizes which may not provide an accurate effect estimate of iron supplementation [41].
331 Based on our systematic review findings, most studies that evaluated RBC transfusion rates as an
332 outcome of interest found no significant difference between groups. However, a multicenter
333 cohort study by Calleja *et al.* found that patients in the group receiving IV FCM (n= 111) needed
334 less RBC transfusions than patients receiving oral iron supplementation (n= 155) (OR: 5.9, 95%
335 CI: 2.9-11.1, p<0.001) [29]. Therefore, additional studies need to be conducted to assess the
336 impact of IV iron and comparator iron types on blood transfusion rates to validate and strengthen
337 the current evidence available. Furthermore, valid clinical endpoints, such as Hgb rise, effective
338 iron repletion, less RBC transfusion, morbidity, QoL and hospital length of stay for inpatient
339 assessments, should be assessed in these studies.

340 Iron parameters were another key factor explored in studies evaluating the efficacy of IV
341 iron treatment in IDA correction. Jones *et al.* found that in the preoperative setting, IV iron
342 intervention revealed a 15-35% increase in TSAT levels from baseline and an increase in serum
343 ferritin levels from 19 µg/L at baseline to 229-558 µg/L [39]. Additionally, they found that in the
344 postoperative setting, there was a 7.2-20% increase in TSAT and a serum ferritin increase from
345 19 µg/L to 114-571 µg/L [39]. In our review, seven studies assessed iron parameters (serum
346 ferritin and TSAT) to evaluate the difference in these biomarkers after treating patients with IV
347 iron. All studies found a statistically significant increase in ferritin and TSAT levels of patients
348 receiving IV iron compared to comparator groups. However, a limitation to these study findings
349 is the use of serum ferritin as an indicator of IDA improvement in cancer patients. Ferritin levels
350 are found to be elevated in the cancer patient population due to the cancer's inflammatory nature
351 [42]. The elevated levels of serum ferritin in cancer patients could be due to the abnormal
352 production and release of ferritin from tumour cells [43]. Thus, the sensitivity of ferritin as a
353 prognostic value for iron deficiency is low and studies should refrain from using this parameter
354 as an indicator of iron levels in cancer patients.

355 QoL is an important factor that is often overlooked when treating IDA and assessing
356 patient performance in an oncology population [29]. A review written by *Strauss and Auerbach*
357 evaluated the importance of using validated patient reported outcome tools (FACT measurement
358 system) to assess QoL (34). They found IV iron (IV ferric gluconate) to be the most effective
359 treatment for IDA in cancer patients which resulted in an improvement in patient FACT scores
360 (34). One RCT assessed in their review by Henry *et al.* looked at the impact of IV iron on
361 FACT-Fatigue scores in anemic patients receiving chemotherapy [29]. All patients in the trial
362 received epoetin alfa once a week for four weeks, then an adjusted dose based on their protocol
363 [29]. These patients were randomized into three groups: no iron (ESA alone), oral iron sulfate
364 with ESA, or IV ferric gluconate with ESA [29]. Researchers found that patients receiving IV
365 ferric gluconate reported a significant improvement in the FACT-Fatigue scale (MID=3)
366 compared to patients receiving oral iron or no iron [29]. In our systematic review, we found that
367 the information on QoL specifically in GI cancer patients was limited. Only two studies
368 evaluated QoL as an outcome of interest. Keeler *et al.*, found that the QoL Fact-An scores were
369 higher in patients receiving IV iron compared to oral iron (FACT-An total score (oral iron 151
370 (132–170 [69–183]); IV iron 168 (160–174 [125–186]); $p = 0.005$)) [26]. However, these
371 conclusions may not be meaningful due to the small sample size ($n = 116$) of the study [26].
372 More QoL research should be conducted in the GI cancer population to gain a stronger
373 understanding of QoL improvement when given iron supplementation.

374 The strengths of this systematic review include the comprehensive and inclusive search
375 strategy that was approved by an oncologist specializing in GI cancers, as well as a hematologist.
376 This review assessed a total of 1,623 studies across five databases with no restrictions to
377 language or publication types. Two authors (SN and NS) independently screened the eligibility
378 of each of the studies to minimize selection bias. Moreover, the two authors (SN and NS)
379 conducted separate data extractions for studies that passed the initial screening phase to ensure
380 all pertinent information was collected and all studies followed the eligibility criteria of the
381 review. Furthermore, the quality of both RCTs and non-RCTs were assessed using Cochrane's
382 RoB 2 and ROBINS-I tools. The risk assessment revealed the limitations of the studies included
383 in this systematic review and helped curate a thorough understanding of the missing findings in
384 current publications.

385 This systematic review presents some limitations. Due to the varying interventions,
386 comparators, populations, clinical endpoints, iron formulation, dosing schemes and settings
387 evaluated in each RCT, the results of the review produced heterogeneous findings and thus,
388 made it difficult to conduct a meta-analysis. Additionally, the studies assessed in this review
389 used different time points of data collection, included patients undergoing different surgical
390 approaches, and different cancer types, making it difficult to make valid comparisons between
391 findings. Some studies also assessed outcomes that did not provide meaningful conclusions, such
392 as the use of serum ferritin as a prognostic parameter in this patient population. Moreover, a
393 majority of studies in this review were potentially underpowered due to their small sample sizes.

394 Overall, to strengthen the findings in this field, research should be conducted using larger
395 sample sizes to validate findings prior to making conclusive statements on the efficacy of the
396 intervention being used. Additionally, research evaluating the efficacy of IV iron should use iron
397 parameters that are solely influenced by iron intake in IDA patients (eg. Hgb levels, RBC
398 transfusion rates, serum iron, and TSAT) to ensure findings are resultant of the type of iron
399 patients receive opposed to co-factors such as chemotherapy. More studies should also follow
400 patients for a longer duration of time to assess the long-term impacts of IV iron on QoL and
401 other important outcomes such as survival in this patient population. Another important
402 consideration future researchers should incorporate in their research is the drug availability of IV
403 iron compared to oral iron and how physicians can implement an IV iron infusion center in a
404 feasible manner, especially as there are newer IV iron formulations (e.g. ferric derisomaltose)
405 requiring shorter infusion times.

406 The findings of this systematic review reveal the importance of addressing the prevalence
407 of IDA in a GI oncology patient population. Patients should receive timely diagnosis and
408 management of ID prior to undergoing cancer treatments to avoid postoperative complications
409 related to anemia, including myelosuppressive chemotherapy dose reductions, and to improve
410 overall QoL. More research in this field will help create an international set of guidelines to
411 ensure best clinical practices to improve IDA in patients with GI malignancies.

412

413

414

415

416 **Appendix**

417 *Full Search Strategy (no restrictions)*

418 (functional iron deficiency OR functional iron deficient anemia OR absolute iron
419 deficiency OR absolute iron deficient anemia OR cancer related anemia OR
420 chemotherapy-induced anemia OR chemotherapy induced anemia OR radiotherapy
421 induced anemia OR radiotherapy-induced anemia OR anemia OR anaemia OR iron
422 deficient* anemia OR cancer-related anemia OR microcytic anemia) AND (treatment OR
423 therapy OR chemotherapy) AND (gastric cancer OR gastroesophageal cancer OR
424 gastrointestinal cancer OR adenocarcinoma OR gastr* neoplasm OR gastr* carcinoma
425 OR colo* cancer OR colo* neoplasm OR colo* carcinoma OR stomach cancer OR
426 stomach neoplasm OR stomach carcinoma) AND (ESA OR ESA therap* OR
427 erythropoiet* stimulating agents OR intravenous iron OR IV iron OR iron replacement
428 OR iron supplement* OR parenteral iron OR iron sequestration OR myelosuppression
429 OR iron studies OR serum iron OR total iron binding capacity OR transferrin saturation)

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Included Studies

Randomized Control Trials							
Study (Author, Year)	Design	Type of Cancer	Treatment Arms (if applicable)	Sample size (N) (Group 1; Group 2)	Iron type and dose	Age, years (Mean ± SD)	Setting
Keeler, 2017	RCT	Colorectal Cancer	IV FCM (Ferinject™)	55	Hg>10 g/dL were given 1000 mg (1 dose) of IV FCM (Ferinject™) if they were <70 kg. If more than 70 kg, they were given 1500 mg (2 doses) of IV iron Patients that had Hgb <10 g/dL and <70 kg got 1500 mg (2 doses) and >70 kg got 2000 mg (2 doses)	Median (IQR): 73.8 (67.4-78.6)	Preoperative patient setting Patients were given an initial dose of IV iron a minimum of 14 days before planned surgery. Patients receiving oral iron received FS, twice daily until surgery
			FS (Oral iron)	61	Patients received 200 mg of FS, twice daily from initial recruitment until surgery	Median (IQR): 74.7 (67.9-80.8)	
Keeler, 2019	RCT	Colorectal Cancer	IV FCM (Ferinject™)	55	Patients received IV FCM (Ferinject™). Dosage was given based on weight and Hg levels	73.8 ± 8.9	Preoperative inpatient setting IV FCM (Ferinject™) was dosed by weight and Hg levels. FS was given twice daily until surgery.
			FS (Oral iron)	61	Patients received 200 mg of FS, twice daily until surgery	76.5 ± 10.9	

Laso-Morales, 2021	RCT	Colorectal Cancer	IV FCM (Ferinject™)	50	A single 1000 mg dose of IV FCM (Ferinject™) in 15 minutes	73 ± 10	<p>Postoperative outpatient setting</p> <p>Patients were given a single dose of IV FCM a day after surgery. IV IS (Feriv) was given to repeated doses every 48 hours from the day after surgery until hospital discharge or until total dose equivalent to iron deficit, whichever first</p>
			IV IS (Feriv)	51	200 mg of IV IS (Feriv) every 48 hours from POD1 up to hospital discharge or up to the total dose equivalent to the iron deficit (cumulative dosage is calculated depending on patient's weight and Hgb levels)	71 ± 12	
Ng, 2018	RCT	Esophagogastric adenocarcinoma	IV iron isomaltoside (Monofer®)	11	Patients received a single dose of iron isomaltoside (Monofer®) 1000 mg diluted in 250 mL 0.9% sodium chloride and infused over a period of 60 minutes	Median (range): 69 (48-85)	<p>Perioperative oncology setting</p>
			Standard care (control)	13	Had anemia treated with traditional regimens as decided by the clinical oncology team	Median Range: 68 (38-79)	

Observational Studies							
Study (Author, Year)	Design	Type of Cancer	Treatment Arms (if applicable)	Sample size (N) (Group 1; Group 2)	Iron type and dose	Age, years (Mean ± SD)	Setting
Bojesen, 2021	Observational Cohort Study	Colorectal Cancer	Responders to IV iron isomaltoside (Monofer®) (>0.64 g/dL increase in Hgb during treatment)	50	Patients weighing <50 kg were given a single total dosage of Monofer® calculated by the following Ganzoni formula: total dosage (mg Fe) = patient weight (kg) × [target Hgb value (g/dl) – current Hgb value (g/dl)] × 2.4 + reserve Fe (500 mg) (With a maximum of 20 mg/kg) If cumulative dosage exceeded 20 mg/kg, a second infusion with the remaining dosage was given a week after the initial dosage	71 ± 9.6	Preoperative inpatient setting Surgery was planned approximately 4 weeks after iron administration
			Poor responders to IV iron isomaltoside (Monofer®) (<0.64 g/dL increase in Hgb during treatment)	12		76 ± 12.1	
Kam, 2020	Observational Single Center Study	Colorectal Cancer	IV IS (Venofer®) OR IV iron isomaltoside (Monofer®)	38	Patients were either given 500 mg of IS (Venofer®) mixed with 250 ml normal saline over 210 minutes with a total of two doses set at 1 week apart OR 1000 mg of iron isomaltoside (Monofer®) in 100 mL of normal saline over 15 minutes as a single dose	Median (range): 70.5 (45-85)	Preoperative inpatient setting IV iron doses were given at least 2 weeks prior to their elective operation date
			No iron therapy	62		Median (range): 69 (43-88)	

Laso-Morales, 2017	Retrospective Observational Study	Colorectal Cancer	IV IS (Venofer®) or FCM (Ferinject™)	232	<p>Cumulative IV iron dosage (mg) was calculated using - $14 - \text{baseline Hgb} \times 2.4 \times \text{body weight kg} + 500$</p> <p>Patients received either IV IS (Venofer®) or IV FCM (Ferinject™). Patients who received IV IS (Venofer®) were given doses of 200 mg in 100 mL saline over 30-60 minutes. These doses were given up to three times a week preoperatively. Patients receiving IV FCM (Ferinject™) were given as 500-1000 mg doses in 200 mL saline over 15 to 30 minutes, once a week preoperatively</p>	71 ± 11	<p>Preoperative inpatient setting</p> <p>Patients were given IV IS (Venofer®) three times a week preoperatively until total iron dosage was given or they were given IV FCM (Ferinject™) one a week preoperatively until total iron dosage was given</p>
			Oral iron or no iron treatment	90	<p>Patients were either given no iron (if they were not referred to the anemia clinic) or given 100 mg of elemental iron per day (if they had contraindication to receive IVI)</p>	69 ± 15	
Laso-Morales, 2018	Retrospective Observational Single-Center Study	Colorectal Cancer	IV IS (Venofer®)	47	<p>Cumulative IV iron dosage was calculated depending on the patients baseline Hgb and bodyweight</p> <p>For patients that did not receive IV iron pre-operatively, 500 mg IV iron were added for deposits</p> <p>Iron sucrose was given at doses of 200 mg in 100 mL saline over 30-60 minutes, up to 3 times a week during hospitalization</p>	72 ± 10.2	<p>Postoperative outpatient setting</p> <p>Patients receiving IV iron were given doses three times a week during hospitalization until total iron dosage was given. Patients receiving oral iron were given 100 mg iron per day on discharge</p>

			Oral iron (elemental iron)	92	Patients that did not receive the total IV iron calculated dose during hospitalization were given 100 mg of elemental oral iron on discharge	69 ± 11	
Lima, 2018	Observational Single Center Study	Colorectal Cancer	All patients received at least one dose of IV FCM (Ferinject™)	30	<p>During the study period (12–14 weeks), in every visit, the need of continuation of iron replacement therapy was evaluated and, if necessary, patients were treated with IV FCM (Ferinject™), according to the approved summary of product characteristics, until anemia or iron deficiency was corrected</p> <p>Throughout the study, 25 patients were administered 1000 mg of IV FCM and 5 patients received two administrations of 1000 mg IV FCM (Ferinject™) each</p>	Median (IQR): 67.0 (60.0-75.8)	<p>Perioperative oncology setting</p> <p>During the course of the study period, the need of continuous iron replacement therapy was evaluated, and patients were treated with FCM (Ferinject™) if needed</p>
Quinn, 2017	Retrospective Observational Study	Colorectal Cancer	Post intervention cohort (IV FCM (Monofer®))	76	IV FCM (Monofer®) administration done at least 10 days before surgery. 1000 mg over a 15-minute period	61.9 ± 13.9	Preoperative colorectal unit setting
			Pre-intervention cohort	76	The pre-intervention cohort was the control group for this study	68.1 ± 12	
Wilson, 2018	Retrospective cohort study	Colorectal Cancer	IV FCM (Ferinject™) or IV iron maltoside (Monofer®)	102	Patients received a single dose of 1000-2000 mg of FCM (Ferinject™) or iron III maltoside (Monofer®)	Median (IQR): 75.0 (67.0-80.0)	Preoperative surgical clinic setting

			No IV iron	218	The non-IV iron treatment group was the control group for this study	Median (IQR): 73.5 (66.0-80.0)	Received IV iron therapy less than 6 weeks before surgery
Wilson, 2018	Retrospective cohort study	Colorectal Cancer	IV FCM (Ferinject™) or IV iron maltoside (Monofer®)	94	Patients received a single dose of 1000-2000 mg of FCM (Ferinject™) or iron III maltoside (Monofer®)	71.8 ± 11.1	Preoperative surgical clinic setting
			No IV iron	224	The non-IV iron treatment group was the control group for this study	73.7 ± 9.9	
Calleja, 2016	Multicenter cohort study	Colon Cancer	IV FCM (Ferinject™)	111	IV iron group received a median total FCM (Ferinject™) dose of 1000 mg, and the administration was done on average 28.5+/- 16.7 days before surgery	72.9 ± 11.1	Preoperative inpatient setting
			No IV iron treatment	155	No-IV group received different doses and formulations of oral iron supplementation at the time of diagnosis	70.8 ± 10.3	Ferinject™ was given to patients 2-4 weeks before scheduled surgery
Kangaspunta, 2022	Retrospective cohort study	Colon Cancer	IV FCM (Ferinject™)	180	Patients in this group received either 500 mg or 1000 mg of IV FCM at a time (also dependent on patient's weight and Hg levels) Forty patients received 500 mg, 1 patient received 800 mg, 109 patients received 1000 mg, 1 patient received 500 mg + 500 mg, 9 patients received 1000 mg + 500 mg, 9 patients received 1000 mg + 1000 mg of IV iron, and 1 patient received 500 mg + 1000 mg + 1000 mg.	Median (IQR): 73.8 (66.9-80.1)	Preoperative outpatient setting
			No IV iron treatment	138	The non-IV iron treatment group was the control group for this study	Median (IQR): 76.0 (70.1-81.9)	Patients were given preoperative IV iron up to 60 days prior to operation

Titos-Acros, 2021	Retrospective Observational Study	Colon Cancer	Postoperative IV iron saccharose	52	Administered dose was 100–200 mg IV iron III saccharose (maximum dose: 200 mg three times a week)	70.9 ± 11.1	Postoperative surgical clinic setting Patients receiving IV iron received a maximum of three doses a week until discharge
			No postoperative IV iron saccharose	52	The non-IV iron treatment group was the control group for this study	70.6 ± 10.9	
Jeong, 2014	Observational Study	Gastric carcinoma	IV IS (Venofer®)	68	300 mg IS made up to 250 ml with 0.9% saline and repeated until the total target amount was given The total iron (mg) to be administered was calculated as: body weight (kg) 9 (target Hgb (12)- patient's Hgb) 9 x 0.24 + 500 mg	63.2 ± 11.2	Postoperative outpatient setting Patients received IV iron every other day until total target amount was given to each patient
			No specific treatment	74	The non-IV iron treatment group was the control group for this study	62.6 ± 11.7	
Verhaeghe, 2017	Retrospective Observational Study	Gastrointestinal malignancies	All patients received at least one dose of IV FCM (Ferinject™)	303	FCM (Ferinject™) administration was done at baseline. Most patients only received one dose of FCM (Ferinject™) (if patients were given another dose within four weeks, the two doses were considered one cumulative dose)	63.22 ± 11.91	Preoperative digestive oncology clinic setting

Table 2. Main Results of Included Studies

Randomized Control Trials					
Study (Author, Year)	Treatment Arms (if applicable)	Diagnostic Criteria	Outcomes of Interest	Results	Conclusion
Keeler, 2017	IV FCM (Ferinject™) vs. FS (Oral Iron)	Hgb <11g/ dL in women Hgb <12g/dL in men	Hgb levels	Increases in Hgb were higher in IV iron recipients (median 1.55 g/dL [IQR 0.93-2.58] vs. 0.50 g/dL [IQR -0.13 to 1.33]; p<0.001). Hgb levels were higher at surgery after treatment with IV iron than oral iron	IV iron did not reduce blood transfusion needs but was more effective than oral iron at treating preoperative anemia and iron deficiency
			Blood Transfusion Rates	No difference in blood transfusion needs from recruitment to trial completion in terms of volume of blood administered (p=0.841) or number of patients transfused (p=0.470).	
			Iron parameters (Serum ferritin, TSAT)	Ferritin levels were significantly higher in the intravenous group at surgery (median 558 (IQR 330–1085) µg/l versus 27.5 (17–51.5) µg/l in oral group; P <0.001) This same relationship was evident with TSAT levels at surgery (median 19 (16–29) and 9(5–14) % respectively; P <0.001)	
			Postoperative complications	There was no difference in grade of complication severity between groups from recruitment to outpatients (P =0.995) or in complication rate over the same period (P =0.305). The same was true for grade (P =0.083) and rate (P =0.091) of infective complications.	
			90-day mortality	Ninety-day mortality rates were similar (2 and 3 deaths respectively; P =0.906).	

			Postoperative length of hospital stay	Postoperative length of hospital stay was 6 days for both groups (IQR 4–9 and 5–10 days for oral and intravenous groups respectively; P =0.950)	
Keeler, 2019	IV FCM (Ferinject™) vs. FS (Oral Iron)	Hgb <11g/ dL in women Hgb <12g/dL in men	Hgb levels	Hgb levels were higher at surgery and in outpatients with IV iron however, no difference in blood transfusion use was seen	IV iron was more efficacious at improving QoL scores than oral iron
			QoL	Eleven QoL components increased by a clinically significant margin in the IV iron group between recruitment and surgery with one component for oral iron. Fact-An scores were higher for the IV iron group.	
Laso-Morales, 2021	IV FCM (Ferinject™) vs. IV IS (Feriv)	Hgb <11 g/dL for all patients	Hgb levels	No between-group differences in mean change in Hgb from postop day 1 to postop day 30 (FC: 2.5 g/dL, 95% CI: 2.1-2.9; IS:2.4g/dL, 95% CI:2.0-2.8; p=-0.52)	Hgb increase was similar for both IV FCM and IV IS, but infection rate was higher in IS
			Blood Transfusion Rates	No between-group differences in blood transfusion rates	
			Iron parameters (Serum ferritin, TSAT)	Both ferritin and TSAT levels were higher on the day of surgery than at the time of CRC diagnosis for FCM group	
			Postoperative complications	Infection rate was lower in the FCM (Ferinject™) group compared to IS (Feriv) group (9.8% vs. 37.2%).	
			Postoperative length of hospital stay	No between-group differences in length of hospital stay	

Ng, 2018	IV iron isomaltoside (Monofer®) vs. Standard care (control)	Hgb <12g/dL in women Hgb <13 g/dL in men	Hgb levels	No significant change in Hgb between both groups with an increase in ferritin levels in IV iron group after cycle one of chemotherapy (Standard care: 116 ng/ml; IV iron 770 ng/ml, P<0.05).	IV iron improves QoL and ferritin levels
			Blood Transfusion Rates	No difference in blood transfusion rates	
			Iron parameters (Serum ferritin, TSAT)	Ferritin showed a significant increase after chemotherapy cycle one in the group treated with IV iron 105 ng/ml to 1015 ng/ml (P<0.05) Transferrin saturations increased above 20% in the intravenous iron group rising from 11.1% to 26.1% after cycle 1 (P=0.196). Transferrin saturations never exceeded 20% in the standard care group but did rise from 11.9 to 19% after cycle three of chemotherapy.	
			QoL	IV iron group saw improvements in QoL	
			Anemia-specific QoL	IV iron group saw improvements in anemia-specific QoL.	
Observational Studies					
Study (Author, Year)	Treatment Arms (if applicable)	Diagnostic Criteria	Outcomes of Interest	Results	Conclusion
Bojesen, 2021	Responders to IV iron isomaltoside (Monofer®) (>0.64 g/dL increase in Hgb during treatment)	Hgb ≤11.28 g/dL for all patients	Hgb levels	Hgb levels improved in patients over the duration of treatment:	Patients with severe anemia (Hgb<9.02 g/dL) had the largest increase in Hgb after 4 weeks.

	<p>vs. Poor responders to IV iron isomaltoside (Monofer®) (<0.64 g/dL increase in Hgb during treatment)</p>			<p>Week 1: 0.77 g/dL (95% CI 0.52-1.03 g/dL, P<0.0001) Week 2: 1.5 g/dL (95% CI 1.21-1.80 g/dL, P<0.0001) Week 4: 2.13 g/dL (95% CI 1.71-2.55 g/dL, P<0.0001)</p>	<p>Patients with mild anemia (>10.31 g/dL) did not have an increase in Hgb during the treatment course.</p>
			<p>Iron parameters (Serum ferritin, TSAT)</p>	<p>Poor responders had significantly higher ferritin levels at weeks 1, 2 and 4 (P = 0.02, P = 0.003 and P = 0.013, respectively) compared to responders. Poor responders had a significantly lower increase in TSAT 1 week after initial treatment (-11%, 95% CI -18% to -4%, P = 0.0026) compared to responders. No difference in serum iron was found between poor responders and responders at week 1, 2 or 4</p>	
			<p>Postoperative complications</p>	<p>Twenty-one patients (34%) developed a postoperative complication within the first 30 days after surgery. Not responding sufficiently to treatment was associated with higher baseline Hgb (P = 0.049) and lower body mass index (P = 0.036) but did not remain significant after correction for multiple testing.</p>	
			<p>Postoperative length of hospital stay</p>	<p>The median length of stay was 3 days (IQR 3–6 days, range 1–36 days).</p>	

Kam, 2020	IV IS (Venofer®) OR IV iron isomaltoside (Monofer®) vs. No iron therapy	Hgb <10 g/dL Hgb <12 g/dL after recent transfusion	Hgb levels	No statistically significant difference in mean preoperative Hgb level between two groups. IV iron group had a higher median Hgb rise of 1.9 g/dL vs. 0.6 g/dL in non-IV iron (P<0.001).	Patients with severe anemia (Hgb<9.02 g/dL) had the largest increase in Hgb after 4 weeks. IV iron can significantly increase Hgb levels in IDA patients before colorectal surgery and reduce RBC transfusions.
			Blood Transfusion Rates	8 patients in the IV iron group required blood transfusion compared to 30 in the non-IV iron group (P=0.006). No significant difference in number of patients with red blood cell transfusion prior to IV iron (42.1% in IV iron and 41.9% in non-IV iron, p=0.987)	
Laso-Morales, 2017	IV IS (Venofer®) OR IV FCM (Ferinject™) vs. Oral iron or no iron	Hgb<13 g/dL for all patients	Blood Transfusion Rates	There was no difference in RBCT rates between anemic patients on IV iron and those on standard care (16% vs. 17%; p=0.865).	IV iron was more effective in treating preoperative anemia and reducing infection rate than standard of care
			Postoperative complications	Infection rates were lower among IV iron treated patients (18% vs. 29%; p<0.05). IV iron did not reduce postoperative blood transfusions but was more effective than standard care in treating preoperative anemia.	
			Postoperative length of hospital stay	No significant differences in length of stay	
Laso-Morales, 2018	IV IS (Ferinject™) vs. Oral iron (elemental iron)	Hgb<12 g/dL for all patients	Hgb levels	Anemia was more prevalent among patients in the IV iron group (p=-0.027), despite greater increment in Hgb (2.0 ± 1.5 g/dL vs. 1.1 ± 1.2 g/dL; p=0.001).	Compared to standard of care, post-operative IV iron administration improved recovery of Hgb levels at 30

			Blood Transfusion Rates	7 IV iron patients and 4 non-IV iron patients required postoperative transfusions.	days post-operative, without an increase in post-operative complications.
			Postoperative complications	No differences in post-operative complications between the groups, and no IV iron-related adverse events.	
Lima, 2018	All patients received at least one dose of IV FCM (Ferinject™)	1) Hgb \leq 11 g/dL or a reduction \geq 2 g/dL since the start of the current chemotherapy regimen AND, 2) Ferritin <30 ng/mL and transferrin saturation (TSAT) <20% OR, Ferritin 30-800 ng/mL, and TSAT<50%	Hgb levels	Statistically significant increase in mean Hgb (10.3 vs 11.2 g/dL)	FCM (Ferinject™) was well tolerated and had a positive impact on treatment of IDA
			Iron parameters (Serum ferritin, TSAT)	Ferritin had a mean change of 646.7 \pm 455.7 ng/mL (p<0.001) TSAT had a mean change of 6.7% \pm 6.9% (p<0.001) Serum iron had a mean change of 17.4 \pm 26.6 mg/mL (p<0.001)	
Quinn, 2017	Post intervention cohort (IV FCM - Ferinject™) vs. Pre-intervention cohort	Hgb <11g/dL for all patients	Hgb levels	Mean day 3 post-operative Hgb levels were significantly lower in patients with uncorrected anemia (9.5 g/dL, p=0.004).	IDA management pathway resulted in improved perioperative Hgb levels with reduction in perioperative transfusion.
			Blood Transfusion Rates	Postoperative transfusion rates were 38% in patients with uncorrected anemia, compared to 0% in corrected anemia and 3.5% in non-anemic patients.	

			Postoperative complications	There were seven postoperative transfusions in the entire cohort: two in non-anemic patients (3.5% transfusion rate), two in patients with iron deficiency (13% transfusion rate) and three in patients with uncorrected anemia from other causes (a 50% transfusion rate).	
			Postoperative length of hospital stay	The difference in length of stay between patients with corrected anemia and non-anemic patients was non-significant (p = 0.472).	
			Iron deficiency rates	Treatment resulted in a preoperative IDA correction rate of 60% (nine of fifteen).	
Wilson, 2018	IV FCM (Ferinject™) or IV iron maltoside (Monofer®) vs. No IV iron	Hgb < 12.0 g/dL in women Hgb < 12.9 g/dL in men	5-year OS	No significant differences in 1-, 3-, and 5-year OS between the IV iron and no IV iron groups	IV iron does not have a profound effect on long-term OS and DFS.
			DFS	No significant differences in DFS between the IV iron and no IV iron group	
Wilson, 2018	IV FCM (Ferinject™) or IV iron maltoside (Monofer®) vs. No IV iron	Hgb < 12.0 g/dL in women Hgb < 12.9 g/dL in men	Hgb levels	In the IV iron group, preoperative Hgb level was significantly increased compared to the non-IV iron group (0.65 mmol/L vs. 0.10 mmol/L, p<0.001).	IV iron leads to optimization of preoperative Hgb levels
			Blood Transfusion Rates	No significant decrease in the percentage of patients with a postoperative blood transfusion	
			Postoperative complications	No advantageous effect was found on postoperative complications	

Calleja, 2016	IV FCM (Ferinject™) vs. Oral iron	1) Hgb<12 g/dL in women Hgb <13 g/dL in men 2) Serum ferritin <30 ng/mL AND/OR 3) Transferrin saturation (TSAT) <20%	Hgb levels	Mean total Hgb increases significantly favor the FCM group between diagnosis and hospital admission (1.5 vs. 0.5 g/dL; p<0.0001) and between diagnosis and 30 days post-surgery (3.1 vs. 1.5 g/dL; p<0.0001)	Preoperative treatment in anemic colon cancer patients reduced RBC transfusion requirements and length of hospital stays.
			Blood Transfusion Rates	Less patients required RBC transfusion during study in FCM group: 9.9% in treatment group vs. 37% in control group (OR: 5.9, 95% CI: 2.9-11.1, p<0.001)	
			Iron parameters (Serum ferritin, TSAT)	At 30 days after-surgery, the average FCM (Ferinject™) treated patient presented no recognizable signs of iron deficiency anemia (being the mean of Hgb: 12.6 g/dL [≥12 g/dL]; serum ferritin: 218 ng/mL [≥30 ng/mL]; and saturation transferrin index: 25.1 % [≥20 %]) compared with the no-IV group that did not reach normalized mean values	
			Postoperative complications	A lower number of re-interventions and post-surgery complications were seen in the FCM (Ferinject™) group (20.7 vs. 26.5 %; p=0.311)	
			Postoperative length of hospital stay	FCM (Ferinject™) group had a significantly shorter mean length of hospital stay (Mean±SD; 8.4±6.8 days) compared to no-IV iron group (Mean±SD; 10.9±12.4 days)	
Kangaspunta, 2022	IV FCM (Ferinject™) vs.	Hgb<12 g/dL in women Hgb <13 g/dL in men	Blood Transfusion Rates	No significant difference in number of transfusions	Overall decrease in postoperative complications, and postoperative

	No IV iron		Postoperative anemia	Patients treated with IV iron had lower prevalence of anemia at 1 month after surgery (38.7% vs. 65.3%, p<0.01) when compared with patients without IV iron treatment.	anemia.
			Postoperative complications	Patients treated with IV iron had less post-operative complications (33.9% vs. 45.9%, p=0.045)	
			30-day and 90-day mortality	No significant difference in mortality	
			Postoperative length of hospital stay	No significant difference in length of hospital stay	
Titos-Acros, 2012	Postoperative IV iron III saccharose vs. No postoperative IV iron	Hgb <11 g/dL for all patients	Hgb levels	Mean Hgb at discharge in the IV iron group was 10.0 ± 1.1 g/dL vs. 10.6 ± 1.2 g/dL in control (p=0.012).	IV iron did not appear to impact blood transfusion requirements
			Blood Transfusion Rates	No significant difference in blood transfusion needs	
Jeong, 2014	IV IS (Venofer®) vs. No specific treatment	Hgb <10 g/dL for all patients	Hgb levels	Mean increase of Hgb at 6 months post-operation was 3.2 g/dL in the IV iron sucrose group, and 2.5 g/dL in the no-iron group (P=0.029).	IV IS (Venofer®) significantly increased serum Hgb in patients developing acute postoperative anemia after gastrectomy
Verhaeghe, 2017	All study patients received IV FCM (Ferinject™)	Serum ferritin < 100 µg/L and TSAT < 20% suggested AID	Hgb levels	Median Hgb change was an increase of 0.5 [IQR; -0.1-1.6] g/dL	Based on the findings, the median increase in Hgb over a 28-day period was 0.5 g/dL. This is not a significant difference but may be due to the inadequate dosing schemes. The response to IV iron depends on the underlying mechanism
			Iron parameters (Serum ferritin, TSAT)	Median serum ferritin change was an increase of 464 [IQR; 230-830] µg/L Median TSAT change was an increase of 11 [IQR; 5-18.5] %	

References

- [1] Arnold M, Abnet CC, Neale RE, Vignat J, Giovannucci EL, McGlynn KA, et al. Global Burden of 5 Major Types Of Gastrointestinal Cancer. *Gastroenterology* 2020;159:335. <https://doi.org/10.1053/J.GASTRO.2020.02.068>.
- [2] Ludwig H, Van Belle S, Barrett-Lee P, Birgegård G, Bokemeyer C, Gascón P, et al. The European Cancer Anaemia Survey (ECAS): a large, multinational, prospective survey defining the prevalence, incidence, and treatment of anaemia in cancer patients. *Eur J Cancer* 2004;40:2293–306. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.EJCA.2004.06.019>.
- [3] World Health Organization. Iron deficiency anaemia: Assessment, Prevention, and Control; A guide for programme managers. World Health Organization 2001:132.
- [4] Rodgers GM, Gilreath JA, Chair V, Achebe MM, Alwan L, Arcasoy M, et al. NCCN Guidelines Version 2.2018 Panel Members Cancer-and Chemotherapy-Induced Anemia 2018.
- [5] Aapro M, Österborg A, Gascón P, Ludwig H, Beguin Y. Prevalence and management of cancer-related anaemia, iron deficiency and the specific role of I.V. iron. *Annals of Oncology* 2012;23:1954–62. <https://doi.org/10.1093/annonc/mds112>.
- [6] Bermejo F, García-López S. A guide to diagnosis of iron deficiency and iron deficiency anemia in digestive diseases. *World Journal of Gastroenterology : WJG* 2009;15:4638. <https://doi.org/10.3748/WJG.15.4638>.
- [7] Strauss WE, Auerbach M. Health-related quality of life in patients with iron deficiency anemia: impact of treatment with intravenous iron. *Patient Relat Outcome Meas* 2018;9:285. <https://doi.org/10.2147/PROM.S169653>.
- [8] Knight K, Wade S, Balducci L. Prevalence and outcomes of anemia in cancer: a systematic review of the literature. *Am J Med* 2004;116:11–26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.AMJMED.2003.12.008>.
- [9] Ludwig H, Evstatiev R, Kornek G, Aapro M, Bauernhofer T, Buxhofer-Ausch V, et al. Iron metabolism and iron supplementation in cancer patients. *Wien Klin Wochenschr* 2015;127:907. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S00508-015-0842-3>.
- [10] Abiri B, Vafa M. Iron Deficiency and Anemia in Cancer Patients: The Role of Iron Treatment in Anemic Cancer Patients. *Nutr Cancer* 2020;72:864–72. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01635581.2019.1658794>.
- [11] Petrelli F, Borgonovo K, Cabiddu M, Lonati V, Barni S. Addition of iron to erythropoiesis-stimulating agents in cancer patients: A meta-analysis of randomized trials. *J Cancer Res Clin Oncol* 2012;138:179–87. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S00432-011-1072-3/FIGURES/5>.
- [12] Bohlius J, Bohlke K, Castelli R, Djulbegovic B, Lustberg MB, Martino M, et al. Management of cancer-associated anemia with erythropoiesis-stimulating agents: ASCO/ASH clinical practice guideline update. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2019;37:1336–51. <https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.18.02142>.
- [13] Mhaskar R, Wao H, Miladinovic B, Kumar A, Djulbegovic B. The role of iron in the management of chemotherapy-induced anemia in cancer patients receiving erythropoiesis-stimulating agents. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2016;2. <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD009624.PUB2>.

- [14] Gafter-Gvili A, Rozen-Zvi B, Vidal L, Leibovici L, Vansteenkiste J, Gafter U, et al. Intravenous iron supplementation for the treatment of chemotherapy-induced anaemia – systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. [Http://DxDoiOrg/103109/0284186X2012702921](http://DxDoiOrg/103109/0284186X2012702921) 2012;52:18–29. <https://doi.org/10.3109/0284186X.2012.702921>.
- [15] Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, et al. Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions. 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119536604>.
- [16] Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ* 2021;372. <https://doi.org/10.1136/BMJ.N71>.
- [17] Auerbach M, Ballard H. Clinical Use of Intravenous Iron: Administration, Efficacy, and Safety. *Hematology* 2010;2010:338–47. <https://doi.org/10.1182/ASHEDUCATION-2010.1.338>.
- [18] Covidence. Covidence - Better systematic review management. Veritas Health Innovation, Melbourne, Australia 2020. <https://www.covidence.org/> (accessed May 31, 2022).
- [19] Higgins JPT, Altman DG, Gøtzsche PC, Jüni P, Moher D, Oxman AD, et al. The Cochrane Collaboration’s tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ* 2011;343. <https://doi.org/10.1136/BMJ.D5928>.
- [20] Sterne JA, Hernan MA, McAleenan A, et al. Chapter 25: Assessing risk of bias in a non-randomized study | Cochrane Training. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions 2021;version 6. <https://training.cochrane.org/handbook/current/chapter-25> (accessed May 31, 2022).
- [21] McGuinness LA, Higgins JPT. Risk-of-bias VISualization (robvis): An R package and Shiny web app for visualizing risk-of-bias assessments. *Res Synth Methods* n.d.;n/a. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jrsm.1411>.
- [22] Bojesen RD, Eriksen JR, Vogelsang RP, Grube C, Forman JL, Gogenur I. The dynamic effects of preoperative intravenous iron in anaemic patients undergoing surgery for colorectal cancer. *Colorectal Dis* 2021;23:2550–8. <https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/codi.15789>.
- [23] Lima J, Gago P, Rocha M, Grilo I, Gomes R, Luís M, et al. Role of intravenous iron in the treatment of anemia in patients with gastrointestinal tract tumors undergoing chemotherapy: A single-center, observational study. *Int J Gen Med* 2018;11:331–6. <https://doi.org/10.2147/IJGM.S165947>.
- [24] Verhaeghe L, Bruyneel L, Stragier E, Ferrante M, Dierickx D, Prenen H. The effectiveness of intravenous iron for iron deficiency anemia in gastrointestinal cancer patients: a retrospective study. *Ann Gastroenterol* 2017;30:654–63. <https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.20524/aog.2017.0189>.
- [25] Keeler BD, Simpson JA, Ng O, Padmanabhan H, Brookes MJ, Acheson AG, et al. Randomized clinical trial of preoperative oral versus intravenous iron in anaemic patients with colorectal cancer. *British Journal of Surgery* 2017;104:214-221. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bjs.10328>.
- [26] Keeler BD, Dickson EA, Simpson JA, Ng O, Padmanabhan H, Brookes MJ, et al. The impact of pre-operative intravenous iron on quality of life after colorectal cancer surgery: outcomes from the intravenous iron in colorectal cancer-associated anaemia (IVICA) trial. *Anaesthesia* 2019;74:714-725. <https://doi.org/10.1111/anae.14659>.

- [27] Laso-Morales MJ, Vives R, Bisbe E, Garcia-Erce JA, Munoz M, Martinez-Lopez F, et al. Single-dose intravenous ferric carboxymaltose infusion versus multiple fractionated doses of intravenous iron sucrose in the treatment of post-operative anaemia in colorectal cancer patients: a randomised controlled trial. *Trasfusione Del Sangue [Blood Transfusion]* 2021. <https://doi.org/10.2450/2021.0157-21>.
- [28] Ng O, Keeler B, Simpson JA, Madhusudan S, Brookes M, Acheson A. Feasibility of Intravenous Iron Isomaltoside to Improve Anemia and Quality of Life During Palliative Chemotherapy for Esophagogastric Adenocarcinoma. *Nutr Cancer* 2018;70:1106-1117. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01635581.2018.1504090>.
- [29] Calleja JL, Delgado S, del Val A, Hervás A, Larraona JL, Terán Á, et al. Ferric carboxymaltose reduces transfusions and hospital stay in patients with colon cancer and anemia. *Int J Colorectal Dis* 2016;31:543–51. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00384-015-2461-x>.
- [30] Jeong O, Park YK. Effect of intravenous iron supplementation for acute postoperative anemia in patients undergoing gastrectomy for gastric carcinoma: A pilot study. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2014;21:547–52. <https://doi.org/10.1245/s10434-013-3238-5>.
- [31] Kam PMH, Chu CWH, Chan EMY, Liu OL, Kwok KH. Use of intravenous iron therapy in colorectal cancer patient with iron deficiency anemia: a propensity-score matched study. *Int J Colorectal Dis* 2020;35:521–7. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S00384-020-03508-Y/FIGURES/1>.
- [32] Laso-Morales MJ, Jericó C, Gómez-Ramírez S, Castellví J, Viso L, Roig-Martínez I, et al. Preoperative management of colorectal cancer–induced iron deficiency anemia in clinical practice: data from a large observational cohort. *Transfusion (Paris)* 2017;57:3040–8. <https://doi.org/10.1111/trf.14278>.
- [33] Titos-Arcos JC, Ventura-López M, Soria-Aledo V, Carrillo-Alcaráz A, Molina-Guillén P, Moregó-Soler A, et al. Efficacy of intravenous iron III sucrose in decreasing the number of transfusions in patients with colorectal carcinoma not demonstrated. *Eur J Hosp Pharm* 2012;19:176–176. <https://doi.org/10.1136/EJHPHARM-2012-000074.240>.
- [34] Wilson M, Dekker J, Buettner S, Verhoef C, Harlaar J, Jeekel J, et al. The effect of intravenous iron therapy on long-term survival in anemic colorectal cancer patients: results from a matched cohort study. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2018;25:S154-. <https://doi.org/10.1245/s10434-018-6349-1>.
- [35] Wilson MJ, Dekker JW, Bruns E, Borstlap W, Jeekel J, Zwaginga JJ, et al. Short-term effect of preoperative intravenous iron therapy in colorectal cancer patients with anemia: results of a cohort study. *Transfusion (Paris)* 2018;58:795–803. <https://doi.org/10.1111/trf.14456>.
- [36] Kangaspunta M, Makijarvi J, Koskensalo S, Kokkola A, Arkkila P, Scheinin T, et al. Preoperative intravenous iron treatment reduces postoperative complications and postoperative anemia in preoperatively anemic patients with colon carcinoma. *Int J Colorectal Dis* 2022;37:449–55. <https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00384-021-04080-9>.
- [37] Quinn EM, Meland E, McGinn S, Anderson JH. Correction of iron-deficiency anaemia in colorectal surgery reduces perioperative transfusion rates: A before and after study. *International Journal of Surgery* 2017;38:1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijso.2016.12.029>.
- [38] Laso-Morales MJ, Vives R, Gómez-Ramírez S, Pallisera-Lloveras A, Pontes C. Intravenous iron administration for post-operative anaemia management after colorectal

- cancer surgery in clinical practice: A single-centre, retrospective study. *Blood Transfusion* 2018;16:338–42. <https://doi.org/10.2450/2018.004-18>.
- [39] Jones JJ, Mundy LM, Blackman N, Shwarz M. Ferric Carboxymaltose for Anemic Perioperative Populations: A Systematic Literature Review of Randomized Controlled Trials 2021. <https://doi.org/10.2147/JBM.S295041>.
- [40] Cançado RD, de Figueiredo PON, Olivato MCA, Chiattonne CS. Efficacy and safety of intravenous iron sucrose in treating adults with iron deficiency anemia. *Rev Bras Hematol Hemoter* 2011;33:439. <https://doi.org/10.5581/1516-8484.20110119>.
- [41] Hallet J, Hanif A, Callum J, Pronina I, Wallace D, Yohanathan L, et al. The impact of perioperative iron on the use of red blood cell transfusions in gastrointestinal surgery: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Transfus Med Rev* 2014;28:205–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.TMRV.2014.05.004>.
- [42] Dignass A, Farrag K, Stein J. Limitations of Serum Ferritin in Diagnosing Iron Deficiency in Inflammatory Conditions. *Int J Chronic Dis* 2018;2018:1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2018/9394060>.
- [43] Lorenzi M, Lorenzi B, Vernillo R. Serum ferritin in colorectal cancer patients and its prognostic evaluation. *Int J Biol Markers* 2006;21:235–41.




Figure 1. PRISMA Diagram for study identification, screening, and inclusion.

* Duplicates removed by software program.

Study	Risk of bias domains					Overall
	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	
Keeler 2017						
Keeler 2019						
Laso-Morales 2021						
Ng 2018						

Domains:
D1: Bias arising from the randomization process.
D2: Bias due to deviations from intended intervention.
D3: Bias due to missing outcome data.
D4: Bias in measurement of the outcome.
D5: Bias in selection of the reported result.

Judgement
 High
 Low

Figure 2. Risk of bias assessment of randomized studies included in the current review.

Study	Risk of bias domains							Overall
	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	D7	
Bojesen, 2021	⊗	+	+	+	+	-	+	⊗
Calleja, 2016	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	-
Jeong, 2014	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	-
Kam, 2020	-	+	+	+	?	-	+	-
Kangaspunta, 2022	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-
Laso-Morales, 2017	?	+	+	+	?	-	+	-
Laso-Morales, 2018	?	+	+	+	?	-	+	-
Lima, 2018	-	+	+	+	?	-	+	-
Quinn, 2017	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	-
Titos-Arcos, 2012	-	+	+	+	?	-	+	-
Verhaeghe, 2017	⊗	+	?	+	-	-	+	⊗
Wilson, 2018a	⊗	+	+	+	-	-	+	⊗
Wilson, 2018b	⊗	+	+	+	-	-	+	⊗

Domains:
D1: Bias due to confounding.
D2: Bias due to selection of participants.
D3: Bias in classification of interventions.
D4: Bias due to deviations from intended interventions.
D5: Bias due to missing data.
D6: Bias in measurement of outcomes.
D7: Bias in selection of the reported result.

Judgement
⊗ Serious
- Moderate
+ Low
? No information

Figure 3. The risk of bias assessment completed for non-randomized studies.