

Pain Management of Oral Mucositis in Children

Lauren Bruckner, MD/PhD

Associate Professor of Pediatrics and Oncology University of Rochester Medical Center Golisano Children's Hospital at URMedicine Rochester, NY

SAVE THE DATE

MASCC/ISO0

Annual Meeting on Supportive Care in Cancer

www.mascc.org/meeting



ISCO

Follow us on Twitter: @CancerCareMASCC

#MASCC19

y (in) f

Disclosures

• None





Objectives:

- Review evidence-based guidelines for OM prevention & treatment 2
 - MASCC/ISOO Clinical Practice Guidelines v.2 (2014)
 - POGO Guidelines for OM Prevention in Children (2017)
- Discuss approaches to assess and manage mucositis pain in children
- Briefly review recent RCT and Clinical Trials on OM in children







Main Strategies Used to Manage Chemotherapy or Radiation-induced OM

- Oral care protocols
- Antimicrobial agents (chlorhexidine)
- Anti-inflammatory agents (benzydamine)
- Cytoprotective agents (glutamine)
- Biological response modifiers (palifermin)
- Physical therapies (cryotherapy and PBM)
- Anesthetics
- Analgesics (opioids for pain management)



Main Strategies Used to Manage Chemotherapy or Radiation-induced OM



Evidenced-based Clinical Practice Guidelines of the Mucositis Study Group of MASCC/ISOO

- First published in 2004; most recently updated in 2014
 - The leading clinical practice guidelines for mucositis care

Lalla, Rajesh V., et al. "MASCC/ISOO clinical practice guidelines for the management of mucositis secondary to cancer therapy." *Cancer* 120.10 (2014): 1453-1461.

- 7 sections on Oral mucositis (and 1 on GI):
 - 1. Basic oral care
 - 2. Growth factors and cytokines
 - 3. Anti-inflammatory agents
 - 4. Antimicrobials, coating agents, anesthetics, and analgesics
 - 5. Laser and other light therapy (photobiomodulation, PBM)
 - 6. Cryotherapy
 - 7. Natural and miscellaneous agents
- Based on systematic reviews of the evidence for various interventions
 - 8279 articles identified \rightarrow 1032 for detailed review \rightarrow 570 qualified final



TABLE 1. Criteria for Each Level of Evidence

1	Evidence obtained from meta-analysis of multiple, well-designed, controlled studies; randomized trials with low false-positive and	Recommendation	Reserved for guidelines that are based on level I or level II evidence.			
	false-negative errors (high power).	Suggestion	Used for guidelines that are based on level III, level			
	Evidence obtained from at least 1 well-designed experimental study; randomized trials with high false-positive and/or false- negative errors (low power).		to, and level V evidence; this implies panel consensus regarding the interpretation of this evidence.			
III	Evidence obtained from well-designed, quasi-experimental studies such as nonrandomized, controlled single-group, pretest-postt- est comparison, cohort, time, or matched case-control series.	No guideline possible	Used when there is insufficient evidence on which to base a guideline; this implies 1) that there is little or no evidence regarding the practice in			
IV	Evidence obtained from well-designed, nonexperimental studies, such as comparative and correlational descriptive and case studies.		question, or 2) that the panel lacks consensus on the interpretation of existing evidence.			
۷	Evidence obtained from case reports and clinical examples.					
	Adapted from Somerfield MR, Padberg JR, Pfister DG, et al. ASCO clinical practice guidelines: process, progress, pitfalls, and prospects. <i>Class Pap Curr Comments</i> . 2000;4:881-886. ²¹					
	Evidence					

Evidence Strength	FOR	AGAINST		
Strong	Recommends	Do NOT use		
Weaker	Favors	Did NOT support		
Insufficient	No Guideli	ne possible		

TABLE 2. Criteria for Each Guideline Category

TABLE 4. MASCC/ISOO Clinical Practice Guidelines for Oral Mucositis^a

RECOMMENDATIONS IN FAVOR OF AN INTERVENTION (e, strong evidence supports effectiveness in the treatment setting listed):

- The panel recommends that 30 min of oral cryotherapy be used to prevent oral mucositis in patients receiving bolus 5-fluorouract chemotherapy (II).
- 2. The panel recommends that recombinant human keratinocyte growth factor-1 (KGF-1/palifermin) be used to prevent oral mucositis (at a dose of 60 µg/kg per day for 3 days prior to conditioning treatment and for 3 days after transplant) in patients receiving high-dose chemotherapy and total body irradiation, followed by autologous stem cell transplantation, for a hematological malignancy (II).
- The panel recommends that low-level laser therapy (wavelength at 650 nm, power of 40 mW, and each square centimeter treated with the required time to a tissue energy dose of 2 J/cm²), be used to prevent oral mucositis in patients receiving HSCT conditioned with high-dose chemotherapy, with or without total body irradiation (II).
- The panel recommends that patient-controlled analgesia with morphine be used to treat pain due to oral mucositis in patients undergoing HSCT (II).
- The panel recommends that benzydamine mouthwash be used to prevent oral mucositis in patients with head and neck cancer receiving moderate dose radiation therapy (up to 50 Gy), without concomitant chemotherapy (i).

SUGGESTIONS IN FAVOR OF AN INTERVENTION (e, weaker evidence supports effectiveness in the treatment setting listed):

- 1. The panel suggests that oral care protocols be used to prevent oral mucositis in all age groups and across all cancer treatment modalities (III).
- The panel suggests that oral cryotherapy be used to prevent oral mucositis in patients receiving high-dose melphalan, with or without total body irradiation, as conditioning for HSCT (III).
- The panel suggests that low-level laser therapy (wavelength around 632.8 nm) be used to prevent oral mucositis in patients undergoing radiotherapy, without concomitant chemotherapy, for head and neck cancer (III).
- The panel suggests that transfermal feritaryl may be effective to treat pain due to oral mucositis in patients receiving conventional or high-dose chemotherapy, with or without total body irradiation (III).
- The panel suggests that 2% morphine mouthwash may be effective to treat pain due to oral mucositis in patients receiving chemoradiation for head and neck cancer (III).
- The panel suggests that 0.5% doxepin mouthwash may be effective to treat pain due to oral mucositis (IV).
- The panel suggests that systemic zinc supplements administered orally may be of benefit to prevent oral mucositis in oral cancer patients receiving radiation therapy or chemoradiation (III).
- RECOMMENDATIONS AGAINST AN INTERVENTION (ie, strong evidence indicates lack of effectiveness in the treatment setting listed):
- The panel recommends that PTA (polymyxin, tobramycin, amphotericin B) and BCoG (bacitracin, clothmazole, gentamicin) antimicrobial lozenges and PTA paste not be used to prevent oral mucositis in patients receiving radiation therapy for head and neck cancer (II).
- The panel recommends that iseganan antimicrobial mouthwash not be used to prevent oral mucositis in patients receiving high-dose chemotherapy, with or without total body irradiation, for HSCT (II), or in patients receiving radiation therapy or concomitant chemoradiation for head and neck cancer (II).
- The panel recommends that sucralifate mouthwash not be used to prevent oral mucositis in patients receiving chemotherapy for cancer (I), or in patients receiving radiation therapy (I) or concomitant chemoradiation (II) for head and neck cancer.
- 4. The panel recommends that sucralifate mouthwash not be used to treat oral mucositis in patients receiving chemotherapy for cancer (i), or in patients receiving radiation therapy (ii) for head and neck cancer.
- The panel recommends that intravenous glutamine not be used to prevent oral mucositis in patients receiving high-dose chemotherapy, with or without total body irradiation, for HSCT (II).
- SUGGESTIONS AGAINST AN INTERVENTION (ie, weaker evidence indicates tack of effectiveness in the treatment setting listed):
- The panel suggests that chlorhexidine mouthwash not be used to prevent oral mucositis in patients receiving radiation therapy for head and neck cancer (III).
- The panel suggests that granulocyte-macrophage-colony-stimulating factor mouthwash not be used to prevent oral mucositis in patients receiving high-dose chemotherapy, for autologous or allogeneic stem cell transplantation (II).
- The panel suggests that misoprostol mouthwash not be used to prevent oral mucositis in patients receiving radiation therapy for head and neck cancer (III).
- The panel suggests that systemic pentoxifyline, administered orally, not be used to prevent oral mucositis in patients undergoing bone marrow transplantation (III).
- The panel suggests that systemic pliocarpine, administered orally, not be used to prevent oral mucositis in patients receiving radiation therapy for head and neck cancer (III), or in patients receiving high-dose chemotherapy, with or without total body irradiation, for HSCT (II).

Abbreviations: Gy, grays; HSCT, hematopoietic stem cell transplantation; MASOC/ISOO, Multinational Association of Supportive Care in Cancer and International Society of Oral Oncology; mW, milliwatt; nm, nanometers.

*Level of evidence for each guideline is in brackets after the guideline statement.

MASCC/ISOO Clinical Practice Guidelines for OM 2014

RECOMMENDATIONS IN FAVOR OF (strong evidence)

- Oral Cryotherapy x 30 min to prevent OM in pts receiving 5FU
- Low level laser therapy to prevent OM in HCT using HD chemo +/- TBI
- KGF (Palifermin) to prevent OM in Chemo+TBI auto-HCT for heme Ca
- Benzydamine MW to prevent OM in H&NC w/ moderate RT w/o chemo
- Morphine PCA to treat pain due to OM in pts receiving HCT

9

MASCC/ISOO Clinical Practice Guidelines for OM 2014

10

RECOMMENDATIONS IN FAVOR OF (strong evidence)

- Oral Cryotherapy x 30 min to *prevent* OM in pts receiving 5FU
- Low level laser therapy to prevent OM in HCT using HD chemo +/- TBI
- KGF (Palifermin) to prevent OM in Chemo+TBI auto-HCT for heme Ca
- Benzydamine MW to prevent OM in H&NC w/ moderate RT w/o chemo
- Morphine PCA to treat pain due to OM in pts receiving HCT





- 1. Basic oral care
- 2. Growth factors and cytokines
- 3. Anti-inflammatory agents
- 4. Antimicrobials, coating agents, anesthetics, and analgesics
- 5. Laser and other light therapy (PBM)
- 6. Cryotherapy
- 7. Natural and miscellaneous agents

Evidence Strength	FOR	AGAINST		
Strong	Recommends	Do NOT use		
Weaker	Favors	Did NOT support		
Insufficient	No Guidelii	ne possible		



1. Basic oral care

- **Favors oral care protocols** (toothbrushing, flossing, daily mouth rinse) for all to *prevent* OM
- **Do NOT use Chlorhexidine** (at least not for H&NC RT) to *prevent* OM
- 2. Growth factors and cytokines
- Anti-inflammatory agents 3.
- Antimicrobials, coating agents, anesthetics, and analgesics 4.
- Laser and other light therapy (PBM) 5.
- Cryotherapy 6.
- Natural and miscellaneous agents 7.







Biswas, Kumar, et al. "A mediated model of the effects of human resource management policies and practices on the intention to promote women: An investigation of the theory of planned behaviour." The International Journal of Human Resource Management 28.9 (2017): 1309-1331.

The Multinational Association of Supportive Care in Cancer
 Annual Meeting 2019

No guideline about which mouth rinse is best → use anything regularly

Do NOT use Chlorhexidine (at least not for H&NC RT) to *prevent* OM

Summary of MASCC/ISOO Clinical Guidelines

Favors oral care protocols (toothbrushing, flossing, daily mouth rinse) for all to *prevent* OM

- 2. Growth factors and cytokines
- 3. Anti-inflammatory agents

1. Basic oral care

- 4. Antimicrobials, coating agents, anesthetics
- 5. Laser and other light therapy (PBM)
- 6. Cryotherapy
- 7. Natural and miscellaneous agents

Saline Sodium bicarbonate Mixed medication mouthwashes Calcium phosphate Chlorhexidine with chemo



The Multinational Association of Supportive Care in Cancer + Annual Meeting 2019 + www.mascc.org/meeting

Summary of MASCC/ISOO Clinical Guidelines

- 1. Basic oral care
- 2. Growth factors and cytokines
 - **Recommends KGF** (Palifermin) to *prevent* OM in HD chemo + TBI HCT for heme Cancers
 - Did NOT support GM-CSF to prevent OM in HD chemo for auto- or allo- HCT
 - No guidelines for many others
- 3. Anti-inflammatory agents
- 4. Antimicrobials, coating agents, anesthe
- 5. Laser and other light therapy (PBM)
- 6. Cryotherapy
- 7. Natural and miscellaneous agents

GMCSF and KGF for other settings Fibroblast GF-20 KGF-2 GCSF Transforming GF-beta Epidermal GF Milk-derived GF extract

> IL-11 ATL-104 rHu-intestinal trefoil factor



- 1. Basic oral care
- 2. Growth factors and cytokines

3. Anti-inflammatory agents

- Recommends Benzydamine MW to prevent OM in RT for H&NC (< 50 Gy) w/o chemo
 - No guideline to extend to RT >50 Gy
- Did NOT support Misoprostil MW to prevent OM in RT for H&NC
- No guideline about **Amifostine** to *prevent* OM nor others
- 4. Antimicrobials, coating agents, anesthetics, and analges.
- 5. Laser and other light therapy (PBM)
- 6. Cryotherapy
- 7. Natural and miscellaneous agents

Aspirin OrgoteinAzelastine Mesalazine Prostaglandin E2 Immunoglobulins Corticosteroids Indomethacin Flurbiprofen Histamine Colchicine Placentrex

- 1. Basic oral care
- 2. Growth factors and cytokines
- 3. Anti-inflammatory agents
- 4. Antimicrobials, coating agents, anesthetics, and analgesics
 - Recommends Morphine PCA to <u>treat</u> OM pain



- Favors Fentanyl patch, Morphine MW and Doxepine MW to treat OM pain in specific settings
- Do NOT use Antimicrobial lozenge & pastes (PTA, BCoG) to prevent OM w/ RT for H&NC
- Do NOT use Iseganan MW to <u>prevent</u>OM w/ HD chemo ± TBI for HCT or RT +/- chemo H&NC
- Did NOT support Sucralfate to <u>prevent or treat</u> OM w/ chemo or RT for H&NC
- No guideline possible for any anesthetic nor many other agents
- 5. Laser and other light therapy (PBM)
- 6. Cryotherapy
- 7. Natural and miscellaneous agents

Acyclovir Clarithromycin Nystatin Kefir Povidone-iodine Fluconazole Topical Na Hyaluronate

Cocaine Amethocaine Capsaicin Methadone Ketamine Nortryptiline Gabapentin

WWW.Masconerge

- 1. Basic oral care
- 2. Growth factors and cytokines
- 3. Anti-inflammatory agents
- 4. Antimicrobials, coating agents, anesthetics, and analgesics
- 5. Laser and other light therapy (PBM)
 - Recommends Low level laser therapy to <u>prevent</u> OM in HCT using HD chemo +/- TBI
 - Favors Low level laser therapy to *prevent* OM in RT alone (w/o chemo) for H&NC
 - No guideline for LLLT in other settings or for other emerging light Tx to prevent or treat OM
- 6. Cryotherapy
- 7. Natural and miscellaneous agents



- 1. Basic oral care
- 2. Growth factors and cytokines
- 3. Anti-inflammatory agents
- 4. Antimicrobials, coating agents, anesthetics, and analgesics
- 5. Laser and other light therapy (PBM)
- 6. Cryotherapy
 - **Recommends cryotherapy** to *prevent* OM with bolus dosing of **5-Fluorouracil**
 - Favors cryotherapy to prevent OM with HD Melphalan in HCT +/- TBI
 - No guideline for cryotherapy in other settings due to inadequate evidence
- 7. Natural and miscellaneous agents



- 1. Basic oral care
- 2. Growth factors and cytokines
- 3. Anti-inflammatory agents
- 4. Antimicrobials, coating agents, anesthetics, and analgesics
- 5. Laser and other light therapy (PBM)
- 6. Cryotherapy

7. Natural and miscellaneous agents

- Favors zinc to <u>prevent</u> OM with chemo +/- RT for oral cancer
- Do NOT use IV Glutamine to prevent OM w/ HD chemo ± TBI for HCT
- No guideline for other natural agents d/t conflicting evidence

Vitamins A and E Honey Aloe Vera Chamomile Kamillosan Chinese herbals Indigowood root Manuka/kanuka oils Oral gel wafers Rhodiola algida Glutamine in other settings Traumeel S Wobe-Mugos E



The Multinational Association of Supportive com-

2.

- 1. Basic oral care
- 2. Growth factors and cytokines
- 3. Anti-inflammatory agents
- 4. Antimicrobials, coating agents, anesthetics
- 5. Laser and other light therapy (PBM)
- 6. Cryotherapy

7. Natural and miscellaneous agents

- **Favors zinc** to *prevent* OM with chemo +/- RT for oral cancer
- Do NOT use IV Glutamine to <u>prevent</u> OM w/ HD chemo ± TBI for H
- No guideline for other natural agents d/t conflicting evidence
- Do NOT use Pilocarpine to <u>prevent</u> OM w/ RT +/- TBI in H&NC, or a
- Do NOT use Oral Pentoxifylline to <u>prevent</u> OM w/ HCT
- No guideline for other misc. agents d/t inadequate/conflicting evidence

Allopurinol Payayor RT timing Bethanechol Midline mucosa-sparing RT blocks Chewing gum Propantheline Tetrachlorodecaoxide

to ± TBI for HCT

Children are not just little adults









Ch.

because kids can't fight cancer alone.

The Multinational Association of Supportive Care in Cancer

Annual Meeting 2019

www.masco

www.mascc.org/meeting

A dulls



Kids Are Not Little Adults





- Children and adolescents are more prone to develop OM -Incidence rates range from 40% to over 80% among HCT
- OM interventions effective in adults *likely* similar in children **BUT**:
 - Different pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics
 - Varying levels of cooperation
 - Different cancers and treatment regimens differ \rightarrow
 - same OM intervention may not work with different cancer therapies
 - may interfere with anticancer effectiveness

Risk Factors for OM in Children

Patient-related

Age Type of malignancy or HCT ALL, AML, Lymphoma, Osteosarcoma, HCT Pre-Tx oral health status Prior mucositis Nutritional status



Treatment-related

Risk Factors for OM in Children

Patient-related

• Treatment-related

Chemo commonly assoc. w/ OM in children Cytarabine Doxorubicin Etoposide Melphalan Methotrexate

The Multinational Association of Supportive Care in Cancer • Annual Meeting 2019

Regimen Dose Route Frequency of Administration Short vs long duration of bolus Excretion in saliva Methotrexate, Etoposide Absolute Neutrophil Count Duration of neutropenia

www.mascc.org/meeting

Children are not just little adults













Evidence re: Mucositis in Children Receiving Cancer Therapy or HCT

The Multinational Association of Supportive Care in Cancer

Annual Meeting 2019

www.mascc.org/meeting

Pediatric Oncology Group of Ontario (POGO) Mucositis <u>Prevention</u> Guideline Development Group 2017^a

- Building upon Cochrane Collaboration systemic review^b and the MASCC/ISOO clinical guidelines, with a pediatric focus.
- 3 interventions showing benefit → cryotherapy, PBM, and KGF
 - Did effectiveness differ between adults and children?
 - Included RCTs of these 3 agents that included some children
- RCTs of any other agent for OM prevention conducted exclusively in children

Outcomes:

- severe oral mucositis
- mucositis of any severity
- Mucositis-related pain
- Adverse events associated with OM intervention

a. Sung L, Robinson P, Treister N, et al. *BMJ Supportive & Palliative Care* 2017;7:7–16. <u>https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/cncr.20163</u>
 b. Worthington HV, Clarkson JE, Bryan G, et al. Interventions for preventing oral mucositis for patients with cancer receiving treatment. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2011;(4):CD000978. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD000978.pub5</u>

Summary of POGO Recommendations

- 1. <u>Cryotherapy</u> ok to offer cooperative children receiving chemo or HCT with high risk of OM \rightarrow weak, moderate-quality of evidence
 - 14 RCTs re: cryotherapy; 12 reported benefit.
 - Only 1 included children (youngest was 8 yo)
 - 8 of 14 studies around 5-FU, which is rarely used in children
 - Lacks pediatric-specific evidence, but low risk of harm
 - Inexpensive and relatively easy to administer
 - Most appropriate for use with regimens that have a short infusion time and half-life (ex: Melphalan)

	Cryotherapy		No Cryotherapy		Risk Ratio				Risk Ratio		
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI	Year	М-Н,	Random, 95% C	3	
Mahood 1991	7	50	14	45	14.4%	0.45 [0.20, 1.01]	1991	-			
Casinu 1994	4	44	10	40	10.3%	0.36 [0.12, 1.07]	1994		•		
Baydar 2005	0	45	3	54	2.0%	0.17 [0.01, 3.22]	2005	•			
Lilleby 2006	3	21	14	19	10.3%	0.19 [0.07, 0.57]	2006		<u> </u>		
Svanberg 2007	14	39	24	39	21.5%	0.58 [0.36, 0.95]	2007				
Papadeas 2007	0	36	2	40	1.9%	0.22 [0.01, 4.47]	2007	-			
Gori 2007	29	62	32	60	24.7%	0.88 [0.61, 1.25]	2007				
Sorensen 2008	7	67	21	66	14.9%	0.33 [0.15, 0.72]	2008				
Total (95% CI)		364		363	100.0%	0.46 [0.30, 0.71]		3	•		
Total events	64		120								
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	= 0.16; Chi	² = 14.4	9, df = 7 (P =	= 0.04);	² = 52%					10 100	
Test for overall effect	Z = 3.50 (P = 0.00	005)	ann 12				Favors Cryothe	erapy Favors N	lo Cryotherap	













Summary of POGO Recommendations

- 2. <u>**PBM (LLLT)**</u> ok to offer cooperative children receiving chemo or HSCT with high risk of OM \rightarrow weak, high-quality of evidence
 - Oberoi^c systematic review :
 - 18 LLLT studies, only 2 included children
 - LLLT significantly reduced incidence of severe OM (RR 0.37, 95% CI 0.2-0.67, p = 0.001) and OM-related severe pain (RR 0.26, 95% CI 0.18-0.37, p < 0.0001)
 - No difference in LLLT by age in the 2 studies that included children (p = 0.90)
 - Lacks pediatric-specific evidence, but low risk of harm
 - Requires specialized equipment and expertise \rightarrow Feasibility?
 - Ideal treatment parameters and cost-effectiveness unknown
 - Mostly administered intra-orally, but some experience with external

LLLT effective in *reducing severe OM* in pts receiving cancer Tx or HSCT

C. Oberoi S, Zamperlini-Netto G, Beyene J, et al. Effect of prophylactic low level laser therapy on oral mucositis: a systematic review and metaanalysis. PLoS ONE 2014;9:e107418. <u>https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0107418</u>



Summary of POGO Recommendations

- 3. <u>KGF</u> may be offered to children receiving HSCT regimens assoc. with high rate of severe $OM \rightarrow weak$, high-quality of evidence
 - Lack pediatric-specific efficacy and toxicity, but high value based on adult evidence
 - Theoretical concern that young children have increase risk of adverse effects related to *mucosal thickening* and *lack of long-term data* in pediatric cancers



KGF significantly *reduced severe OM* in the 8 studies reporting this outcome. **BUT** the 1 study w/ children = allo-HSCT, didn't report ped-specific results.



20

SAN FRANC

SUPPORTIVE CARE MAKES EXCELLENT CANCER CARE POSSIBLE

Fundamental Principles of Pediatric Pain Management







"Pain is whatever the experiencing person says it is, existing whenever the experiencing person says it does" (McCaffery, 1999)



Variables Used to Assess Pain in Children

- Physiologic
- Heart rate
 Oxygen saturation
- · Blood pressure
- · Respiratory rate
- Behavioral



- · Consolability · Reg
- · Activity level
- Regressive behaviors
- · Disinterest in play

 \cdot Tonicity

· Posture/position · Disinterest in self

Subjective



- · Child
- \cdot Parent
- · Clinicians






Neonatal Infant Pain Scale (NIPS)

Parameter	Finding	Points
Facial	Relaxed	0
Expression	Grimaced	1
	No cry	0
Cry	Whimper	1
	Vigorous cry	2
Ducathing	Relaxed	0
Breatning	Altered	1
	Relaxed	0
Arms	Flexed/extende d	1
	Relaxed	0
Legs	Flexed/extende d	1
State of aroused	Sleeping/awake	0
State of arousal	Fussy	1









Wong-Baker Faces



Faces Pain Scale – Revised 2001







Faces Pain Scale - Revised





This scale is intended to measure how children feel INSIDE, not how their face looks

"These faces show how much something can hurt. This face (point to leftmost face) shows no pain. The faces show more and more pain (point to each from left to right) up to this one (point to right most). It shows very much pain. Point to the face that shows how much you hurt (right now)."

Assessing mucositis pain in children

Children's International Mucositis Evaluation Scale (ChIMES)

<u>S Jacobs</u>, <u>C Baggott</u>, <u>R Agarwa</u>l, <u>L Sung</u>, et al. *British Journal of Cancer* (2013) 109: 515–2522



PAIN

1. Which of these faces best describes how much pain your child feels in their mouth or throat today?

















PAIN									
1. Which of thes	se faces best des	scribes how muc	h pain your child	feels in their mo	outh or throat tod	ay? Circle one.			
٢							Pain		1.0
0 No	1 Hurts a	2 Hurts a	3 Hurts	4 Hurts a	5 Hurts		i dili		2010
FUNCTI		inde more	even more	WHOIP IOL	worse				2019
2. Which of the mouth or thr	ese faces shows oat pain? Circle	how hard it is for one.	your child to SV	VALLOW their sa	aliva/spit today b	ecause of			21-23 JUNE SAN FRANCISCO
						Can't tell	Swallow		SUPPORTIVE CARE MAKES EXCELLENT CANCER CARE POSSIBLE
0 Not hard	1 Little: bit hard	2 Little more hard	3 Even harder	4 Very hard	5 Can't swallow				
 Which of the Circle one. 	se faces shows I	how hard it is for	your child to EA	T today because	e of mouth or thro	oat pain?		Child	Deventer
$(\hat{\bullet}\hat{\bullet})$	ÔÔ	$\overline{(0)}$	60				Eat	cniia	Reporter Parent
		~			5	tell			Dath
Not	Little: bit hard	Little more hard	Even	Very hard	Can't eat			8-12	Both
 Which of the Circle one. 	se faces shows h	how hard it is for	your child to DR	INK today becau	use of mouth or t	hroat pain?		>12	Self (child)
						Can't tell	Drink		
0 Not	1 Little	2 Little	3 Even	4 Very	5 Can't				
)N	narder	hard	annk				-
5. Has your chi	ld taken medicin	e for any kind of	pain today?						
Yes	□ No						Use of pa	in med	
If yes, did yo	our child need the	e medicine beca	use they had mo	outh or throat pai	in?				
APPEAF	RANCE								11-21
 Please look i Please look i 	in your child's mo □ No □	outh. Can you se] Can't tell	e any mouth so	res (ulcers)?			🦉 Visual as	sessment	
_									



1. Which of these faces best describes how much pain you feel in your mouth or throat today? Tap one.



Which of these faces shows how hard it is for you to SWALLOW your saliva/spit today because of mouth or throat pain? Tap one.



Which of these faces shows how hard it is for you to EAT today because of mouth or throat pain? Tap one.



 Which of these faces shows how hard it is for you to DRINK today because of mouth or throat pain? Tap one.



PAIN MEDICATION (You will need some help from your parent or another adult to answer these questions).

5. Have you taken any medicine for any kind of pain today?

V

No

Yes

If yes, did you need the medicine because you had a sore mouth or throat?

APPEARANCE (The photos shown on questionnaire instructions) are examples of what mouth sores may look like).

I can't tell

No No

Yes

6. Please ask an adult to look in your mouth. Can he or she see any mouth sores in your mouth today?



eChIMES

Tomlinson, D., Hesser, T., Maloney, AM. et al. Support Care Cancer (2014) 22: 115. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00520-013-1953-x



Common Non-Pharmacologic Strategies

Comfort Measures	Guided Imagery
 pacifier, swaddling, sucrose pacifiers 	- music, emotive imagery, special place
Distraction	Progressive Muscle
- reading, bubbles, video games, music	Relaxation
Breathing Techniques - patterned, shallow, rhythmic	Self-hypnosis/self- regulation activities



Non-pharmacological Approaches

TODDLERS

♦ Complementary

- ♦ Massage
- ♦ Warm/cool compresses
- ♦ Aromatherapy

♦ Cognitive behavioral

- ♦ Story telling
- ♦ Blowing bubbles
- ♦ Toys
- \diamond Distraction
- ♦ Art and music therapy

PRESCHOOLERS

- ♦ Complementary
 - ♦ Massage

- ZUIJ 21-23 JUNE SAN FRANCISCO SUPPORTIVE CARE MAKES EXCELLENT CANCER CARE POSSIBLE
- ♦ Warm/cool compresses
- ♦ Aromatherapy
- 🔶 Reiki
- ♦ Emotive imagery
- ♦ Cognitive behavioral
 - \diamond Distraction
 - ♦ Art and music therapy
 - ♦ Favorite toy to hold

Pediatric Clinics of North America, 2007; 54(5): 645-672.

Non-pharmacological Approaches

SCHOOL AGE & ADOLESCENTS

♦ Complementary

- 🔶 Yoga
- Aassage
- ♦ Warm/cool compresses
- ♦ Aromatherapy
- 🔶 Reiki
- ♦ Emotive imagery

- Cognitive behavioral
 - \diamond Biofeedback
 - ♦ Guided imagery
 - ♦ Progressive relaxation
 - ♦ Journal
 - ♦ Art & Music Therapy



Pediatric Clinics of North America, 2007; 54(5): 645-672.

Pharmacologic Treatment of Pain in Children

- Local Anesthetics and Topical Analgesics
- Acetaminophen and NSAIDS
- Opioids
- Combination Medications



Topical Agents for Mucositis Pain in Children

- \diamond Bland rinses
 - ♦ Saline
 - ♦ Hydrogen peroxide
- \diamond Viscous lidocaine
- \diamond Single dose of lidocaine 2% (5 ml swish and spit)
- ♦ Benzydamine topical rinse
- \diamond Lip balms, salves, and other coating agents

No significant evidence to support use of mouthwashes often called "magic mouthwash"





2012 WHO Ladder to Treat Pain in Children

A 2-step approach vs the 3-step ladder

It is recommended to use the analgesic treatment in two steps according to the child's level of pain severity

Step 1: mild pain

 Acetaminophen and NSAIDS ± non-opioid ± adjuvant



Step 2: moderate – severe pain

Opioid analgesics ± non-opioid ± adjuvant

© World Health Organization 2012

Persisting pain in children package: WHO guidelines on the pharmacological treatment of persisting pain in children with medical illnesses.



General Principles of Opioid Management

- Keep it simple
- > Avoid mixed preparations
- Steady pain control works best
- Reassess and adjust as needed
- > Anticipate, prevent, treat toxicities





Constipation

Nausea/Vomiting Myoclonus Respiratory depression Itching Confusion Somnolence

Intravenous administration of opioids

 \diamond Most common routes of administration

- ♦ Intravenous
- ♦ Subcutaneous (far less common)
- ♦ Patient-controlled analgesia used for older kids
 - ♦ Emerging use of PARENT-controlled analgesia

\diamond Most common opioids utilized

- \diamond Morphine
- ♦ Hydromorphone (Dilaudid)



IV Morphine: Start Low and Work Up

<u>Infants ≤6 months</u>

• 0.025 to 0.03 mg/kg/dose every 2 to 4 hours

Infants >6 months, Children, and Adolescents

Patient weight <50 kg: :

- Opioid naïve initial: 0.05 0.1 mg/kg/dose every 2 to 4 hours
- Opioid tolerant: 0.1 to 0.2 mg/kg/dose every 2 to 4 hours

Patient weight ≥50 kg:

Initial: 2 to 5 mg every 2 to 4 hours

Patient Age	Max Dose of IV Morphine
Infant	2 mg/dose
Children 1-6 yo	4 mg/dose
Children 7-12 yo	8 mg/dose
Adolescent	10 mg/dose





IV Morphine Administration

1. Start with an IV dose (e.g., 2 mg IV morphine)

prn for intermittent pain scheduled for steady or frequent pain



- 2. Determine how many doses needed over 24 hours 12 doses x 2 mg/dose = 24 mg
- 3. Give that dose continuously: 1 mg/hr
- 4. Add prn dosing: 1 mg prn (usually every 15 minutes)
- 5. Monitor, Reassess frequently, adjust as needed

Received: 5 December 2018	Revised: 21 February 2019	Accepted: 24February 2019	
CLINICAL PRACT	TICE GUIDELINES	Pediatric Blood & Cancer Statistics Statisti	3
Reducing pa for the deve	ain in childre lopment of	en with cancer: Methodology a clinical practice guideline	2019 21-23 JUNE SAN FRANCISCO
Renée L. Mulder ² Wim J.E. Tissing ¹ Panel* <u>https://de</u>	Anna Font-G Anna Font-G On behalf of t	ionzalez ^{2,3} Lee L. Dupuis ^{4,5} Fiona Campbell ⁶ the Pain in Children with Cancer Guideline Development First published March 2019	SUPPORTIVE CARE MAKES EXCELLENT CANCER CARE POSSIBLE

"With the current lack of evidence-based guidance in this area, and the existing large variations in daily practice, a CPG could be pivotal to improve pain outcomes and quality of life. We therefore initiated the development of a comprehensive CPG regarding pain in children with cancer."

		CG	-					P	\rightarrow									
		99	-		1	1222		2	-		8	manth	-					
	1	¢	-	- 0	68			2	manit		2	and street						
		0	-	- 6	0	147.00	- 0	2	-		2	want						
		C	-	- C	C	100		8		APP	2	-						
ī	ASSESSMENT	-	źa			рнаям/ 2b		MOREMENT	zc		<u>.</u>	Ĵa	PSYCHOLOG	CAL AND P	HYSICAL N		= /	F
ri.	-		(œ		-	1 94		-	(e			1 62	-	-	19			
÷.		•	1 60	station in case	C	60			99		-	1 60		-	99		œ/	
45		C	68	Conception of the local division of the loca	C	œ		-	60	and in the second		M		(1)	M		•••	
24	Time south	•	œ		-	H	and shares		0	-	•	H	March 1 and 1	-	٢	And Address of Concession	0	
Q	Without sectors	C	0		-	0	10000		M		(10)	2	Name and	-	品	CONTRACTOR OF	•	1
Ð	-	C	M		C	0				Terrarent .		2	-	-	2	-	C.	
9	-	•				t\$	-	-	12	-	-	1	tere and	-			1	IDX(



FIGURE 2 Flowchart of the study search and selection regarding clinical questions on the management of pain in children with cancer



89 clinical questions identified

22 after voting



Identified 5 studies on mucositis pain management in children with cancer



- 37. Bardellini E, Amadori F, Schumacher RF, D'Ippolito C, Porta F, Majorana A. Efficacy of a solution composed by verbascoside, polyvinylpyrrolidone (PVP) and sodium hyaluronate in the treatment of chemotherapy-induced oral mucositis in children with acute lymphoblastic leukemia. J Pediatr Hematol Oncol. 2016;38(7): 559-562.
- 38. Cheng KKF, Chang AM. Palliation of oral mucositis symptoms in pediatric patients treated with cancer chemotherapy. Cancer Nurs. 2003;26(6):476-484.
- 39. Collins JJ, Grier HE, Sethna NF, Wilder RT, Berde CB. Regional anesthesia for pain associated with terminal pediatric malignancy. Pain. 1996;65(1):63-69.
- 40. Oudot C, Laplanche A, Orbach D, et al. PCA analgesia for children with chemotherapy-related mucositis: a double-blind randomized comparison of morphine and pethidine. Bull Cancer. 2011;98(2): E11-E18.
- 41. Raphael MF, Den Boer AM, Abbink FCH, et al. Caphosol, a therapeutic option in case of cancer therapy-induced oral mucositis in children? Results from a prospective multicenter double blind randomized controlled trial. Support Care Cancer. 2013;21:S158-S159.



Brief Review of Recent RCT and CTs about OM in Children Receiving Cancer Therapy or HCT

Photobiomodulation Update

- LLLT (or PBM) recommended both MASCC and POGO
- Ped LLLT reviewed by He et al (2018, incl. 2015 pub)

He, Mengxue, et al. "A systematic review and meta-analysis of the effect of low-level laser therapy (LLLT) on chemotherapyinduced oral mucositis in pediatric and young patients." *European journal of pediatrics* 177.1 (2018): 7-17.

- Recently, several new RCTs in children supporting PBM
 - Prevention of OM in children:
 - reduces OM frequency, severity, and duration
 - Treatment of OM in children:
 - Reduces OM severity, incidence and overall pain, and use of analgesia
- 1. Gobbo, Margherita, et al. "Multicenter randomized, double-blind controlled trial to evaluate the efficacy of laser therapy for the treatment of severe oral mucositis induced by chemotherapy in children: laMPO RCT." *Pediatric blood & cancer* 65.8 (2018): e27098.
- 2. João Batista Medeiros-Filho, et al. Laser and photochemotherapy for the treatment of oral mucositis in young patients: Randomized clinical trial: *Photodiagnosis and Photodynamic Therapy*, Volume 18, 2017, pp. 39-45
- 3. Vânia Cavalcanti Ribeiro da Silva et al. Photodynamic therapy for treatment of oral mucositis: Pilot study with pediatric patients undergoing chemotherapy: *Photodiagnosis and Photodynamic Therapy*, Volume 21, 2018, pp. 115-120
- 4. Boris SP et al. Photobiomodulation of tissues of the oral cavity for prevention and treatment of mucositis associated with polychemotherapy in children. *Pediatric Hematology/Oncology and Immunopathology*. 2016;15(3):29-33. (In Russ.)
- 5. Vitale, M.C., et al. Preliminary study in a new protocol for the treatment of oral mucositis in pediatric patients undergoing hematopoietic stem cell transplantation (HSCT) and chemotherapy (CT) *Lasers Med Sci* (2017) 32: 1423.
- 6. Ribeiro, I.L.A.; Limeira, R.R.T.; Dias de Castro, R.; Ferreti Bonan, P.R.; Valença, A.M.G. Oral Mucositis in Pediatric Patients in Treatment for Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **2017**, *14*, 1468.



Photobiomodulation Update: Prevention



OM Occurrence



Fig. 2 Forest plot showing the meta-analysis results for the occurrence of OM after prophylactic LLLT

	uu	r	Contr	ref.		Odds Ratio		Odds	Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Wright	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI		M-H, Fixe	ed, 95% CI	
Abramoff 2008	0	11	1	11	11.4%	0.30 [0.01, 8.32]	-	•		
Ahmed 2015	1	34	4	33	31.1%	0.22 [0.02, 2.08]			-	
Cruz 2007	2	29	3	31	21.3%	0.69 [0.11, 4.47]				
Solo 2015	1	12	5	12	36.2%	0.13 (0.01, 1.33)		•	- · ·	
Total (95% CI)		86		87	100.0%	0.30 [0.10, 0.90]		-		
Total events	4		13						1	
Heterogeneity: Chi#=	1.36, df=	3 (P=	0.72), P	0%			0.01			100
Test for overall effect	Z= 2.14	(P = 0.0	33)				Favours	experimental	Favours control	100

Occurrence of greater than Grade III OM

Fig. 3 Forest plot showing the meta-analysis results for the occurrence of grade III or higher OM after prophylactic LLLT

Study or Subaroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	Control SD	Total	Weight	Std. Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% CI	Std. Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% CI
Abramoff 2008	0.364	0.674	11	1.091	0.944	11	22.8%	-0.851-1.73, 0.031	• •
Ahmed 2015	1.364	0.674	11	2.056	0.938	18	29.0%	-0.79[-1.57, -0.01]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Cruz 2007	1.654	0.745	13	1.471	0.8	11	27.3%	0.23 [-0.58, 1.04]	
Soto 2015	1.667	0.707	9	2.417	0.793	12	20.9%	-0.95[-1.87, -0.03]	
Total (95% Ct)			44			52	100.0%	0.56 [0.98, 0.14]	-
Heterogeneity Chi*:	- 5.13, df	= 3 (P =	0.16);	P= 429	6				
Test for overall effect	t Z = 2.61	(P=0.	009)						-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 avours experimental Eavours control

Occurrence of severe OM

Fig. 4 Forest plot showing the meta-analysis results for OM severity after prophylactic LLLT

He, Mengxue, et al. "A systematic review and meta-analysis of the effect of low-level laser therapy (LLLT) on chemotherapyinduced oral mucositis in pediatric and young patients." *European journal of pediatrics* 177.1 (2018): 7-17.

Photobiomodulation Update: Treatment



	Expe	erimen	ital	C	ontrol			Std. Mean Difference		Std. Mean Difference	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI		IV. Fixed, 95% Cl	
Amadori 2016	0	0.74	62	1	0.74	61	75.2%	-1.34 [-1.74, -0.95]	-		
Kuhn 2009	1.11	0.33	.9	1.25	0.45	12	15.3%	-0.33 [-1.20, 0.54]			~ ~ ~
Vitale 2017	1.5	0.76	8	2.38	0.52	8	9.5%	-1.28 [-2.38, -0.17]	•••		OM
Total (95% CI)			79			81	100.0%	-1.18 [-1.52, -0.84]	٠	8	severity
Heterogeneity: Chi#:	= 4.32, df	= 2 (P	= 0.12	; P= 54	36				\rightarrow		
Test for overall effect	t Z = 6.81	(P < (0.00001	1)				3	avours et	-0.5 0 0.5 1	

Fig. 5 Forest plot showing the meta-analysis results for OM severity after thempeutie LLLT

	Expe	rimer	ital	C	ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% C	I IV, Random, 95% Cl	
Amadori 2016	0	0.1	62	1	0.25	61	58.9%	-1.00 [-1.07, -0.93	3]	Degree of
Vitale 2017	2.85	0.5	8	3.2	0.6	8	41.1%	-0.35 [-0.89, 0.19	N	OM-related
Total (95% CI)			70			69	100.0%	-0.73 [-1.36, -0.11		
Heterogeneity: Tau*	= 0.17; Ct	17=5	46, df :	= 1 (P =	0.02);	I* = 82	%			oral pain
Test for overall effect	Z= 2.29	(P = (0.02)						Favours experimental Favours control	·

Fig. 6 Forest plot showing the meta-analysis results for oral pain after therapeutic LLLT

He, Mengxue, et al. "A systematic review and meta-analysis of the effect of low-level laser therapy (LLLT) on chemotherapyinduced oral mucositis in pediatric and young patients." *European journal of pediatrics* 177.1 (2018): 7-17.

Photobiomodulation Update

The basic disease and methods of treatment	Age of patients,	Laser therapy methods	Develo complic	pment of ations, %	Source
	years		After LLLT	Without LLLT	
A randomized, prospective, controlled trial during 93 sessions of chemotherapy with highdose methotrexate for acute lymphoblastic leukemia or lymphoma involved 33 children: 17 - main group, 16 - comparison group	The main, 1.7-17.9 (Av. age - 5.9) Comparison group 1.2-16.3 (Av. age - 8.4)	$\lambda = 670$ nm, HP, M = 30 mW, S = 0.5cm ² ; E = 12-24 secs per one zone. For prevention, each of the 13 affected areas were consistently illuminated: the left and right cheek tissues along the line of teeth closing, the retromolar space, the lateral and ventral surfaces of the tongue, and the palate, upper and lower	59	88	Boris S.P. et al., 2016 [<u>16]</u>



Moskvin, Sergey, et al. "A brief literature review and own clinical experience in prophylaxis of oral mucositis in children using low level laser therapy." *BioMedicine* 9.1 (2019).

14 studies reviewed, most included in 2017 He article, except for this Russian one

¹⁶ Photobiomodulation of tissues of the oral cavity for prevention and treatment of mucositis associated with polychemotherapy in children. *Pediatric Hematology/Oncology and Immunopathology*. 2016;15(3):29-33. (In Russ.)

PBM to TREAT Mucositis Pain in Children

1 had parent or guardian who declined

to participate



Primary outcome:

• severity of OM day +7

Secondary outcomes:

- OM days +4 and 11
- decreased analgesia use
- adverse events

Diode laser treated on Days +1 \rightarrow +4

- 660 and 970 nm-combined wavelength
- 3.2 W peak power
- 320 mW/cm2 irradiance
- 36.8 J/cm2
- 50% frequency
- 9 areas of oral cavity treated
- 2 consecutive 2-3 min treatments

Gobbo M, Verzegnassi F, Ronfani L, et al. Multicenter randomized, double-blind controlled trial to evaluate the efficacy of laser therapy for the treatment of severe oral mucositis induced by chemotherapy in children: laMPO RCT. *Pediatr Blood Cancer*. 2018;65:e27098. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/pbc.27098</u>

The Multinational Association of Supportive Care in Cancer

Annual Meeting 2019

www.mascc.org/meeting

, , ,





102 subjects admitted with oral mucositis

WHO 3-4

101 eligible and

randomized subjects



PBM to TREAT Mucositis Pain in Children

TABLE 2 Study results

	Laser therapy (n = 51)	Sham therapy $(n = 50)$	P
OMgrade at day +4, number (%)		d) - 157	
Grade 4 Grade 3 Grade < 3	7 (14%) 16 (31%) 28 (55%)	12 (24%) 19 (38%) 19 (38%)	0.19
OM grade at day +7, number (%)	(n = 49)		
Grade 4 Grade 3 Grade < 3	1 (2.0%) 2 (4.1%) 46 (94%)	8 (16%) 6 (12%) 36 (72%)	0.01
OM grade at day +11, number (%)	(n=49)		
Grade 4 Grade 3 Grade < 3	0 1 (2.1%) 47 (98%)	5 (10%) 5 (10%) 40 (80%)	0.02
Self-reported pain score at day +4, median (IQR)	4 (2-6)	5 (3-7)	0.07
Self-reported pain score at day +7, median (IQR)	1 (0-3)	2.5 (1-5)	0.006
Self-reported pain score at day +11, median (IQR)	0 (0-1)	1 (0-3)	0.01
Analgesic use at day +7, number (%)			
Parenteral Oral Topical Combined No use	15 (31%) 5 (10%) 0 4 (8.2%) 25 (51%)	18 (36%) 8 (16%) 0 5 (10%) 19 (38%)	0.60
Neutrophil count at day +4, median (IQR)	100 (0-800)	104(0-580)	0.98
Neutrophil count at day +7, median (IQR)	770 (100–1938)	917(50-2100)	0.79
Neutrophil count at day +11, median (IQR)	1456 (503-4158)	1380 (275-2875)	0.32
Admission due to isolated OM	(n = 48) 6 / 48 (13%)	8 / 50 (16%)	0.62

Gobbo M, Verzegnassi F, Ronfani L, et al. Multicenter randomized, double-blind controlled trial to evaluate the efficacy of laser therapy for the treatment of severe oral mucositis induced by chemotherapy in children: laMPO RCT. *Pediatr Blood Cancer*. 2018;65:e27098. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/pbc.27098</u>



PBM to TREAT Mucositis Pain in Children





FIGURE 2 Percentage of patients with OM grade 3-4 in the PBM group (white columns) and sham group (black columns) on days +1, +4, +7, and +11

Gobbo M, Verzegnassi F, Ronfani L, et al. Multicenter randomized, double-blind controlled trial to evaluate the efficacy of laser therapy for the treatment of severe oral mucositis induced by chemotherapy in children: laMPO RCT. *Pediatr Blood Cancer*. 2018;65:e27098. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/pbc.27098</u>

Photobiomodulation Update: Treatment High-Power Laser Therapy (Pilot Clinical Trial)





Fig. 1 Visual analogue scale—VAS score progression between day 0 and day 11

- 16 ped HCT randomize, blind $CT \rightarrow HPLT$ or Sham
 - HPLT = 970 nm, 3.2 W (50%), 35-60,000 Hz, 240 s
 - Treatments daily x 4 from first OM Sx
- Outcomes at days 0, 3, 7 and 11
 - Severity and duration of OM \rightarrow WHO OM grading scale
 - OM-associated pain \rightarrow Visual Analogue Scale (pain)

en day 0 Fig. 2 Mucositis scale—CTC score progression between day 0 and day 11

st OM Sx 1 → WHO OM grading scale al Analogue Scale (pain)

Vitale, Marina Consuelo, et al. "Preliminary study in a new protocol for the treatment of oral mucositis in pediatric patients undergoing hematopoietic stem cell transplantation (HSCT) and chemotherapy (CT)." *Lasers in medical science* 32.6 (2017): 1423-1428.

Photobiomodulation Update

- Intraoral vs extraoral?
- Optimal dosing and delivery?
- Other new PBM modalities?



1. Anna N. Yaroslavsky, Nathaniel S. Treister et al, "A Monte Carlo simulation of the dosimetry of extraorally delivered photobiomodulation therapy (Conference Presentation)," Proc. SPIE 10477, Mechanisms of Photobiomodulation Therapy XIII, 104770H (14 March 2018);



Photobiomodulation (PBM) Update



Intraoral

- Multiple RCTs and meta-analyses showing effective
 - Adults and children
 - Prevention and for pain
- More complex procedure
 - Spots vs scanning
- Treatment parameters defined, but not optimal & no dose response
 - Dose in children?





- Simpler application, larger treatment
- LED arrays allow larger surface to be treated with a single exposure
- More comfortable for patient
 - especially children
- Requires unique device/treatment parameters d/t skin/tissue attenuation
 - Median-centered treatment plan approach?

Anna N. Yaroslavsky, Nathaniel S. Treister et al, "A Monte Carlo simulation of the dosimetry of extraorally delivered photobiomodulation therapy (Conference Presentation)," Proc. SPIE 10477, Mechanisms of Photobiomodulation Therapy XIII, 104770H (14 March 2018);

Use of KGF for Children Receiving HCT



- RCT
- prevention
- Ages 7 16 yo
- ALL → HCT
- KGF daily x 3, twice
 - 60 mcg/kg/day
 - 3 days prior to conditioning, then
 - Days 0, +1 and +2
- Outcomes:
 - WHO oral-toxicity scale

SUDDUDUTIVE

CANCER CARE POSSIBLE

 self-reported Oral Mucositis Daily Questionnaire

Alessandra Lucchese et al Efficacy and effects of palifermin for the treatment of oral mucositis in patients affected by acute lymphoblastic leukemia, *Leukemia & Lymphoma*, 57:4, 820-827, (2016) DOI: 10.3109/10428194.2015.1081192



Use of KGF for Children Receiving HCT

Alessandra Lucchese et al Efficacy and effects of palifermin for the treatment of oral mucositis in patients affected by acute lymphoblastic leukemia, *Leukemia & Lymphoma*, 57:4, 820-827, (2016) DOI: 10.3109/10428194.2015.1081192

21-

SAN FRANCI

SUPPORTIVE CARE

MAKES EXCELLENT CANCER CARE POSSIBLE

Use of KGF for Children Receiving HCT

Table III. Efficacy of palifermin in the control and palifer	min groups.
--	-------------

	Palifermin group (n = 27)	Control group (n = 27)	p value
Incidence of ulcerative OM, n (%)	12 (48)	18 (72)	0.081
Duration of ulcerative OM days, mean (SD)	6 (1.2)	15 (1.6)	0.027
Incidence of severe OM, n (%)	4 (16)	7 (28)	0.124
Duration of severe OM days, median (range)	3.0 (0-21)	8.0 (0-26)	0.04
AUC for Patients-reported MTS, mean (SD)	30 (41)	45 (33)	0.06
Mean grading of mucositis	1.65	2.33	0.033

AUC, area under the curve; MTS, mouth and throat soreness; OM, oral mucositis; SD, standard deviation.

Table	IV.	Efficacy	of	palifermin	in	the	control	and	palifermin
group	s fo	r patient	-re	ported outo	on	nes.			82

	Scale	Palifermin group (n = 27)	Control group $(n = 27)$	p value
Sleeping, mean (SD)	0-5	1 (0.6)	3 (1.1)	≤0.001
Swallowing, mean (SD)	0-5	1 (0.5)	4 (0.8)	<0.001
Drinking, mean (SD)	0-5	1 (0.3)	4 (1.1)	< 0.001
Eating, mean (SD)	0-5	2 (0.4)	3 (33)	≤0.001
Talking, mean (SD)	0-5	0 (0.2)	3 (0.2)	≤0.001

Scale: 0 = Not limited, 5 = Unable to do.

- Decrease duration of severe OM
- Less mucosal pain
- Decreased use of narcotics
- Improved ability to
 - Sleep
 - Swallow
 - Drink
 - Eat
 - Talk
 - General Quality of life

Alessandra Lucchese et al Efficacy and effects of palifermin for the treatment of oral mucositis in patients affected by acute lymphoblastic leukemia, *Leukemia & Lymphoma*, 57:4, 820-827, (2016) DOI: 10.3109/10428194.2015.1081192





Thank You!

Email: Lauren_Bruckner@URMC.Rochester.EDU

- 1. Basic oral care
 - **Favors oral care protocols** (toothbrushing, flossing, daily mouth rinse) for all to <u>prevent</u> OM
 - Do NOT use Chlorhexidine (at least not for H&NRT) to prevent OM
 - No guideline about which **mouth rinse** is best, but use of anything regularly better than none
- 2. Growth factors and cytokines
 - **Recommends KGF** (Palifermin) to <u>prevent</u> OM in HD chemo + TBI auto-**HCT for heme Cancers**
 - Did NOT support GM-CSF to prevent OM in HD chemo for auto- or allo- HCT
 - No guidelines for many others
- 3. Anti-inflammatory agents
 - Recommends Benzydamine mouthwash to prevent OM in RT for H&NC (< 50 Gy) w/o chemo
 - But no guideline for >50 Gy
 - **Do NOT use Misoprostil MW** to *prevent* OM in RT for H&NC
 - No guideline about **Amifostine** to <u>prevent</u> OM nor others
- 4. Antimicrobials, coating agents, anesthetics, and analgesics
 - Recommends Morphine PCA; Favors Fentanyl patch, Morphine and Doxepine MW to <u>treat</u> OM pain
 - **Do NOT use Antimicrobial lozenge & pastes (PTA, BCoG) or Iseganan MW** to <u>prevent</u> OM w/ RT for H&NC
 - Did NOT support Sucralfate to <u>prevent or treat</u> OM w/ chemo or RT for H&NC
 - No guideline possible for any anesthetic nor many other agents
- 5. Laser and other light therapy (PBM)
 - Recommends LLLT to <u>prevent</u> OM in HCT and Favors LLLT to <u>prevent</u> OM in RT alone for H&NC
 - No guideline for LLLT in other settings or for other emerging light Tx to prevent or treat OM
- 6. Cryotherapy
 - Recommends cryotherapy to <u>prevent</u> OM w/ 5-FU; Favors it to <u>prevent</u> OM w HD Melphalan in HCT +/- TBI
 - No guideline for cryotherapy in other settings due to inadequate evidence
- 7. Natural and miscellaneous agents
 - Favors zinc to <u>prevent</u> OM with chemo +/- RT for oral cancer
 - Do NOT use IV Glutamine, Pilocarpine, or Pentoxyfyline to prevent OM w/ HD chemo ± TBI for HCT
 - Do NOT use Pilocarpine to <u>prevent</u> OM w/ RT +/- TBI in H&NC
 - No guideline for many other natural and miscellaneous agents d/t inadequate/conflicting evidence

