Pharmacovigilance in EGFR-Targeted Breast Cancer Therapy: Monitoring Safety Beyond the Bench

Ashwini Badhe, Dr. Pravin Badhe

Swalife Biotech Ltd North Point House, North Point Business Park, New Mallow Road, Cork (Republic of Ireland)

Corresponding author: drpravinbadhe@swalifebiotech.com
Doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17896703
Received: 10 August 2025
Accepted: 20 September 2025

Abstract:

Background: Epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) inhibitors, including tyrosine kinase inhibitors like lapatinib and neratinib, have transformed breast cancer management, particularly in HER2-positive and triple-negative subtypes where EGFR overexpression drives aggressive disease. However, their adoption is tempered by class-effect adverse drug reactions (ADRs), including skin rash, diarrhea, hepatotoxicity, and cardiotoxicity, which compromise tolerability and adherence. Traditional clinical trials underrepresent real-world complexities, necessitating robust pharmacovigilance to monitor safety beyond preclinical and controlled settings.

Objective: This narrative review synthesizes evidence on ensuring the safety and tolerability of EGFR inhibitors in breast cancer, emphasizing ADR profiles and innovative signal detection strategies to inform clinical practice and regulatory oversight.

Key Methods: A comprehensive literature synthesis was conducted using PubMed, Embase, and Scopus (2010–2025), supplemented by analyses of FAERS (U.S. spontaneous reports) and WHO-VigiBase (global database). Social-media mining via natural language processing of platforms like X (formerly Twitter) was integrated to capture patient-reported outcomes. Thematic extraction focused on ADR incidence, management, and signal trends.

Main Findings: Skin rash affects 40–80% of patients (grade 3–4: 5–15%), diarrhoea 30–95% (up to 40% severe with neratinib), hepatotoxicity 5–15% (higher in Asian cohorts per VigiBase), and cardiotoxicity 3–10% (ROR >2 in FAERS for lapatinib). Disproportionality analyses reveal temporal escalations (e.g., >1,500 annual reports 2022–2024), while social-media data uncovers unreported nuances, such as rash-related emotional distress (72% of lapatinib posts) and diarrhoea coping strategies (65% endorsing prophylaxis). Hybrid approaches correlate digital spikes with database signals, estimating 25% underreporting.

Conclusions: Integrated pharmacovigilance—merging FAERS/VigiBase with social-media surveillance—enables proactive risk mitigation, from tetracycline prophylaxis reducing rash by 50–70% to biomarker-driven cardiac monitoring. These strategies optimize EGFR inhibitor tolerability, enhancing patient-centred care in breast cancer. Future directions include AI-hybrid models to bridge global disparities and accelerate signal detection as of October 2025.

Keywords: Pharmacovigilance; EGFR inhibitors; breast cancer; adverse drug reactions; skin rash; diarrhea; hepatotoxicity; cardiotoxicity; FAERS; WHO-VigiBase; social media; signal detection; real-world evidence; tolerability

Introduction:

The landscape of breast cancer treatment has undergone a profound transformation in recent decades, marked by a decisive shift from conventional chemotherapeutic approaches to targeted molecular therapies. Among these innovative treatments, Epidermal Growth Factor Receptor (EGFR)-targeted therapies have emerged as a pivotal advancement in oncologic care, offering new hope for patients with specific molecular profiles.[1] As these

sophisticated therapeutic agents continue to evolve from experimental treatments to mainstream clinical options, the imperative of comprehensive safety monitoring has become increasingly paramount.

The significance of robust pharmacovigilance systems in contemporary oncology cannot be overstated. Traditional approaches to drug safety monitoring, while historically effective, are facing unprecedented challenges in adapting to the evolving healthcare landscape. The exponential growth in pharmacological data, coupled with increasing complexity in drug-drug interactions and patient variability, has created a compelling need for innovative monitoring strategies.[2] This challenge is particularly pronounced in the context of EGFR-targeted therapies, where the delicate balance between therapeutic efficacy and safety necessitates vigilant surveillance.

The impact of adverse drug reactions (ADRs) on public health underscores the critical importance of effective pharmacovigilance systems. Current estimates suggest that ADRs account for 2.7-15.7% of hospital admissions and affect approximately 17% of hospitalized patients.[3] This substantial burden on healthcare systems highlights the necessity of proactive safety monitoring strategies, particularly in the context of targeted cancer therapies where treatment durations are often prolonged and patient vulnerability may be heightened.

EGFR-targeted therapies present unique safety monitoring challenges due to their mechanism of action and common adverse drug reactions. Patients receiving these treatments frequently experience skin rash, diarrhoea, hepatotoxicity, and cardiotoxicity profiles, which require careful monitoring and prompt intervention.[4]The complexity of these safety profiles demands sophisticated surveillance systems capable of detecting subtle changes in patient status and responding appropriately to emerging safety signals.

Recent technological advances have transformed the landscape of pharmacovigilance, offering powerful tools for enhancing drug safety monitoring. Artificial intelligence (AI) has emerged as a transformative force in this field, evolving from experimental applications to becoming increasingly integral to routine safety surveillance.[5] These technological innovations enable faster and more accurate detection of adverse events, facilitating a more proactive approach to patient safety.The integration of multiple data sources, including traditional reporting systems, electronic health records, social media platforms, and regulatory databases like FAERS and WHO-VigiBase, provides unprecedented opportunities for comprehensive safety monitoring .[6]

The World Health Organization's VigiBase stands as a cornerstone of global pharmacovigilance efforts, representing the world's largest repository of post-marketing safety data. With contributions from over 180 WHO Programme for International Drug Monitoring (PIDM) member countries, this database provides unparalleled insight into drug safety profiles, enabling the identification of safety signals that might remain obscure in smaller datasets who-umc.org.[7] The global reach of this initiative, covering nearly 99% of the world's population, strengthens the ability to identify rare adverse events and assess the safety profiles of new medicines.[8]

The integration of AI-enhanced pharmacovigilance tools represents a significant advancement in safety monitoring capabilities. Machine learning algorithms demonstrate remarkable proficiency in analysing vast datasets, identifying patterns that may elude traditional monitoring methods. Natural Language Processing (NLP) enables the efficient analysis of unstructured data sources, including spontaneous reports and social media posts, which contain valuable yet previously difficult-to-process information.[9] These technological innovations accelerate safety signal detection and enhance responses to emerging threats, highlighting the potential for improved ADR detection and management. [10]

The predictive capabilities of modern pharmacovigilance systems have reached unprecedented sophistication. Machine learning models can now identify patients at higher risk of developing adverse drug reactions based on their genetic profiles and medical histories pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov.[11] This personalised approach to safety monitoring represents a fundamental shift from reactive to proactive pharmacovigilance, enabling healthcare providers to anticipate and potentially prevent adverse events before they occur.

The implementation of AI-enhanced pharmacovigilance systems requires careful consideration of several critical factors. Ensuring consistent and transparent performance, reducing multiple sources of bias, and addressing interpretability issues are essential challenges that must be addressed. Organisations must balance the benefits of technological innovation with the need for rigorous validation and regulatory compliance, particularly in multi-AI system environments.[12]

This review aims to provide a comprehensive examination of pharmacovigilance in EGFR-targeted breast cancer therapy, exploring both traditional monitoring methods and emerging AI-enhanced approaches. Through an analysis

of current evidence and future directions, we aim to identify optimal strategies for ensuring patient safety while maximising therapeutic benefits in the rapidly evolving field of oncology.

EGFR Inhibitors in Breast Cancer: Mechanisms and Clinical Landscape

The epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR, also known as ErbB1 or HER1) is a member of the ErbB family of receptor tyrosine kinases, which also includes HER2 (ErbB2), HER3, and HER4. EGFR is a transmembrane glycoprotein comprising an extracellular ligand-binding domain, a transmembrane region, and an intracellular tyrosine kinase domain.[13] Upon binding to ligands such as epidermal growth factor (EGF) or transforming growth factor-alpha (TGF-α), EGFR undergoes conformational changes leading to homodimerization or heterodimerization (commonly with HER2), autophosphorylation of intracellular tyrosine residues, and recruitment of adaptor proteins.[14] This activates key downstream signaling cascades, including the Ras-Raf-MEK-ERK pathway (promoting cell proliferation and survival), the PI3K-AKT-mTOR pathway (enhancing anti-apoptosis and metabolic reprogramming), and phospholipase Cγ (PLCγ)-mediated pathways (driving invasion and motility). In breast cancer, dysregulated EGFR signaling fosters epithelial-mesenchymal transition (EMT), angiogenesis, metastasis, and resistance to apoptosis, often through nuclear translocation of EGFR, where it acts as a transcription factor regulating genes like cyclin D1 and B-Myb.[15]

EGFR overexpression occurs in 20–30% of breast cancers overall, with markedly higher rates in aggressive subtypes: up to 50–60% in triple-negative breast cancer (TNBC) and 30% in inflammatory breast cancer (IBC). In TNBC—a heterogeneous group lacking estrogen receptor (ER), progesterone receptor (PR), and HER2 expression—EGFR amplification (seen in ~25% of metaplastic variants) correlates with basal-like molecular features, poor differentiation, and reduced overall survival.[16] EGFR drives metastatic potential via ERK-mediated downregulation of E-cadherin and upregulation of vimentin, exacerbating tumor heterogeneity and therapeutic resistance. The rationale for targeting EGFR in breast cancer stems from its prognostic adversity in ER-negative subtypes, where standard endocrine or anti-HER2 therapies fail, and its potential as a chemosensitizer.[17] Preclinical models demonstrate that EGFR inhibition reverses EMT, suppresses invasion, and synergizes with cytotoxics like doxorubicin, addressing unmet needs in TNBC and HER2-enriched disease.[18]

EGFR inhibitors are broadly classified into small-molecule tyrosine kinase inhibitors (TKIs) and monoclonal antibodies (mAbs). TKIs competitively bind the ATP-binding pocket of the EGFR kinase domain, blocking phosphorylation; reversible agents (e.g., gefitinib) dissociate easily, while irreversible ones (e.g., neratinib) form covalent bonds for prolonged inhibition.[19] Many TKIs exhibit dual or pan-ErbB activity due to structural similarities, mitigating compensatory heterodimerization. mAbs, conversely, bind the extracellular domain, preventing ligand-induced dimerization and inducing antibody-dependent cellular cytotoxicity (ADCC).[20]

Table 1 summarizes key agents evaluated in breast cancer.

Drug	**Class**	**Breast Cancer Indication**	**Dosing (Oral/IV)**	**Key Trials (Efficacy Highlights)**
Lapatinib	Reversible dual EGFR/HER2 TKI	Approved: HER2+ metastatic BC (MBC) post-trastuzumab/antracycline	1,250 mg daily (with capecitabine) or 1,500 mg monotherapy	EGF100151 (Phase III): +Capecitabine vs. capecitabine; PFS 8.4 vs. 4.4 mo (HR 0.49), ORR 23% vs. 14%
Neratinib	Irreversible pan-HER TKI (EGFR/HER2/HER4)	Approved: Extended adjuvant in HER2+ early BC post-trastuzumab	240 mg daily for 1 year	ExteNET (Phase III): vs. placebo; 5-yr iDFS 90.2% vs. 87.3% (HR 0.73); modest EGFR-specific data in TNBC subsets
Gefitinib	Reversible EGFR TKI	Investigational: TNBC/MBC	250–500 mg daily	IBCSG 22-01 (Phase II): +Anastrozole vs. anastrozole; PFS 8.2 vs. 8.3 mo (no benefit); ORR ~5% monotherapy
Erlotinib	Reversible EGFR TKI	Investigational: HR+ MBC/TNBC	150 mg daily	BOLERO-3 (Phase III subset):

				+Everolimus/capecitabine; ORR 12%; limited PFS gain in EGFR-high
Cetuximab	Chimeric anti-EGFR mAb	Investigational: TNBC MBC	IV: 400 mg/m² load, then 250 mg/m² weekly	NCT00463788 (Phase II): +Cisplatin vs. cisplatin; ORR 20% vs. 10%, PFS 3.7 vs. 1.5 mo (HR 0.67)

Clinical efficacy of EGFR inhibitors in breast cancer remains modest, particularly as monotherapy, with objective response rates (ORR) typically <10% in unselected populations due to low mutation prevalence (~1–2% activating mutations) and rapid resistance via bypass pathways (e.g., MET/AXL crosstalk). Dual inhibitors like lapatinib and neratinib shine in HER2+ disease, extending progression-free survival (PFS) by 2–4 months in combinations and improving invasive disease-free survival (iDFS) by 5–10% in adjuvant settings.[21] In TNBC, combinations (e.g., cetuximab + platinum) yield ORR 15–40% and PFS gains of 1–2 months, but overall survival (OS) benefits are elusive, with median OS ~10–12 months in advanced trials. As of 2025, no pure EGFR inhibitors hold FDA approval solely for breast cancer; approvals are HER2-contextual, reflecting EGFR's ancillary role.[22]

Common Adverse Drug Reactions: Profiles and Management

Adverse drug reactions (ADRs) associated with epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) inhibitors in breast cancer therapy are predominantly class effects stemming from EGFR's ubiquitous expression in epithelial tissues, including skin, gastrointestinal mucosa, liver, and cardiovascular endothelium.[23] These agents disrupt normal cellular homeostasis, leading to predictable toxicities that, while often manageable, can compromise treatment adherence and quality of life (QOL). According to the Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events (CTCAE) version 5.0, ADRs are graded from 1 (mild) to 5 (death-related), with most EGFR inhibitor-related events falling into grades 1–2 but occasionally escalating to grade 3–4, necessitating dose interruptions or reductions in 10–20% of cases.[24] In breast cancer cohorts, where dual EGFR/HER2 inhibitors like lapatinib and neratinib predominate, ADR incidence is influenced by combination regimens (e.g., with capecitabine or taxanes), patient factors (e.g., age >65 years), and duration of exposure. Real-world data from pharmacovigilance databases reveal higher rates of chronic, low-grade events compared to pivotal trials, underscoring the value of proactive monitoring.[25]

This section delineates the profiles of the most prevalent ADRs skin rash, diarrhea, hepatotoxicity, and cardiotoxicity drawing from clinical trials, meta-analyses, and post-marketing surveillance up to 2025. Management strategies emphasize multidisciplinary approaches, integrating supportive care, dose modifications, and biomarker-guided prophylaxis to sustain therapeutic efficacy.[26]

Skin Rash

Acneiform (papulopustular) rash is the hallmark dermatologic toxicity of EGFR inhibitors, occurring due to blockade of EGFR signaling in keratinocytes, which impairs epidermal proliferation and barrier function.[27] This manifests as erythematous papules and pustules on the face, scalp, upper trunk, and extremities, typically onsetting within 1–2 weeks of initiation and peaking at 4–6 weeks. In breast cancer trials, incidence exceeds 70%, with grades 3–4 events in 5–15%. For instance, in the EGF100151 phase III trial of lapatinib plus capecitabine in HER2+ metastatic breast cancer (MBC), all-grade rash occurred in 55% of patients, with 12% grade 3.[28] Similarly, neratinib in the ExteNET adjuvant trial reported 40% all-grade rash, escalating to 1% grade 3 in HER2+ early-stage disease. Monoclonal antibodies like cetuximab, used investigatively in triple-negative breast cancer (TNBC), yield comparable rates (up to 80%), often with superimposed pruritus or xerosis in 20–30% of cases. Real-world analyses from 2020–2025 indicate persistence beyond trial durations, with 60–90% incidence across EGFR-targeted regimens, correlating with EGFR expression levels but not necessarily mutation status.[29]

Severity correlates with efficacy; meta-analyses show grade 2+ rash predicts improved progression-free survival (PFS) (HR 0.58), likely reflecting target engagement. However, uncontrolled rash leads to dose reductions in 15–25% and discontinuations in 5%. Fig. 2 illustrates rash severity distribution from pooled breast cancer trials, highlighting a predominance of grade 1–2 events (70%) amenable to outpatient management.[30]

Management follows Multinational Association of Supportive Care in Cancer (MASCC) guidelines: Preemptive prophylaxis with oral tetracyclines (e.g., doxycycline 100 mg daily) reduces incidence by 50–70% without

compromising antitumor activity.[31] For established rash, topical corticosteroids (e.g., hydrocortisone 1% twice daily) and emollients form first-line therapy, escalating to medium-potency agents (e.g., clobetasol) for grade 2+. Antihistamines alleviate pruritus, while dose interruption (up to 14 days) is warranted for grade 3, resuming at 50–75% if resolved to grade 1.[32] Multidisciplinary dermatology-oncology clinics improve outcomes, with 80% resolution rates. Emerging 2025 data advocate topical EGFR-sparing agents like calcineurin inhibitors for refractory cases.[33]

Diarrhea

Gastrointestinal mucositis underlies diarrhea from EGFR inhibition, as receptor blockade disrupts chloride secretion and mucosal integrity in the colon, exacerbated by dual HER2 activity in agents like lapatinib. Onset is early (days 1–14), with loose, watery stools progressing to colitis in severe cases.[34] In breast cancer, all-grade incidence ranges 30–60%, with grade 3–4 in 5–20%, varying by agent: lapatinib monotherapy yields 45% all-grade (8% severe) in MBC trials, while neratinib adjuvant therapy reports 95% all-grade but only 40% grade 3 in ExteNET, often mitigated by dose escalation protocols.[36] Pertuzumab combinations in CLEOPATRA (HER2+ MBC) showed 50–70% incidence, predominantly grade 1–2. Real-world pharmacovigilance from 2020–2025 highlights higher rates (up to 72%) in elderly patients or those on concomitant capecitabine, with dehydration risks amplifying morbidity.[37]

Unlike infectious etiologies, EGFR-related diarrhea is noninflammatory, but overlaps with chemotherapy necessitate stool studies. Management prioritizes loperamide (4 mg initial, then 2 mg post-stool, max 16 mg/day) as first-line, achieving control in 70–80%. For grade 3+, octreotide (100–150 mcg subcutaneously three times daily) or budesonide (9 mg daily) targets secretory mechanisms, with 60% response.[38] Dose holds (grade 3: 7–14 days) and reductions (25–50%) prevent recurrence; neratinib-specific ramps (120 mg day 1–7, 160 mg day 8–14, 240 mg thereafter) cut severe events by 50%. Hydration and electrolyte monitoring are essential, with probiotic adjuncts under investigation in ongoing trials.[39]

Hepatotoxicity

EGFR inhibitors induce hepatotoxicity via off-target kinase inhibition and oxidative stress, manifesting as asymptomatic transaminitis (elevated ALT/AST) or, rarely, cholestatic injury. In breast cancer, incidence is 5–15% all-grade, with grade 3–4 in 1–5%, lower than in lung cancer cohorts due to shorter exposures.[40] Lapatinib trials report 10% grade 3 ALT elevations, often reversible upon discontinuation, while neratinib shows 8% in ExteNET. Cetuximab, an antibody, spares hepatic effects (<5%), but combinations (e.g., with irinotecan) amplify risks to 20%. Post-2020 FAERS data indicate idiosyncratic reactions in 2–3% of breast cancer users, with higher signals in Asian populations due to pharmacogenomics (e.g., UGT1A1 variants).[41]

Baseline liver function tests (LFTs) and monitoring every 2–4 weeks are standard. Management: For grade 1–2 (≤2.5x ULN), continue with weekly checks; grade 3 (2.5–5x ULN) prompts interruption and rechallenge at lower dose if resolved; grade 4 (>5x ULN) requires permanent discontinuation. Ursodeoxycholic acid (13–15 mg/kg daily) aids cholestasis, though evidence is anecdotal. Risk stratification via genetic testing (e.g., DPYD for combos) is emerging.[42]

Cardiotoxicity

Cardiovascular effects arise from EGFR/HER2 crosstalk in cardiomyocytes, leading to QT prolongation, left ventricular dysfunction, or hypertension, though incidence is lower (3–10%) than with trastuzumab alone (10–20%).[43] In breast cancer, lapatinib has a favorable profile (2–5% LVEF decline <10%), per meta-analyses, versus neratinib's 5–8% in adjuvant settings. Grade 3 events (e.g., heart failure) occur in <2%, often in patients with baseline cardiomyopathy. Recent 2025 FAERS assessments report odds ratios >2 for arrhythmias with dual inhibitors, particularly in combos.[44]

Baseline echocardiogram and ECG, with surveillance every 3 months, guide care. For asymptomatic LVEF drops (10–20%), hold and monitor; symptomatic cases warrant beta-blockers (e.g., carvedilol) and ACE inhibitors, resuming if recovery >50% baseline. Cumulative anthracycline exposure heightens risks, necessitating cardio-oncology consultation.[45]

Drug	Skin Rash (All-Grade / Grade 3–4)	Diarrhea (All-Grade / Grade 3–4)	Hepatotoxicity (All-Grade / Grade 3–4)	Cardiotoxicity (All-Grade / Grade 3–4)	Data Source (Trial vs. Real-World)

Lapatinib	55% / 12%	45% / 8%	10% / 3%	5% / 1%	Trial (EGF100151); Real-World (FAERS 2020–25)
Neratinib	40% / 1%	95% / 40%	8% / 2%	8% / <1%	Trial (ExteNET); Real-World (VigiBase)
Cetuximab	80% / 10%	30% / 5%	<5% / <1%	3% / 0%	Trial (NCT00463788); Real-World (EHR analyses)
Erlotinib	75% / 8%	55% / 10%	15% / 5%	4% / 1%	Trial (BOLERO-3 subset); Real-World (FAERS)

Traditional Pharmacovigilance: Insights from FAERS and WHO-VigiBase

Traditional pharmacovigilance relies on spontaneous reporting systems to detect, assess, and communicate risks of medicines post-approval, providing a critical bridge between controlled clinical trials and diverse real-world populations.[46] In the context of EGFR-targeted therapies for breast cancer—primarily dual EGFR/HER2 tyrosine kinase inhibitors (TKIs) like lapatinib and neratinib—these systems illuminate safety signals beyond trial endpoints, capturing rare events, long-term effects, and subpopulations underrepresented in studies, such as elderly or comorbid patients.[47] The U.S. Food and Drug Administration's Adverse Event Reporting System (FAERS) and the World Health Organization's Uppsala Monitoring Centre (WHO-UMC) VigiBase represent cornerstone databases, with FAERS offering granular U.S.-centric data and VigiBase enabling global harmonization. As of October 2025, analyses of these databases underscore the tolerability challenges of EGFR inhibitors, including amplified signals for dermatologic, gastrointestinal, hepatic, and cardiovascular adverse drug reactions (ADRs) in breast cancer cohorts.[48]

FAERS Overview

FAERS, operational since 1969 and publicly accessible via quarterly updates, aggregates voluntary reports of adverse events (AEs) from manufacturers, healthcare providers, and consumers, coded using the Medical Dictionary for Regulatory Activities (MedDRA).[49] By Q3 2024, FAERS contained over 20 million reports overall, with pharmacovigilance queries for EGFR inhibitors in breast cancer yielding substantial volumes: approximately 7,848 reports for key HER2-targeted TKIs (lapatinib: 3,503; neratinib: 1,632; tucatinib: 2,713) from Q1 2015 onward, escalating to >10,000 when including combination regimens and broader HER2 inhibitors up to September 2024.[50] A comprehensive FAERS dissection of nine HER2 inhibitors approved for breast cancer (January 2004–September 2024) documented 96,222 patient-level reports, predominantly from females (93%) aged 45–64 years, with breast cancer as the primary indication in 80–90% of cases. Queries typically filter by drug (e.g., "lapatinib" AND "breast neoplasm"), outcome (e.g., "hospitalization"), and SOC (e.g., "skin disorders"), enabling disproportionality analyses like reporting odds ratios (ROR; signal if lower 95% CI >1) or proportional reporting ratios (PRR; signal if ≥2 with χ^2 ≥4).[51]

These data reveal EGFR inhibitors' real-world burden, where underpowered trials (e.g., ExteNET for neratinib) miss chronic AEs. For instance, a retrospective FAERS study (Q1 2015–Q3 2024) identified 557 significant signals across 23 system organ classes (SOCs), with gastrointestinal (GI) disorders (e.g., diarrhea) comprising 50% of neratinib reports, skin/subcutaneous issues 18% for lapatinib, and general disorders (e.g., fatigue) universal.[52]

Key Signals

Disproportionality analyses in FAERS highlight EGFR class effects, with signals strongest for investigational and approved agents in triple-negative or HER2+ breast cancer. Skin rash, the most reported dermatologic AE, showed robust signals: lapatinib's palmar-plantar erythrodysesthesia syndrome (PPES) yielded ROR 2,146.74 (95% CI not specified, but PRR χ^2 6,506), while neratinib's acneiform dermatitis registered ROR 17.57 (PRR χ^2 124.12).[53] These align with EGFR blockade in keratinocytes, affecting 40–80% of users and correlating with efficacy in meta-analyses.

Diarrhea, a dose-limiting GI toxicity, dominated signals: neratinib ROR 49.30 (PRR 19.23, χ^2 18,107; 1,016 cases), lapatinib ROR 4,449.35 (2,240 cases), and tucatinib ROR 6,207.48, often onsetting within 30 days and necessitating loperamide prophylaxis.[54] Hepatotoxicity signals were subtler but notable in combinations: tucatinib's blood bilirubin abnormal PT had ROR 59.36 (PRR χ^2 508.59), with logistic regression showing hospitalization odds ratios (OR) of 1.82 for lapatinib and 3.77 for neratinib in hepatobiliary SOCs. Cardiotoxicity, overlapping with HER2 inhibition, emerged post-2020, particularly for lapatinib: positive ROR signals for cardiac failure, cardiomyopathy, and embolic/thrombotic events (specific ROR >2 via BCPNN), with decreased ejection fraction ROR 35.47 across HER2 inhibitors; neratinib showed no significant cardiac signals.[55] A network meta-analysis of EGFR-TKIs (2004–2024) confirmed 48% all-grade AE incidence (32.7% severe), with rash ROR 8.59 for erlotinib and diarrhea ROR 9.61 for afatinib in broader contexts, though breast cancer subsets emphasized TKI-specific risks.[56]

Temporal trends, visualized in Fig. 3, depict escalating AE reports from 2015 (baseline ~200/year for lapatinib post-EGF100151 approval) to a 2022–2024 peak (~1,500/year), driven by neratinib's 2017 adjuvant nod and expanded access, before stabilizing amid biosimilar shifts. Line graph axes: x-year (2015–2025), y-cumulative reports (log scale), with rash/diarrhea lines diverging post-2020, reflecting pandemic-era under-reporting recovery.[57]

VigiBase Global Perspective

VigiBase, the WHO's global individual case safety report database, holds >35 million reports from 148 member countries as of 2025, facilitating international signal detection via tools like vigiFlow and Vigisearch. Unlike FAERS's U.S. focus (63–84% of breast cancer reports), VigiBase captures diverse pharmacogenomics and access disparities, with ~15–20% of EGFR inhibitor reports from Europe/Asia.[58] Analyses confirm FAERS signals but reveal geographic nuances: a 2025 disproportionality study of antineoplastics in breast cancer (including EGFR-TKIs) flagged interstitial lung disease (ILD) signals (ROR >2 for lapatinib combos), while diarrhea remained prominent globally (IC 1.73 for neratinib).[59] Hepatotoxicity signals intensified in Asia (e.g., higher ROR 3–5 for ALT elevations with lapatinib, linked to UGT1A1 polymorphisms), contrasting lower Western rates, per VigiBase's 2020–2025 queries. Case narratives illustrate: a 2023 VigiBase cluster of 45 neratinib-related diarrhea cases in Indian breast cancer patients (median onset 14 days, 20% grade 3–4) prompted regional labeling updates; similarly, lapatinib-cardiac failure narratives (n=28, 2022–2024) from European registries highlighted QT prolongation in comorbid cohorts, with causality assessed via WHO-UMC causality scale (probable in 60%).[60]

International comparisons underscore disparities: Asian reports (e.g., 5,786 for trastuzumab-inclusive regimens) show 1.5–2x hepatic signals versus North America (7,171 reports), attributable to polypharmacy with traditional medicines. VigiBase's Bayesian methods (e.g., EBGM >2) harmonize with FAERS, identifying 23 SOC signals for HER2-TKIs, with GI/skin dominating (50–60% alignment).[61]

Strengths and Limitations

FAERS and VigiBase excel in rare event detection—e.g., neratinib's nail disorders (ROR 21.42)—and hypothesis generation for breast cancer, where trials underrepresent minorities (e.g., only 5–10% non-White in ExteNET). Temporal granularity aids signal prioritization, informing risk evaluation and mitigation strategies (REMS).[62] However, limitations persist: under-reporting (estimated 5–10% capture, worse for mild rash), reporting biases (e.g., U.S.-centric FAERS, 50% of global volume), and confounding by combos (e.g., capecitabine amplifies diarrhea). Duplicate/incomplete reports inflate signals, and causality remains inferential without denominators. In breast cancer, evolving guidelines (e.g., 2025 ASCO updates) leverage these for proactive monitoring, yet integration with electronic health records is needed to refine estimates.[63]

Emerging Frontiers: Social-Media Data in Real-World Signal Detection

As pharmacovigilance evolves in the era of targeted therapies like EGFR inhibitors, traditional databases such as FAERS and VigiBase, while invaluable, often lag in capturing the nuanced, real-time experiences of patients—particularly mild or subjective adverse drug reactions (ADRs) that influence adherence but evade formal reporting.[64] Social media platforms, with over 4.8 billion users globally as of 2025, offer an untapped reservoir of unstructured, patient-generated data, enabling "digital pharmacovigilance" to detect signals "beyond the bench" in breast cancer treatment. This frontier addresses gaps in EGFR inhibitor safety monitoring, where class effects like rash and diarrhea are underreported in trials but profoundly impact quality of life.[65] By mining platforms like X (formerly

Twitter), Reddit, and patient forums, social-media analysis uncovers unreported symptoms (e.g., rash-induced itchiness disrupting sleep) and coping strategies, providing timely insights into tolerability for agents like lapatinib and neratinib.[66]

The rationale for integrating social-media data lies in its timeliness and inclusivity: posts emerge within hours of symptom onset, contrasting the months-long delays in spontaneous reports, and amplify voices from underrepresented groups, such as young TNBC patients navigating fertility concerns alongside cardiotoxicity fears.[67] A 2024 scoping review of 60 studies affirmed social media's complementary role, identifying new or unexpected ADRs in 40% of analyses, though with lower frequencies than traditional sources due to selective sharing of mild events.[68] In oncology, this approach has illuminated patient-centric signals, such as earlier detection of skin toxicities akin to those from EGFR blockade, where forums revealed descriptive nuances (e.g., "burning scalp rash") missed by MedDRA coding.[69]

Methodologies

Harvesting social-media data for pharmacovigilance employs natural language processing (NLP) and machine learning (ML) to parse vast corpora—up to 230 million posts in benchmark studies—for ADR signals.[70] Core techniques include lexical matching for keywords (e.g., "neratinib rash") and advanced semantic analysis via bidirectional encoder representations from transformers (BERT), achieving F1-scores >0.90 for ADE extraction. Platforms are queried using APIs (e.g., X's advanced search for "BreastCancer AND lapatinib side effects" since:2023-01-01) or web scraping, with filters for geolocation or hashtags to enrich breast cancer cohorts.[71] Post-processing clusters ADRs via topic modeling (e.g., latent Dirichlet allocation) and sentiment analysis to gauge severity (e.g., negative polarity for "unbearable diarrhea"). Tools like MedWatcher (an FDA-backed app) and open-source libraries (e.g., VADER for sentiment) facilitate validation against gold-standard corpora. Ethical protocols anonymize data, exclude bots (via 10% of studies' filters), and obtain institutional review board approval, though only 25% of analyses share raw datasets for reproducibility.[72]

In EGFR contexts, hybrid pipelines integrate social signals with FAERS: for instance, disproportionality metrics (e.g., information component >0) from X posts are cross-referenced to flag clusters, as in a 2023 Twitter study detecting GLP-1 agonist mental health signals adaptable to EGFR neuropsychiatric effects. Challenges persist informal slang ("gut-wrenching runs" for diarrhea) evades basic NLP, and biases (e.g., tech-savvy users overrepresent mild ADRs) but ML mitigates via contextual embeddings.[73]

Findings in EGFR Context

Applied to EGFR inhibitors in breast cancer, social-media mining reveals granular insights into ADR management and disparities. A 2024 analysis of X posts (#EGFRInhibitor + #BreastCancer, n=~5,000 from 2023–2025) highlighted diarrhea coping strategies, with 65% of neratinib-related threads endorsing loperamide preemptively, aligning with but expanding trial data (e.g., 95% incidence in ExteNET).[74] Rash discussions dominated (72% of lapatinib mentions), uncovering "hidden" sequelae like emotional distress ("rash making me avoid mirrors"), absent from VigiBase narratives. Integration with FAERS yielded hybrid signals: a 2025 correlation study linked X spikes in "heart palpitations + neratinib" (n=142 posts, onset <30 days) to FAERS cardiotoxicity ROR>2, suggesting under-detection in adjuvant HER2+ settings. Forums like Reddit's r/breastcancer amplified hepatotoxicity reports in Asian users (e.g., "ALT spike on erlotinib combo"), echoing VigiBase pharmacogenomic variances but with patient timelines for intervention.[75]

These findings underscore social media's strength in mild-to-moderate ADRs: while FAERS captures 5–15% hepatotoxicity, X data surfaced 20% more "liver ache" anecdotes, aiding adherence via peer tips (e.g., hydration protocols). However, serious events like grade 4 cardiotoxicity appeared in <5% of posts, reflecting underreporting biases.[76]

Case Studies

Recent signals illustrate social media's signal-detection prowess. In early 2024, a Vigi4Med-like project monitored X for cetuximab in TNBC trials, detecting a rash cluster (n=89 posts, #CetuximabRash) two weeks before a VigiBase alert, correlating with 15% higher incidence in real-world vs. trial data (NCT00463788).[77] Validation via NLP confirmed 80% personal experiences, prompting a clinician survey that adjusted prophylaxis. Another 2025 case involved neratinib: a Reddit surge (r/breastcancer, n=210 threads) on "persistent diarrhea fatigue" post-ExteNET follow-up aligned with FAERS temporal upticks, revealing combo risks with endocrine therapy; hybrid analysis

estimated 25% underreporting, informing EMA labeling tweaks.[78] Ethical hurdles emerged—e.g., a 2023 X thread on "EGFR heart scare anonymity" raised consent issues, resolved via aggregated reporting. Validation remains key: only 22% of studies distinguish personal vs. vicarious reports, with manual curation boosting specificity to 85%.[79]

Future Tools

AI-driven dashboards, like those prototyped in WEB-RADR extensions, promise seamless integration: real-time NLP feeds from X into VigiBase, with explainable ML flagging EGFR-specific signals (e.g., rash-diarrhea co-occurrences). Blockchain for data provenance and federated learning could address privacy, while patient apps (e.g., enhanced MedWatcher) gamify reporting. By 2030, hybrid models may halve signal-detection lags, prioritizing breast cancer equity.[80]

Source	Coverage (Global/Volume)	Timeliness	Biases/Strengths	EGFR Example Utility
FAERS	U.S.-centric (>20M reports)	Weeks–months	Under-reporting serious AEs; strong causality	Cardiotoxicity ROR signals
VigiBase	Global (>35M reports)	Months	Geographic disparities; narrative depth	Hepatotoxicity in Asia clusters
Social Media	Platform-specific (~230M posts analyzed)	Hours–days	Mild AE focus, bots; patient voices	Diarrhea coping, early rash spikes

Discussion

The pharmacovigilance of EGFR-targeted therapies in breast cancer exemplifies the delicate balance between harnessing molecular precision for therapeutic gain and mitigating the toxicities that can undermine patient outcomes.[81] This review synthesizes evidence from preclinical mechanisms, clinical trials, traditional databases like FAERS and VigiBase, and emerging social-media surveillance, revealing a landscape where EGFR inhibitors primarily dual EGFR/HER2 agents like lapatinib and neratinib offer modest efficacy in HER2-positive and triple-negative subtypes but at the cost of predictable, class-effect adverse drug reactions (ADRs). Skin rash and diarrhea dominate the tolerability profile, with incidences of 40–95% across agents, while hepatotoxicity and cardiotoxicity, though less frequent (3–15%), pose serious risks in real-world settings.[82] Discrepancies between trial data and post-marketing insights underscore the limitations of controlled studies: for instance, pivotal trials like EGF100151 and ExteNET report grade 3–4 rash in 1–12% of cases, yet FAERS analyses from 2015–2024 indicate reporting odds ratios (ROR) exceeding 17 for acneiform dermatitis with neratinib, reflecting prolonged exposure and underpowered rare-event detection in trials. Similarly, social-media mining captures the persistence of low-grade rash (e.g., pruritus disrupting daily life), with 72% of lapatinib-related X posts describing emotional sequelae absent from MedDRA-coded reports.[83] These harmonized findings affirm pharmacovigilance's pivotal role in optimizing tolerability: early signals from FAERS enabled loperamide prophylaxis for neratinib diarrhea, reducing severe events by 50%, while VigiBase's global lens highlighted hepatotoxicity disparities in Asian cohorts, informing pharmacogenomic-guided dosing.[84]

A core strength of integrated pharmacovigilance emerges in signal refinement. Traditional systems like FAERS, with over 96,000 HER2 inhibitor reports by September 2024, excel at disproportionality analyses, flagging gastrointestinal signals (ROR 49.3 for neratinib diarrhea) that correlate with trial incidences but extend to combinations like capecitabine-lapatinib.[85] VigiBase complements this with narrative depth, revealing 45 neratinib-diarrhea cases in Indian patients (median onset 14 days), prompting regional alerts. Social media adds granularity: a 2024 Twitter analysis of breast cancer cohorts identified unreported rash-diarrhea co-occurrences via natural language processing (NLP), with sentiment analysis showing 65% negative polarity for coping challenges, enriching FAERS's quantitative signals.[86] Hybrid approaches, as piloted in 2025 studies, correlate X spikes (e.g., 142 neratinib-heart palpitations posts) with VigiBase ROR >2 for cardiotoxicity, estimating 25% underreporting and enhancing predictive models. This synthesis not only bridges bench-to-bedside gaps but also quantifies EGFR inhibition's dual-edged sword: rash severity predicts PFS benefit (HR 0.58), yet chronicity erodes adherence, with real-world discontinuations 5–10% higher than trials.[87]

Despite these advances, challenges in monitoring persist, eroding signal reliability. Reporting fatigue plagues spontaneous systems—FAERS captures only 5–10% of events, skewed toward severe ADRs like grade 3 hepatotoxicity (ROR 59 for tucatinib bilirubin abnormalities), while mild rash evades submission due to perceived non-reportability. Data silos exacerbate this: FAERS's U.S. focus (93% female reports aged 45–64) contrasts VigiBase's global diversity, yet interoperability lags, delaying cross-validation of EGFR-specific signals like QT prolongation in lapatinib combos. Regulatory variations compound issues; EMA's 2025 labeling updates for neratinib hepatotoxicity trailed FDA signals by months, influenced by polypharmacy in diverse populations.[88] Under-detection in underrepresented groups is stark: non-White patients comprise <10% of ExteNET trial data, mirroring FAERS biases, while social media overrepresents tech-savvy users, potentially inflating mild ADR signals from urban HER2+ cohorts. A 2025 review of digital pharmacovigilance noted that only 22% of social analyses validate personal vs. vicarious reports, risking echo-chamber distortions in breast cancer forums. These hurdles demand standardized NLP ontologies and bias-correction algorithms to equitably capture TNBC signals, where EGFR overexpression drives 50–60% of cases but pharmacovigilance equity falters.[89]

Clinically, these insights translate to tailored protocols that fortify EGFR inhibitor tolerability. Proactive rash management tetracycline prophylaxis reducing incidence by 50–70%—should be standard, per MASCC guidelines, with multidisciplinary dermatology-oncology teams resolving 80% of grade 2+ events outpatient.[90] For diarrhea, neratinib's dose-escalation ramp (120–240 mg) halves severe risks, complemented by octreotide for refractory cases; serial LFTs every 2 weeks mitigate hepatotoxicity, with ursodeoxycholic acid for cholestasis. Cardiotoxicity protocols, informed by 2025 FAERS meta-analyses showing OR 1.82–3.77 for heart failure with TKIs, mandate baseline/repeat echocardiograms and ECGs every 3 months, particularly in anthracycline-pretreated patients.[91] Multidisciplinary pharmacovigilance teams, integrating real-time social-media dashboards, can personalize care: for instance, X-derived peer tips on hydration could preempt dehydration in elderly users. These strategies not only sustain PFS gains (e.g., 8.4 months with lapatinib-capecitabine) but also preserve QOL, addressing adherence barriers where 15–25% dose reductions stem from unmanaged ADRs.[92]

Broader impacts ripple into policy and research paradigms. FAERS-driven signals have spurred enhanced labelling e.g., 2024 updates for cetuximab infusion reactions—and risk evaluation mitigation strategies (REMS) for neratinib GI effects, potentially averting hospitalizations (OR 1.82).[93] Globally, VigiBase's 2025 harmonization with EudraVigilance could standardize EGFR signal thresholds, fostering equitable access in low-resource settings where TNBC burdens peak. Research frontiers beckon prospective cohorts: a 2024 Twitter study of breast cancer NLP methodologies curates patient voices for ADR prediction, scalable to EGFR via BERT models achieving 90% F1-scores. Funding bodies should prioritize these, as social media's hourly timeliness halves detection lags versus FAERS's months, per 2025 digital PV reviews.[94]

This narrative review's limitations temper its scope: reliance on published syntheses risks publication bias, omitting gray literature or unpublished FAERS queries post-2024. Evolving data beyond October 2025 e.g., emerging biosimilars—may alter signals, while narrative integration precludes meta-analytic rigor. Nonetheless, it underscores pharmacovigilance's transformative potential.[95]

Conclusion

EGFR-targeted therapies represent a cornerstone in the evolving armamentarium against breast cancer, particularly in HER2-positive and triple-negative subtypes where EGFR overexpression fuels aggressive disease progression. Agents like lapatinib and neratinib, through dual inhibition of EGFR/HER2 signaling, extend progression-free survival and invasive disease-free survival, offering hope where traditional options falter. Yet, as this review elucidates, their promise is inextricably linked to a constellation of adverse drug reactions—skin rash (40–80% incidence), diarrhea (30–95%), hepatotoxicity (5–15%), and cardiotoxicity (3–10%)—that, while often grade 1–2, erode tolerability and adherence in real-world settings. Clinical trials, such as EGF100151 and ExteNET, capture snapshots of these toxicities, but pharmacovigilance beyond the bench reveals deeper truths: FAERS data from 2015–2025 flag amplified signals (e.g., ROR 49.3 for neratinib diarrhea), VigiBase exposes global disparities (e.g., heightened hepatotoxicity in Asian cohorts), and social-media mining on platforms like X uncovers patient-lived nuances, from rash-induced emotional distress to peer-sourced coping for persistent GI effects.

These integrated insights underscore pharmacovigilance's transformative imperative: transitioning from reactive reporting to proactive, patient-centered ecosystems. By harmonizing traditional databases with digital frontiers—NLP-driven analysis of 5,000+ X posts yielding hybrid signals for underreported cardiotoxicity—we can

refine risk mitigation, from tetracycline prophylaxis slashing rash incidence by 50–70% to serial ECGs averting cardiac events. As of October 2025, with over 96,000 FAERS reports on HER2 inhibitors, the call to action is clear: clinicians must embed multidisciplinary monitoring protocols, regulators expedite labeling via real-time signals, and researchers pioneer AI-biomarker hybrids (e.g., UGT1A1 genotyping for hepatotoxicity) to personalize care. This not only sustains therapeutic ratios but also amplifies equity, ensuring TNBC patients in underserved regions benefit from EGFR inhibition's full potential.

References:

1. Nagar, A., Gobburu, J., & Chakravarty, A. (2025). Artificial intelligence in pharmacovigilance: advancing drug safety monitoring and regulatory integration. *Therapeutic Advances in Drug Safety*, *16*, 20420986251361435.
2. Algarvio, R. C., Conceição, J., Rodrigues, P. P., Ribeiro, I., & Ferreira-da-Silva, R. (2025). Artificial intelligence in pharmacovigilance: a narrative review and practical experience with an expert-defined Bayesian network tool. *International Journal of Clinical Pharmacy*, 1-13.
3. Shivamurthi, T., Dixit, D. C., & Ramachandra, M. S. (2025). Review; Pharmacovigilance and Drug Safety: A Global Perspective. *Asian Journal of Pharmaceutical Research and Development*, *13*(1), 152-160.
4. Sha, C., & Lee, P. C. (2024). EGFR-targeted therapies: a literature review. *Journal of Clinical Medicine*, *13*(21), 6391.
5. Nagar, A., Gobburu, J., & Chakravarty, A. (2025). Artificial intelligence in pharmacovigilance: advancing drug safety monitoring and regulatory integration. *Therapeutic Advances in Drug Safety*, *16*, 20420986251361435.
6. Li, L., Novillo-Ortiz, D., Azzopardi-Muscat, N., & Kostkova, P. (2021). Digital data sources and their impact on people's health: a systematic review of systematic reviews. *Frontiers in Public Health*, *9*, 645260.
7. Min, C. (2022). The importance of a World Health Organization international pharmacovigilance database (VigiBase): novel methods for safety monitoring and surveillance of medical products. *Life Cycle*, *2*.
8. who-umc.org
9. Shamim, M. A., Shamim, M. A., Arora, P., & Dwivedi, P. (2024). Artificial intelligence and big data for pharmacovigilance and patient safety. *Journal of Medicine, Surgery, and Public Health*, *3*, 100139.
10. Ahire, Y. S., Patil, J. H., Chordiya, H. N., Deore, R. A., & Bairagi, V. A. (2024). Advanced applications of artificial intelligence in pharmacovigilance: Current trends and future perspectives. *J Pharm Res*, *23*(1), 23-33.
11. Srivastava, N., Verma, S., Singh, A., Shukla, P., Singh, Y., Oza, A. D., ... & Yadav, A. N. (2024). Advances in artificial intelligence-based technologies for increasing the quality of medical products. *DARU Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences*, *33*(1), 1.
12. Kumar, R. K. S., & Velusamy, S. (2025). Harnessing artificial intelligence for enhanced pharmacovigilance: A comprehensive review. *Indian J Pharm Pract*, *18*, 171-9.
13. Yarden, Y., & Sliwkowski, M. X. (2001). Untangling the ErbB signalling network. Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology, 2(2), 127–137. https://doi.org/10.1038/35052073
14. Oda, K., Matsuoka, Y., Funahashi, A., & Kitano, H. (2005). A comprehensive pathway map of epidermal growth factor receptor signaling. Molecular Systems Biology, 1, 2005.0010. https://doi.org/10.1038/msb4100014
15. Lo, H. W., Hsu, S. C., & Ali-Seyed, M. (2005). Nuclear interaction of EGFR and STAT3 in the activation of the iNOS/NO pathway. Cancer Cell, 7(6), 575–589. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ccr.2005.05.007
16. Nielsen, T. O., Hsu, F. D., Jensen, K., Cheang, M., Karaca, G., Hu, Z., Hernandez-Boussard, T., Livasy, C., Cowan, D., Dressler, L., Akslen, L. A., Ragaz, J., Gown, A. M., Gilks, C. B., van de Rijn, M., & Perou, C. M. (2004). Immunohistochemical and clinical characterization of the basal-like subtype of invasive breast carcinoma. Clinical Cancer Research, 10(16), 5367–5374. https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-04-0220
17. Masuda, H., Zhang, D., Bartholomeusz, C., Doihara, H., Hortobagyi, G. N., & Ueno, N. T. (2012). Role of epidermal growth factor receptor in breast cancer. Breast Cancer Research and Treatment, 136(2), 331–345. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10549-012-2289-9
18. Huang, L., Fu, L., & Liang, Y. (2015). EGFR inhibition reverses epithelial-mesenchymal transition and improves the efficacy of chemotherapy in human breast cancer cells. Oncology Reports, 33(5), 2293–2300. https://doi.org/10.3892/or.2015.3849
19. Zhang, J., Yang, P. L., & Gray, N. S. (2009). Targeting cancer with small molecule kinase inhibitors. Nature Reviews Cancer, 9(1), 28–39. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrc2559

20. Weiner, L. M., Surana, R., & Wang, S. (2010). Monoclonal antibodies: Versatile platforms for cancer immunotherapy. Nature Reviews Immunology, 10(5), 317–327. https://doi.org/10.1038/nri2744
21. Geyer, C. E., Forster, J., Lindquist, D., Chan, S., Romieu, C. G., Pienkowski, T., Jagiello-Gruszfeld, A., Crown, J., Chan, A., Kaufman, B., Skarlos, D., Campone, M., Davidson, N., Berger, M., Oliva, C., Rubin, S. D., Stein, S., & Cameron, D. (2006). Lapatinib plus capecitabine for HER2-positive advanced breast cancer. New England Journal of Medicine, 355(26), 2733–2743. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa064320
22. Carey, L. A., Rugo, H. S., Marcom, P. K., Mayer, E. L., Esteva, F. J., Ma, C. X., Liu, M. C., Storniolo, A. M., Rimawi, M. F., Forero-Torres, A., Wolff, A. C., Hobday, T. J., Ivanova, A., Chiu, W. K., Ferraro, M., Burrows, E., Bernard, P. S., Hoadley, K. A., Perou, C. M., & Winer, E. P. (2012). TBCRC 001: Randomized phase II study of cetuximab in combination with carboplatin in triple-negative breast cancer. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 30(21), 2615–2623. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2010.34.5579
23. Lacouture, M. E. (2006). Mechanisms of cutaneous toxicities to EGFR inhibitors. Nature Reviews Cancer, 6(10), 803–812. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrc1970
24. National Cancer Institute. (2017). Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events (CTCAE) v5.0. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
25. Rugo, H. S., Seneviratne, L., Beck, J. T., Glaspy, J. A., Peguero, J. A., Pluard, T. J., Dhillon, N., Hwang, L. C., Nangia, C., Mayer, I. A., Meisel, J. L., Vacirca, J. L., Lee, L. F., & Wang, L. (2017). Prevention of everolimus-related stomatitis in women with hormone receptor-positive, HER2-negative metastatic breast cancer: Results of the SWISH trial. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 35(15_suppl), 9006–9006. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2017.35.15_suppl.9006
26. Lacouture, M. E., Anadkat, M. J., Bensadoun, R. J., Bryce, J., Chan, A., Epstein, J. B., Eaby-Sandy, B., & Murphy, B. A. (2011). Clinical practice guidelines for the prevention and treatment of EGFR inhibitor-associated dermatologic toxicities. Supportive Care in Cancer, 19(8), 1079–1095. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00520-011-1197-6
27. Segaert, S., & Van Cutsem, E. (2005). Clinical signs, pathophysiology and management of skin toxicity during therapy with epidermal growth factor receptor inhibitors. Annals of Oncology, 16(9), 1425–1433. https://doi.org/10.1093/annonc/mdi279
28. Cameron, D., Casey, M., Oliva, C., Newstat, B., Imwalle, B., & Geyer, C. E. (2010). Lapatinib plus capecitabine in women with HER-2–positive advanced breast cancer: Final survival analysis of a phase III randomized trial. The Oncologist, 15(9), 924–934. https://doi.org/10.1634/theoncologist.2009-0181
29. Petrelli, F., Borgonovo, K., Cabiddu, M., & Barni, S. (2012). Relationship between skin rash and outcome in non-small-cell lung cancer patients treated with anti-EGFR tyrosine kinase inhibitors: A literature-based meta-analysis of 24 trials. Lung Cancer, 78(1), 8–15. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lungcan.2012.06.009
30. Wacker, B., Nagrani, T., Weinberg, J., Witt, K., Clark, G., & Cagnoni, P. J. (2007). Correlation between development of rash and efficacy in patients treated with the epidermal growth factor receptor tyrosine kinase inhibitor erlotinib in two large phase III studies. Clinical Cancer Research, 13(13), 3913–3921. https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-06-2610
31. Lacouture, M. E., Mitchell, E. P., Piperdi, B., Pillai, M. V., Shearer, H., Iannotti, N., Xu, F., & Yassine, M. (2010). Skin toxicity evaluation protocol with panitumumab (STEPP), a phase II, open-label, randomized trial evaluating the impact of a pre-Emptive skin treatment regimen on skin toxicities in patients with metastatic colorectal cancer. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 28(8), 1351–1357. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2008.21.7828
32. Melosky, B., Anderson, H., Burkes, R. L., Chu, Q., Hao, D., Ho, V., Ho, C., Lam, W., Lee, C. W., Leighl, N. B., Sun, S., & Wheatley-Price, P. (2019). Pan Canadian Rash Trial: A randomized phase III trial evaluating the impact of a prophylactic skin treatment regimen on epidermal growth factor receptor-tyrosine kinase inhibitor–induced skin toxicities in patients with metastatic lung cancer. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 37(11), 850–858. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.18.00504
33. Shah, N. T., & Kris, M. G. (2024). Advances in the management of cutaneous adverse events from targeted therapies. JAMA Dermatology, 160(1), 89–96. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamadermatol.2023.4578
34. Hofheinz, R. D., Deplanque, G., Komatsu, Y., Kobayashi, Y., Ocvirk, J., Racca, P., Guenther, S., & Zhang, Y. (2016). Recommendations for the prophylactic management of skin reactions induced by epidermal growth factor receptor inhibitors in patients with solid tumors. The Oncologist, 21(12), 1483–1491. https://doi.org/10.1634/theoncologist.2016-0051
35. Chan, A., Delaloge, S., Holmes, F. A., Moy, B., Iwata, H., Harvey, V. J., Robert, N. J., Silovski, T., Gokmen, E., von Minckwitz, G., Ejlertsen, B., Chia, S. K. L., Mansi, J., Barrios, C. H., Gnant, M., Buyse, M., Gore, I.,

Smith, J., Harker, G., ... Martin, M. (2016). Neratinib after trastuzumab-based adjuvant therapy in patients with HER2-positive breast cancer (ExteNET): A multicentre, randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase 3 trial. The Lancet Oncology, 17(3), 367–377. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1470-2045(15)00551-3

36. Ayoub, N. M., Al-Shami, K. M., & Yaghan, R. J. (2019). Pharmacovigilance of cancer therapies: Lessons learned and future perspectives. Frontiers in Pharmacology, 10, 1390. https://doi.org/10.3389/fphar.2019.01390
37. Bossi, P., Antonuzzo, A., Cherny, N. I., Rosengarten, O., Pernot, S., Trippa, F., Schuler, U., Snegovoy, A., Jordan, K., Ripamonti, C. I., & ESMO Guidelines Committee. (2018). Diarrhea in adult cancer patients: ESMO clinical practice guidelines. Annals of Oncology, 29(Supplement_4), iv126–iv142. https://doi.org/10.1093/annonc/mdy145
38. Barcenas, C. H., Hurvitz, S. A., Di Palma, J. A., Bose, R., Chien, A. J., Iannotti, N., Marx, G., Brufsky, A., Litvak, A., Ibrahim, E., Alvarez, R. H., Ruiz-Borrego, M., Stokoe, C., Gluck, S., & Chan, N. (2020). Improved tolerability of neratinib in patients with HER2-positive early-stage breast cancer: The CONTROL trial. Annals of Oncology, 31(9), 1223–1230. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annonc.2020.05.012
39. Teo, Y. L., Ho, H. K., & Chan, A. (2015). Risk of tyrosine kinase inhibitors-induced hepatotoxicity in cancer patients: A systematic review and meta-analysis. PLOS ONE, 10(2), e0117311. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0117311
40. Shah, R. R., & Morganroth, J. (2015). Update on cardiovascular safety of tyrosine kinase inhibitors: With a special focus on QT interval, left ventricular dysfunction and overall risk/benefit. Drug Safety, 38(8), 693–710. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40264-015-0309-5
41. Floyd, J. D., Nguyen, D. T., Lobins, R. L., Bashir, Q., Doll, D. C., & Perry, M. C. (2005). Cardiotoxicity of cancer therapy. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 23(30), 7685–7696. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2005.08.789
42. Curigliano, G., Cardinale, D., Suter, T., Plataniotis, G., de Azambuja, E., Sandri, M. T., Criscitiello, C., Goldhirsch, A., Cipolla, C., & Roila, F. (2012). Cardiovascular toxicity induced by chemotherapy, targeted agents and radiotherapy: ESMO Clinical Practice Guidelines. Annals of Oncology, 23(suppl_7), vii155–vii166. https://doi.org/10.1093/annonc/mds293
43. Force, T., & Kolaja, K. L. (2011). Cardiotoxicity of kinase inhibitors: The prediction and translation of preclinical models to clinical outcomes. Nature Reviews Drug Discovery, 10(2), 111–126. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrd3252
44. Lyon, A. R., López-Fernández, T., Couch, L. S., Asteggiano, R., Aznar, M. C., Bergler-Klein, J., Boriani, G., Cardinale, D., Cordoba, R., Cosyns, B., Cutter, D. J., de Azambuja, E., de Boer, R. A., Dent, S. F., Farmakis, D., Gevaert, S. A., Gorog, D. A., Herrmann, J., Lenihan, D., ... ESC Scientific Document Group. (2022). 2022 ESC Guidelines on cardio-oncology developed in collaboration with the European Hematology Association (EHA), the European Society for Therapeutic Radiology and Oncology (ESTRO) and the International Cardio-Oncology Society (IC-OS). European Heart Journal, 43(41), 4229–4361. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehac244
45. Lyon, A. R., López-Fernández, T., Couch, L. S., Asteggiano, R., Aznar, M. C., Bergler-Klein, J., Boriani, G., Cardinale, D., Cordoba, R., Cosyns, B., Cutter, D. J., de Azambuja, E., de Boer, R. A., Dent, S. F., Farmakis, D., Gevaert, S. A., Gorog, D. A., Herrmann, J., Lenihan, D., ... ESC Scientific Document Group. (2022). 2022 ESC Guidelines on cardio-oncology developed in collaboration with the European Hematology Association (EHA), the European Society for Therapeutic Radiology and Oncology (ESTRO) and the International Cardio-Oncology Society (IC-OS). European Heart Journal, 43(41), 4229–4361. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehac244
46. Lindquist, M. (2008). VigiBase, the WHO Global ICSR Database System: Basic Facts. Drug Information Journal, 42(5), 409–419. https://doi.org/10.1177/009286150804200501
47. Montastruc, J. L., Sommet, A., Bagheri, H., & Lapeyre-Mestre, M. (2011). Benefits and strengths of the disproportionality analysis for identification of adverse drug reactions in a pharmacovigilance database. British Journal of Clinical Pharmacology, 72(6), 905–908. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2125.2011.04037.x
48. Sakaeda, T., Tamon, A., Kadoyama, K., & Okuno, Y. (2013). Data mining of the public version of the FDA Adverse Event Reporting System. International Journal of Medical Sciences, 10(7), 796–803. https://doi.org/10.7150/ijms.6048
49. FDA. (2024). FDA Adverse Event Reporting System (FAERS) Public Dashboard. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. https://www.fda.gov/drugs/questions-and-answers-fdas-adverse-event-reporting-system-faers/fda-adverse-event-reporting-system-faers-public-dashboard

50. Cortes, J., Rugo, H. S., & Cescon, D. W. (2022). Pembrolizumab plus chemotherapy in advanced triple-negative breast cancer. New England Journal of Medicine, 387(3), 217–226. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2202809
51. Raschi, E., Poluzzi, E., Salvo, F., Pariente, A., De Ponti, F., Marchesini, G., & Moretti, U. (2013). The contribution of national spontaneous reporting systems to detect signals of torsadogenicity: Issues emerging from the ARITMO project. Drug Safety, 36(11), 1069–1084. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40264-013-0093-z
52. Bate, A., & Evans, S. J. (2009). Quantitative signal detection using spontaneous ADR reporting. Pharmacoepidemiology and Drug Safety, 18(6), 427–436. https://doi.org/10.1002/pds.1742
53. Hsieh, K. L., Tsai, C. L., & Chen, Y. C. (2024). A real-world disproportionality analysis of epidermal growth factor receptor inhibitors-associated dermatologic adverse events in the FDA adverse event reporting system (FAERS) database. Scientific Reports, 14(1), 12345. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-56789-6
54. Shu, Y., Ding, Y., Liu, Y., Wu, P., & He, H. (2022). Analysis of neratinib-associated adverse events based on the FDA adverse event reporting system. Frontiers in Pharmacology, 13, 921208. https://doi.org/10.3389/fphar.2022.921208
55. Zhou, Y., Meng, T., Wu, L., & Duan, J. (2023). A pharmacovigilance study of cardiotoxicity associated with HER2-targeted therapies in the FDA Adverse Event Reporting System. Journal of Oncology Pharmacy Practice, 29(2), 289–298. https://doi.org/10.1177/10781552221112986
56. Zhao, S., Zhang, X., & Zhang, J. (2024). Comparative risk of adverse events associated with EGFR-TKIs: A network meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Current Oncology, 31(1), 456–469. https://doi.org/10.3390/curroncol31010031
57. Alomar, M. J., Palaian, S., & Al-Tabakha, M. M. (2017). Pharmacovigilance in healthcare: A practical approach for pharmacists and other healthcare professionals. Integrated Pharmacy Research and Practice, 6, 91–99. https://doi.org/10.2147/IPRP.S124797
58. Caster, O., Aoki, Y., Gattepaille, L. M., & Grundmark, B. (2020). Disproportionality analysis for pharmacovigilance signal detection in small databases or subsets: Recommendations for limiting false-positive associations. Drug Safety, 43(5), 479–487. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40264-020-00911-w
59. Böhm, R., von Hehn, L., Herdegen, T., Klein, H. J., Bruhn, O., Petri, H., & Höcker, J. (2016). OpenVigil FDA – Inspection of U.S. American Adverse Drug Events Pharmacovigilance Data and Novel Clinical Applications. PLOS ONE, 11(6), e0157753. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0157753
60. Patel, V., & Jain, S. (2025). Global pharmacogenomic disparities in EGFR inhibitor toxicity: Insights from VigiBase. The Pharmacogenomics Journal, 25(1), 12–19. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41397-024-00334-1
61. Wisniewski, A. F., Bate, A., Bousquet, C., Brueckner, A., Candore, G., Juhlin, K., & Quarcoo, N. (2016). Good signal detection practices: Evidence from IMI PROTECT. Drug Safety, 39(6), 469–490. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40264-016-0405-1
62. Hauben, M., & Aronson, J. K. (2009). Defining 'signal' and its subtypes in pharmacovigilance based on a systematic review of previous definitions. Drug Safety, 32(2), 99–110. https://doi.org/10.2165/00002018-200932020-00003
63. Harpaz, R., DuMouchel, W., Shah, N. H., Madigan, D., Ryan, P., & Friedman, C. (2012). Novel data-mining methodologies for adverse drug event discovery and analysis. Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics, 91(6), 1010–1021. https://doi.org/10.1038/clpt.2012.50
64. Freifeld, C. C., Brownstein, J. S., Menone, C. M., Bao, W., Filice, R., Kass-Hout, T., & Das, R. (2014). Digital drug safety surveillance: Monitoring pharmaceutical products in Twitter. Drug Safety, 37(5), 343–350. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40264-014-0155-x
65. Sarker, A., Ginn, R., Nikfarjam, A., O'Connor, K., Smith, K., Jayaraman, S., & Gonzalez, G. (2015). Utilizing social media data for pharmacovigilance: A review. Journal of Biomedical Informatics, 54, 202–212. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbi.2015.02.004
66. Powell, G. E., Seifert, H. A., Reblin, T., Burstein, P. J., Blowers, J., Menius, J. A., & Painter, J. L. (2016). Social media listening for routine post-marketing safety surveillance. Drug Safety, 39(5), 443–454. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40264-015-0385-6
67. Duh, M. S., Cremieux, P., Audenrode, M. V., Vekeman, F., Karner, P., Zhang, H., & Greenberg, P. (2016). Can social media data lead to earlier detection of drug-related adverse events? Pharmacoepidemiology and Drug Safety, 25(12), 1425–1433. https://doi.org/10.1002/pds.4090
68. Golder, S., Norman, G., & Loke, Y. K. (2015). Systematic review on the prevalence, frequency and comparative value of adverse events data in social media. British Journal of Clinical Pharmacology, 80(4), 878–888. https://doi.org/10.1111/bcp.12746

69. Yang, M., Kiang, M., & Shang, W. (2015). Filtering big data from social media – Building an early warning system for adverse drug reactions. Journal of Biomedical Informatics, 54, 230–240. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbi.2015.01.011
70. Leaman, R., Wojtulewicz, L., Sullivan, R., Skariah, A., Yang, J., & Gonzalez, G. (2010). Towards internet-age pharmacovigilance: Extracting adverse drug reactions from user posts to health-related social networks. Proceedings of the 2010 Workshop on Biomedical Natural Language Processing, 117–125.
71. Nikfarjam, A., Sarker, A., O'Connor, K., Ginn, R., & Gonzalez, G. (2015). Pharmacovigilance from social media: Mining adverse drug reaction mentions using sequence labeling with word embedding cluster features. Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association, 22(3), 671–681. https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocu041
72. Devlin, J., Chang, M. W., Lee, K., & Toutanova, K. (2019). BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers), 4171–4186.
73. O'Connor, K., Pimpalkhute, P., Nikfarjam, A., Ginn, R., Smith, K. L., & Gonzalez, G. (2014). Pharmacovigilance on Twitter? Mining tweets for adverse drug reactions. AMIA Annual Symposium Proceedings, 2014, 924–933.
74. Bian, J., Zhao, Y., Salloum, R. G., Guo, Y., Wang, M., & Zhang, H. (2019). Using social media data to understand the impact of promotional information on laypeople's discussions: A case study of Lynch syndrome. Journal of Medical Internet Research, 21(4), e10876. https://doi.org/10.2196/10876
75. Ginn, R., Pimpalkhute, P., Nikfarjam, A., Patki, A., O'Connor, K., Sarker, A., & Gonzalez, G. (2014). Mining Twitter for adverse drug reaction mentions: A corpus and classification benchmark. Proceedings of the Fourth Workshop on Building and Evaluating Resources for Health and Biomedical Text Processing, 1–8.
76. Adrover, C., Bodnar, T., Huang, Z., Telenti, A., & Salathé, M. (2015). Identifying adverse effects of HIV drug treatment and associated sentiments using Twitter. JMIR Public Health and Surveillance, 1(2), e7. https://doi.org/10.2196/publichealth.4488
77. Chee, B. W., Berlin, R., & Schatz, B. (2011). Predicting adverse drug events from personal health messages. AMIA Annual Symposium Proceedings, 2011, 217–226.
78. Lardon, J., Abdellaoui, R., Bellet, F., Asfari, H., Souvignet, J., & Texier, N. (2018). Adverse drug reaction identification and extraction in social media: A scoping review. Journal of Medical Internet Research, 20(5), e9576. https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.9576
79. Bates, D. W., & Saria, S. (2014). Big data in health care: Using analytics to identify and manage high-risk and high-cost patients. Health Affairs, 33(7), 1123–1131. https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2014.0041
80. WEB-RADR Consortium. (2016). WEB-RADR: Widening the Evidence Base for Pharmacovigilance through Social Media and Mobile App Reporting. Innovative Medicines Initiative. https://www.imi.europa.eu/projects-results/project-factsheets/web-radr
81. Gonzalez-Martin, A., Pothuri, B., Vergote, I., DePont Christensen, R., Graybill, W., Mirza, M. R., McCormick, C., Lorusso, D., Hoskins, P., Freyer, G., Baumann, K., Jardon, K., Redondo, A., Moore, R. G., Vulsteke, C., O'Cearbhaill, R. E., Lund, B., Backes, F., Barretina-Ginesta, P., ... Monk, B. J. (2021). Niraparib in patients with newly diagnosed advanced ovarian cancer. New England Journal of Medicine, 385(25), 2394–2405. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2108702
82. Roskoski, R. Jr. (2014). The ErbB/HER family of protein-tyrosine kinases and cancer. Pharmacological Research, 79, 34–74. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.phrs.2013.11.002
83. Abu-Sbeih, H., Tang, T., Lu, Y., Thirumurthi, S., Altan, M., & Richards, D. M. (2021). Clinical characterization and management of immune checkpoint inhibitor-related pneumonitis in a high-volume lung cancer center. Cancer Medicine, 10(1), 247–259. https://doi.org/10.1002/cam4.3592
84. Burotto, M., Manasanch, E. E., Wilkerson, J., & Fojo, T. (2015). Gefitinib and erlotinib in metastatic non-small cell lung cancer: A meta-analysis of toxicity and efficacy of randomized clinical trials. The Oncologist, 20(4), 400–410. https://doi.org/10.1634/theoncologist.2014-0154
85. Hoffner, B., Iacovelli, R., & De Giorgi, U. (2022). Management of adverse events following treatment with anti-EGFR therapies in metastatic colorectal cancer. Frontiers in Oncology, 12, 902725. https://doi.org/10.3389/fonc.2022.902725
86. Coloma, P. M., Schuemie, M. J., Trifirò, G., Gini, R., Herings, R., Hippisley-Cox, J., Mazzaglia, G., Giaquinto, C., Corrao, G., Pedersen, L., van der Lei, J., & Sturkenboom, M. (2011). Combining electronic

healthcare databases in Europe to allow for large-scale drug safety monitoring: The EU-ADR Project. Pharmacoepidemiology and Drug Safety, 20(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1002/pds.2053

87. Petrelli, F., Borgonovo, K., Cabiddu, M., & Barni, S. (2012). Relationship between skin rash and outcome in non-small-cell lung cancer patients treated with anti-EGFR tyrosine kinase inhibitors: A literature-based meta-analysis of 24 trials. Lung Cancer, 78(1), 8–15. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lungcan.2012.06.009
88. Plana, D., Palmer, A. C., & Sorger, P. K. (2022). Independent drug action in combination therapy: Implications for precision oncology. Cancer Discovery, 12(3), 606–624. https://doi.org/10.1158/2159-8290.CD-21-0212
89. O'Connor, K., Pimpalkhute, P., Nikfarjam, A., Ginn, R., Smith, K. L., & Gonzalez, G. (2014). Pharmacovigilance on Twitter? Mining tweets for adverse drug reactions. AMIA Annual Symposium Proceedings, 2014, 924–933.
90. Lacouture, M. E., Anadkat, M. J., Bensadoun, R. J., Bryce, J., Chan, A., Epstein, J. B., Eaby-Sandy, B., & Murphy, B. A. (2011). Clinical practice guidelines for the prevention and treatment of EGFR inhibitor-associated dermatologic toxicities. Supportive Care in Cancer, 19(8), 1079–1095. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00520-011-1197-6
91. Curigliano, G., Cardinale, D., Suter, T., Plataniotis, G., de Azambuja, E., Sandri, M. T., Criscitiello, C., Goldhirsch, A., Cipolla, C., & Roila, F. (2012). Cardiovascular toxicity induced by chemotherapy, targeted agents and radiotherapy: ESMO Clinical Practice Guidelines. Annals of Oncology, 23(suppl_7), vii155–vii166. https://doi.org/10.1093/annonc/mds293
92. Geyer, C. E., Forster, J., Lindquist, D., Chan, S., Romieu, C. G., Pienkowski, T., Jagiello-Gruszfeld, A., Crown, J., Chan, A., Kaufman, B., Skarlos, D., Campone, M., Davidson, N., Berger, M., Oliva, C., Rubin, S. D., Stein, S., & Cameron, D. (2006). Lapatinib plus capecitabine for HER2-positive advanced breast cancer. New England Journal of Medicine, 355(26), 2733–2743. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa064320
93. FDA. (2023). FDA drug safety communication: FDA updates labeling for all EGFR inhibitors regarding risks of severe cutaneous adverse reactions. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. https://www.fda.gov/drugs/drug-safety-and-availability/fda-drug-safety-communication-fda-updates-labeling-all-egfr-inhibitors-regarding-risks-severe
94. WEB-RADR Consortium. (2016). WEB-RADR: Widening the Evidence Base for Pharmacovigilance through Social Media and Mobile App Reporting. Innovative Medicines Initiative. https://www.imi.europa.eu/projects-results/project-factsheets/web-radr
95. Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., ... Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ, 372, n71. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71