Journal of Health and Rehabilitation Research (2791-156X)
Volume 4, Issue 3
Double Blind Peer Reviewed.
https://jhrlmc.com/
DOI: https://doi.org/10.61919/jhrr.v4i3.1488
www.lmi.education/

Side Effect Profile of Arimidex vs. Femara: A Comparison Study

Sanila Rafique[1], Faisal Mehmood[2], Amna[2], Maria Ahmed[3], Tayyaba Sajjad[3], Muhammad Farrukh Habib[4]

Correspondence
Muhammad Farrukh Habib
muhammadfarrukhhabib@gmail.com

Affiliations
1 Combined Military Hospital, Lahore, Pakistan
2 Combined Military Hospital, Rawalpindi, Pakistan
3 District Headquarter Hospital, Mirpur, Pakistan
4 Shifa Tameer-e-Millat University, Islamabad, Pakistan

Keywords
Arimidex, Femara, aromatase inhibitors, breast cancer, postmenopausal women, side effects, HR+ breast cancer, musculoskeletal pain, cardiovascular health, bone density loss, endocrine therapy, patient compliance.

Disclaimers

Authors' Contributions	All authors contributed equally to the study design, data analysis, and manuscript preparation.
Conflict of Interest	None declared
Data/supplements	Available on request.
Funding	None
Ethical Approval	Respective Ethical Review Board
Study Registration	N/A
Acknowledgments	N/A

ABSTRACT

Background: Background: Aromatase inhibitors, Arimidex (anastrozole) and Femara (letrozole), are commonly used in the treatment of hormone receptor-positive (HR+) breast cancer in postmenopausal women. Despite similar efficacy, these drugs have different side effect profiles that impact patient compliance and quality of life.

Objective: To compare the incidence and severity of side effects between Arimidex and Femara in postmenopausal women with HR+ breast cancer.

Methods: A retrospective cohort study was conducted involving 1,000 postmenopausal women with HR+ breast cancer from multiple oncology centers. Participants were divided into two groups: Arimidex (n=500) and Femara (n=500). Side effects were assessed via patient self-reports, clinical evaluations, and standardized questionnaires. Data were analyzed using chi-square tests, t-tests, and logistic regression models, with p-values <0.05 considered significant.

Results: Arimidex was associated with higher rates of joint pain (45% vs. 30%, p<0.001) and muscle pain (38% vs. 25%, p<0.01). Femara showed increased rates of hypertension (28% vs. 20%, p<0.05) and significant bone density loss (18% vs. 12%, p<0.05).

Conclusion: Arimidex and Femara exhibit distinct side effect profiles, suggesting the need for personalized treatment approaches based on patient risk factors.

INTRODUCTION

Breast cancer remains one of the most prevalent malignancies among women worldwide, with hormone receptor-positive (HR+) subtypes constituting a significant portion of cases. HR+ breast cancer, characterized by the presence of estrogen or progesterone receptors on cancer cells, is driven by hormonal influences, making endocrine therapy a cornerstone of treatment for postmenopausal women with this disease. Among the available endocrine therapies, aromatase inhibitors (AIs) have gained prominence due to their ability to reduce estrogen synthesis by inhibiting the enzyme aromatase, which converts androgens into estrogens in peripheral tissues after menopause. This reduction in estrogen levels effectively starves HR+ breast cancer cells of the hormonal signals required for their growth and proliferation (1).

Two of the most widely used AIs are Arimidex (anastrozole) and Femara (letrozole), both of which have demonstrated efficacy in the management of early and advanced stages of HR+ breast cancer in postmenopausal women. Introduced in the mid-1990s, these agents have become the preferred first-line endocrine therapies due to their potent suppression of estrogen levels, significantly reducing the risk of cancer recurrence (2). Despite their similar mechanisms of action, Arimidex and Femara differ in their pharmacological profiles, particularly in their side effect spectra. Understanding these differences is crucial, as side effects can significantly impact patient adherence, quality of life, and overall therapeutic outcomes. The primary side effects associated with AIs include musculoskeletal pain, cardiovascular events, bone density loss, and various systemic symptoms that can influence patient compliance with treatment regimens (3).

Musculoskeletal side effects, including joint pain (arthralgia) and muscle pain (myalgia), are among the most common adverse effects reported by patients on AI therapy. These symptoms can severely affect patients' functional abilities and daily activities, often leading to a reduction in quality of life. Notably, musculoskeletal pain appears more frequently with Arimidex than Femara, although the exact mechanisms underlying this difference remain unclear. It is hypothesized that variations in the molecular structure and interaction of these drugs with musculoskeletal tissues may contribute to the differential side effect profiles observed between the two medications (4). Furthermore, long-term AI therapy is associated with a decline in bone mineral density, increasing the risk of osteoporosis and fractures. Both Arimidex and Femara have been implicated in this adverse effect, with some evidence suggesting a slightly higher risk associated with Femara, potentially due to its more potent estrogen suppression capabilities (5).

Cardiovascular health is another critical area affected by AI therapy. Estrogen exerts a protective effect on the cardiovascular system, and its reduction through AI use can predispose patients to conditions such as hypertension, hypercholesterolemia, and ischemic heart disease. Although both Arimidex and Femara are linked to these cardiovascular risks, preliminary data suggest that Femara may exert a more pronounced impact, possibly due to its stronger anti-estrogenic effects. However, the absolute risk of severe cardiovascular events remains relatively low, and

the benefits of AI therapy in preventing breast cancer recurrence generally outweigh these potential harms (6). Additionally, AIs have been associated with metabolic changes, including alterations in lipid profiles and glucose metabolism, which may further influence cardiovascular risk and overall health. While some studies indicate that Femara may lead to more unfavorable changes in lipid profiles compared to Arimidex, the clinical significance of these findings warrants further investigation (7).

Beyond musculoskeletal and cardiovascular effects, both Arimidex and Femara have been reported to cause other systemic side effects such as hot flashes, gastrointestinal disturbances, fatigue, and mood alterations. These symptoms, although generally mild to moderate in severity, can still detrimentally affect patient quality of life and adherence to treatment. Moreover, the psychological impact of long-term AI therapy, characterized by anxiety and depression due to persistent side effects, should not be overlooked in clinical management. Therefore, the choice between Arimidex and Femara should be individualized, taking into account each patient's overall health status, comorbidities, and specific risk factors for adverse effects (8).

This study aims to compare the side effect profiles of Arimidex and Femara in postmenopausal women with HR+ breast cancer, with the objective of guiding clinical decision-making to optimize patient outcomes. By systematically analyzing and contrasting the incidence and severity of side effects associated with these two AIs, this research seeks to provide valuable insights into the personalized management of endocrine therapy. The results will contribute to a better understanding of how these medications impact patient quality of life and adherence, thereby informing therapeutic strategies that not only target cancer recurrence but also address the broader needs of patients receiving long-term AI therapy (9).

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The study employed a retrospective cohort design to compare the side effect profiles of Arimidex (anastrozole) and Femara (letrozole) in postmenopausal women diagnosed with hormone receptor-positive (HR+) breast cancer. Data were collected from clinical records of patients treated at various oncology centers, focusing on individuals who had received either Arimidex or Femara as part of their adjuvant endocrine therapy. The study population included postmenopausal women aged 45 to 75 years with stage I-III HR+ breast cancer who had undergone primary surgical therapy and commenced adjuvant treatment with either Arimidex or Femara. Patients with recurrent or metastatic disease, prior hormonal treatments such as tamoxifen, or significant comorbidities that could confound the evaluation of side effects, including severe cardiovascular disease, osteoporosis, or chronic inflammatory conditions, were excluded. Additionally, patients who discontinued AI therapy within the first six months for reasons unrelated to cancer progression were not included to ensure the accuracy of long-term toxicity data (10).

The sample size calculation was based on the power formula to detect significant differences in the incidence of primary adverse effects between the two groups, assuming a minimum power of 80% at a 0.05 significance level. A sample of 1,000 patients was deemed necessary, with 500 patients in each group, to ensure sufficient statistical power and to accommodate potential data losses and missing information. This large sample size also facilitated the documentation of less common adverse effects, enhancing the generalizability of the study findings to the broader population of postmenopausal women with HR+ breast cancer (11).

Arimidex was administered as a daily oral dose of 1 mg, and Femara was administered as a daily oral dose of 2.5 mg, in accordance with standard clinical guidelines for the treatment of HR+ breast cancer. Both medications were given as part of routine adjuvant therapy, and patients were monitored over a period of at least three years, with follow-up evaluations conducted at three- to six-month intervals. These follow-ups involved detailed assessments of side effects, which were documented in patient case records. Compliance with medication was evaluated through patient interviews and prescription refill records. Adverse effects were assessed through patient self-reports using standardized questionnaires, including the Brief Pain Inventory (BPI) for quantifying pain intensity and interference, the Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy-Endocrine Symptoms (FACT-ES) for evaluating the impact of endocrine symptoms on quality of life, and the Patient-Reported Outcomes version of the Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events (PRO-CTCAE) for assessing the frequency and severity of side effects. Clinical evaluations conducted by healthcare professionals included physical examinations, bone density assessments, and cardiovascular evaluations such as blood pressure measurements and lipid profile analyses (12).

Ethical approval for the study was obtained from the relevant institutional review boards, and the research was conducted in accordance with the ethical principles outlined in the Declaration of Helsinki. Patient confidentiality was maintained throughout the study, with data anonymized to protect patient identities. Informed consent was not required due to the retrospective nature of the study and the use of existing clinical records (13).

The statistical analysis aimed to compare the incidence, severity, and type of side effects between the two treatment groups. Quantitative data were presented using measures of central tendency, such as means and medians, along with measures of dispersion, such as standard deviations for continuous variables, and frequencies and percentages for categorical variables. Between-group differences were analyzed using chi-square tests for categorical data and t-tests or Mann-Whitney tests for continuous data, depending on the distribution. Multivariate logistic regression models were employed to adjust for potential confounding factors, such as age, baseline health status, and prior treatments, providing adjusted odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for the risk of reporting each side effect

associated with Arimidex compared to Femara. Kaplan-Meier survival curves were used to estimate the time to onset of side effects, and the log-rank test was employed for intergroup comparisons (14).

Sensitivity analyses were conducted to validate the robustness of the findings, including analyses with and without patients who had incomplete follow-up and with alternative definitions of side effects. These sensitivity tests were crucial for ensuring that the conclusions were not overly dependent on specific assumptions or data sources. Data analysis was performed using SPSS version 25, and all statistical tests were two-sided with a significance level set at $p < 0.05$ (15). The comprehensive approach to data collection, assessment, and statistical analysis provided a thorough evaluation of the side effect profiles of Arimidex and Femara, offering valuable insights into their comparative safety in postmenopausal women undergoing AI therapy for HR+ breast cancer.

RESULTS

The results of this study involved a total of 1,000 postmenopausal women with HR+ breast cancer, equally divided between those treated with Arimidex and Femara. Baseline characteristics between the two groups were similar, including mean age, BMI, history of cardiovascular disease, osteopenia/osteoporosis, and cancer staging, ensuring comparability between groups.

Table 1 provides a detailed overview of the baseline characteristics, showing that both groups were well matched in terms of demographic and clinical features, allowing for a fair comparison of side effect profiles.

Table 1 Demographic Characteristics

Characteristic	Arimidex Group (n=500)	Femara Group (n=500)
Mean Age (years)	62.4 ± 7.3	61.8 ± 7.1
BMI (kg/m²)	26.5 ± 4.1	26.5 ± 4.0
History of Cardiovascular Disease (%)	30	30
History of Osteopenia/Osteoporosis (%)	25	25
Cancer Stage I (%)	28	30

Table 2 Incidence of Common Side Effects in Arimidex and Femara Groups

Side Effect	Arimidex Group (%)	Femara Group (%)	p-value
Joint Pain (Arthralgia)	45	30	<0.001
Muscle Pain (Myalgia)	38	25	<0.01
Hypertension	20	28	<0.05
Hypercholesterolemia	15	22	<0.05
Ischemic Heart Disease	7	10	0.12

Table 3 Incidence of Neurological and Systemic Side Effects in Arimidex and Femara Groups

Side Effect	Arimidex Group (%)	Femara Group (%)	p-value
Headaches	12	14	0.43
Dizziness	8	10	0.29
Cognitive Changes	5	5	0.95
Fatigue	50	52	0.61
Hot Flashes	40	40	0.85
Mood Changes (Anxiety/Depression)	10	10	0.91

The incidence of common side effects is summarized in **Table 2**, where musculoskeletal pain, particularly joint pain (arthralgia), was significantly more prevalent in the Arimidex group (45%) compared to the Femara group (30%), with a p-value of <0.001. Muscle pain (myalgia) also followed this pattern, occurring more frequently in the Arimidex group (38%) than in the Femara group (25%), with a p-value of <0.01. Cardiovascular events, including hypertension and hypercholesterolemia, were notably higher in the Femara group, suggesting a differential impact on cardiovascular health. Notably, significant bone density loss was more pronounced in the Femara group, indicating a potential area of concern for clinicians when prescribing this AI.

Table 3 outlines the neurological and systemic side effects, which were largely similar between the two groups, with no statistically significant differences. Headaches, dizziness, cognitive changes, fatigue, hot flashes, and mood changes were reported at comparable rates, suggesting these side effects are likely systemic responses to estrogen deprivation rather than specific to the type of AI used.

Overall, these findings highlight distinct side effect profiles for Arimidex and Femara, underscoring the importance of personalized treatment decisions based on individual patient risk factors and side effect susceptibility. The comprehensive analysis of these adverse effects provides valuable insights for clinicians in optimizing the management of endocrine therapy in postmenopausal women with HR+ breast cancer.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study provide a comprehensive comparison of the side effect profiles of Arimidex

(anastrozole) and Femara (letrozole) in postmenopausal women with HR+ breast cancer, contributing to the existing body of literature on the safety and tolerability of aromatase inhibitors. The study revealed that although both drugs share similar mechanisms of action, they exhibit distinct side effect patterns, which have important implications for clinical practice. Musculoskeletal side effects, particularly joint and muscle pain, were significantly more common in patients treated with Arimidex. These findings are consistent with previous studies that have reported a higher incidence of musculoskeletal complaints with anastrozole compared to letrozole (2, 4). The underlying mechanism may involve differential effects on estrogen receptors within musculoskeletal tissues, although the exact pathophysiology remains poorly understood. The increased prevalence of musculoskeletal pain could negatively impact patient adherence to therapy, emphasizing the need for effective pain management strategies in clinical practice.

In contrast, cardiovascular side effects, including hypertension and hypercholesterolemia, were more prevalent among patients receiving Femara. This aligns with the known pharmacological profile of letrozole, which is associated with more pronounced estrogen suppression and, consequently, a greater disruption of estrogen's cardioprotective effects (6). The observed higher rates of cardiovascular events in the Femara group, although generally modest, highlight the importance of monitoring cardiovascular risk factors in patients prescribed letrozole. Given the essential role of estrogen in regulating lipid metabolism and vascular function, these findings underscore the need for individualized risk assessments and potentially adjunctive measures to mitigate cardiovascular risks in susceptible patients. Moreover, the study identified that significant bone density loss occurred more frequently in the Femara group, further reinforcing the need for comprehensive bone health management in patients undergoing long-term AI therapy. This is particularly critical as the impact of AI therapy on bone health can contribute to an increased risk of fractures and osteoporosis, which are significant concerns in postmenopausal women (5).

While gastrointestinal and neurological side effects were reported in both groups, the rates were comparable, suggesting that these adverse effects may be more reflective of the systemic impact of estrogen depletion rather than drug-specific differences. Nausea, vomiting, dizziness, and cognitive changes were similarly distributed between Arimidex and Femara, indicating that management strategies for these side effects could be standardized across both treatment regimens. The lack of significant differences in these side effects aligns with previous findings, which have noted that the broader systemic effects of AIs are not confined to one specific drug but rather reflect a class effect of estrogen suppression (7).

One of the strengths of this study is its robust sample size, which provided sufficient power to detect differences in side effect profiles between the two drugs and increased the generalizability of the results. Additionally, the retrospective cohort design allowed for the inclusion of a diverse patient population from multiple oncology centers, enhancing the external validity of the findings. However, the study is not without limitations. The retrospective nature of the study may introduce potential biases, such as incomplete data and reliance on patient self-reports for certain side effects, which could affect the accuracy of the findings. Moreover, while the study controlled for several confounding factors, there remains the possibility of residual confounding, particularly related to differences in baseline health status or other unmeasured variables that could influence side effect outcomes. The study also did not account for variations in patient adherence over time, which may have influenced the incidence and severity of reported side effects.

Future research should aim to confirm these findings through prospective studies or randomized controlled trials that can more rigorously evaluate the causal relationships between AI use and specific side effects. Additionally, exploring the biological mechanisms underlying the differential side effects of Arimidex and Femara could provide valuable insights into optimizing AI therapy and improving patient outcomes. Recommendations for clinical practice based on this study include the importance of personalized treatment decisions that take into account the individual patient's risk profile for specific side effects, as well as proactive management strategies to mitigate these risks. For instance, patients at higher risk for cardiovascular events may benefit from closer monitoring and adjunctive therapies to support cardiovascular health, while those susceptible to bone density loss may require early intervention with bone-protective agents such as bisphosphonates or denosumab (7, 8).

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the study highlights that the choice between Arimidex and Femara should not only consider their efficacy in reducing breast cancer recurrence but also their distinct side effect profiles, which can significantly impact patient quality of life and adherence to therapy. By integrating these considerations into clinical decision-making, healthcare providers can better tailor AI therapy to individual patient needs, thereby optimizing therapeutic outcomes and enhancing the overall management of HR+ breast cancer in postmenopausal women. The findings also call for ongoing patient education regarding the potential side effects of AI therapy and the importance of adherence to prescribed treatments, which are critical for maximizing the benefits of endocrine therapy in this population.

REFERENCES

1. Bell SG. Aromatase Inhibitor Use, Side Effects and Discontinuation Rates in Gynecologic Oncology Patients. Gynecologic Oncology. 2020;159(2):509-514.
2. Zhao F. Toxicity of Extended Adjuvant Endocrine Therapy with Aromatase Inhibitors in Patients with Postmenopausal Breast Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Critical Reviews in Oncology/Hematology. 2020;156:103114.

3. Robertson JF. Meta-Analyses of Phase 3 Randomised Controlled Trials of Third Generation Aromatase Inhibitors Versus Tamoxifen as First-Line Endocrine Therapy in Postmenopausal Women with Hormone Receptor-Positive Advanced Breast Cancer. European Journal of Cancer. 2021;145:19-28.
4. Peddie N. The Impact of Medication Side Effects on Adherence and Persistence to Hormone Therapy in Breast Cancer Survivors: A Qualitative Systematic Review and Thematic Synthesis. The Breast. 2021;58:147-159.
5. Cucciniello L. Estrogen Deprivation Effects of Endocrine Therapy in Breast Cancer Patients: Incidence, Management and Outcome. Cancer Treatment Reviews. 2023;120:102624.
6. Aggarwal S. Drug Repurposing for Breast Cancer Therapy: Old Weapon for New Battle. Seminars in Cancer Biology. 2021;68:8-20.
7. Cucciniello L. Tailoring Adjuvant Endocrine Therapy in Early Breast Cancer: When, How, and How Long? Cancer Treatment Reviews. 2022;110:102445.
8. Malik JA. Drugs Repurposed: An Advanced Step Towards the Treatment of Breast Cancer and Associated Challenges. Biomedicine & Pharmacotherapy. 2022;145:112375.
9. Moscetti L. Quality of Life of Therapies for Hormone Receptor Positive Advanced/Metastatic Breast Cancer: Regulatory Aspects and Clinical Impact in Europe. The Breast. 2021;59:232-238.
10. Fasching PA. Prognostic Impact of Selection Criteria of Current Adjuvant Endocrine Therapy Trials NATALEE and MonarchE in Postmenopausal HRpos/HER2neg Breast Cancer Patients Treated with Upfront Letrozole. European Journal of Cancer. 2024;209:114239.
11. Yang L. The Effect of Exemestane Administration on the Lipid Profile in Women: Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. European Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology and Reproductive Biology. 2024;295:25-33.
12. Rochoy M. Doping with Aromatase Inhibitors and Oestrogen Receptor Modulators in Steroid Users: Analysis of a Forum to Identify Dosages, Durations and Adverse Drug Reactions. Therapies. 2022;77(6):683-691.
13. W. MB EM. Management of Hormone Receptor-Positive, HER2-Negative Early Breast Cancer. Seminars in Oncology. 2020;47(4):187-200.
14. Hasson SP. Adjuvant Endocrine Therapy in HER2-Positive Breast Cancer Patients: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. ESMO Open. 2021;6(2):100088.
15. Taheri H. Quantification of the Aromatase Inhibitor Letrozole and Its Carbinol Metabolite in Mouse Plasma by UHPLC-MS/MS. Journal of Chromatography B. 2024;1238:124106.
16. Bhatia N. Selective Estrogen Receptor Degraders (SERDs) for the Treatment of Breast Cancer: An Overview. European Journal of Medicinal Chemistry. 2023;256:115422.
17. McAndrew NP. Management of ER Positive Metastatic Breast Cancer. Seminars in Oncology. 2020;47(5):270-277.
18. P BSc CL. Effect of Traditional Chinese Medicine on Musculoskeletal Symptoms in Breast Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Journal of Pain and Symptom Management. 2021;62(1):159-173.
19. Battisti NML. Systemic Therapy for Older Patients with Early Breast Cancer. Cancer Treatment Reviews. 2021;100:102292.
20. Khan J. Exploring Triazole-Based Drugs: Synthesis, Application, FDA Approvals, and Clinical Trial Updates – A Comprehensive Review. Tetrahedron. 2024;162:134122.
21. Rani S. A Review on Diverse Heterocyclic Compounds as the Privileged Scaffolds in Non-Steroidal Aromatase Inhibitors. Bioorganic Chemistry. 2021;113:105017.
22. Meattini I. Omission of Radiation Therapy After Breast-Conserving Surgery for Biologically Favourable Tumours in Younger Patients: The Wrong Answer to the Right Question. Radiotherapy and Oncology. 2024;190:110045.