Efficacy of percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy on unplanned treatment interruption and nutritional status in patients undergoing chemoradiotherapy for advanced head and neck cancer
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Abstract: Objective: Efficacy of percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy (PEG) on unplanned treatment interruption and nutritional status was examined in patients undergoing chemoradiotherapy (CRT) for advanced head and neck cancer. Methods: We retrospectively reviewed hospital charts of 44 patients with advanced head and neck cancer who were treated with CRT. Results: CRT-induced mucositis of grade 3 or worse and inadequate oral intake of less than one third of their usual intake developed in 33 patients who were recommended PEG placement, but not in 11 patients. Thirteen patients accepted PEG placement and then completed CRT (compliant group). However, among 20 patients who refused both PEG and nasogastric tube (NGT) placements (non-compliant group), 10 required unplanned interruptions of CRT at a radiation dose around 30-40 Gy (UI-CRT group) while 10 others could complete CRT without interruption (C-CRT group). Total serum protein levels were significantly decreased after CRT in all patients. Discussion: It is suggested that therapeutic PEG placement is useful for preventing unplanned interruption of CRT in patients with advanced head and neck cancer. After severe mucositis and inadequate oral intake have developed during CRT, PEG placement should be considered before the radiation therapy dose of 30 Gy. J. Med. Invest. 62 : 173-176, August, 2015
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INTRODUCTION

For patients with advanced stage squamous cell carcinoma of the head and neck, chemoradiotherapy (CRT) is frequently used as the primary treatment in order to achieve organ preservation and to improve survival. However, most patients who are treated with CRT for advanced head and neck cancer suffer from its side effects such as dysphagia, mucositis, xerostomia and nausea. Severe oropharyngeal mucositis leads to decreased oral food intake, resulting in interruption of CRT that may reduce its efficacy (1, 2).

Nasogastric tube (NGT) is often placed as enteral nutritional support for head and neck cancer patients with CRT-induced mucositis. However, NGT is frequently associated with local irritation, which might worsen mucositis, risk of aspiration pneumonia and high frequency of occlusion. Recently, percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy (PEG) has been introduced for nutritional support for patients with advanced head and neck cancer undergoing CRT (3, 4). It was reported that in comparison with NGT, PEG was equally effective in maintaining body weight with less rates of mechanical failure and aspiration pneumonia (5). Moreover, PEG has additional advantages in terms of mobility, cosmetics and quality of life. Thus, PEG is now a safe and effective method of providing enteral nutrition during CRT in patients with advanced head and neck cancer. In order to clarify if PEG placement improves the completion of CRT and nutrition status in head and neck cancer patients, the present study examined the efficacy of PEG on unplanned treatment interruption and total serum protein levels in patients treated with CRT for advanced head and neck cancer. For that purpose, we recommended the placement of PEG in patients with inadequate oral food intake of less than one third of their usual intake due to severe CRT-induced mucositis. Then, we compared the rate of treatment interruption and total serum protein concentration in patients who accepted PEG placement with those who refused it.

PATIENTS AND METHODS

Patients and study design

We retrospectively reviewed hospital charts of 44 patients with advanced head and neck cancer (38 males, 6 females, the average age was 68.4±10.3 years old, 53-85 years old) who were treated with CRT at the Department of Otolaryngology of Tokushima University Hospital. Tumor sites included : nasopharynx (n=7), oropharynx (n=8), hypopharynx (n=13), larynx (n=10), oral cavity (n=4), and metastatic cervical lymph nodes of unknown origin (n=2). All patients were previously untreated and had locally advanced stage III or stage IV disease (Table 1). The radiation dose was approximately 70 Gy, and chemotherapy usually consisted of cisplatin and 5-fluorouracil. We performed concurrent CRT, except alternative CRT for nasopharyngeal cancer. This study was approved by the Committee for Medical Ethics of Tokushima University Hospital.

Treatment and placement of PEG

Indications criteria for PEG placement were as follows : CRT-induced mucositis of grade 3 or worse on common terminology criteria for adverse events (CTCAE Version 4.0) and inadequate
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Results

Efficacy of PEG on treatment interruption of chemoradiotherapy

All 44 patients who were treated with CRT for advanced head and neck cancer suffered from CRT-induced mucositis of grade 3 or worse and 33 of them developed inadequate oral intake of less than one third of their usual intake. Because they met our criteria for PEG placement during CRT, we recommended them for this nutritional support method. Among them, 13 patients accepted PEG placement (the compliant group), while the remaining 11 patients did not meet the criteria for PEG placement (non-indication group).

PEG was placed using the Pull method, as described by Ponsky et al. (10). No complications were associated with PEG tube placement such as local infections, tube blockage, migration or dislodgement.

CRT-induced non-hematologic toxicity of grade 3 or worse (other than mucositis) and CRT-induced hematologic toxicity of grade 4 led to the interruption of CRT. But, in patients with only CRT-induced mucositis of grade 3 or worse without hematologic toxicity of grade 4, CRT was interrupted when patient had difficulty eating.

Assessment of total serum protein levels

Total serum protein (TP) levels were measured before and after CRT in all patients and taken as an index of nutritional status.

Statistical analysis

Fisher’s exact probability test, Student’s t-test and ANOVA with Kruskal-Wallis post hoc test were used for statistical analysis, and P< 0.05 was considered significant.

Table 1 Patient characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tumor site</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean age (years)</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Stage II</th>
<th>Stage IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nasopharynx</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>68.9±14.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oropharynx</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>63.1±9.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypopharynx</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>69.3±11.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larynx</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67.6±7.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral cavity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>74.8±6.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown origin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>77.5±9.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data show as either n, or mean± standard deviation.

Efficacy of PEG on nutritional status

Serum TP levels were significantly decreased after CRT in each group (Fig. 3). The decrease rate of serum TP in the compliant group was 6.4±9.0% (mean± SD) ; 6.4±7.6 in the non-compliant group ; 13.1±8.7% in patients who completed CRT without interruption, and 8.3±7.4% in those of the non-indication group. There were not significant differences among groups.

Adverse events except mucositis during chemoradiotherapy

In the compliant and non-compliant groups, 4 patients suffered
from grade 3 leukopenia in each group, while 1 patient suffered from both grade 4 leukopenia of and grade 3 dermatitis at the interruption of CRT. There was no significant difference in the frequency of grade 3 leukopenia between the groups.

**DISCUSSION**

Most patients with advanced head and neck cancer have some degree of malnutrition, which is deteriorated by toxic side-effects during CRT. Although NGT is useful for short-term nutritional support, PEG is indicated for long-term nutritional support when oral intake is inadequate. In the present study, of 44 patients who were treated with CRT for advanced head and neck cancer, 33 met the criteria for PEG placement. Among them, 13 patients accepted the placement and subsequently completed their CRT. However, among the 20 patients who refused both PEG and NGT placements, unplanned interruptions of CRT were required in 10 of them. Their interruption period ranged from 1 week to 4 weeks. Patel, et al. reported that advanced head and neck cancer patients who required break of radiation for more than 2 weeks were significantly more likely to have residual tumor in the neck after CRT (2). McCloskey, et al. also reported that CRT interruption of more than a week constitutes a significant higher risk of loco-regional recurrence of tumor (1). Therefore, it is suggested that PEG placement is useful for preventing unplanned interruption of CRT in patients with advanced head and neck cancer, resulting in improvement of their residual and recurrent rates of tumor. Prospective controlled studies are necessary to clarify whether PEG placement improves the prognosis of advanced head and neck cancer.

In the present study, among 10 patients who refused both PEG and NGT placements, unplanned interruptions of CRT were required at a radiation dose around 30-40 Gy in 8 patients. The indication of therapeutic PEG placement is still controversial, because no single marker can be used to identify malnutrition (3, 4). Therefore, after severe mucositis and inadequate oral intake have developed, therapeutic PEG placement should be considered before the dose of 30 Gy in patients with advanced head and neck cancer undergoing CRT.

The same as for patients in whom PEG placement was indicated, serum TP levels were significantly decreased after CRT in those who did not undergo the procedure. This finding suggests that malnutrition further developed even in patients with mild/moderate CRT-induced mucositis during CRT. Moreover, it is suggested that therapeutic PEG placement did not prevent malnutrition, because TP levels were decreased even in patients who accepted it. All patients who accepted PEG placement completed CRT without interruption regardless of their significant decrease of serum TP levels after CRT. It may be suggested that enteral feeding by PEG placement improve nutritional status that can’t be estimated by only serum TP levels. Since malnutrition is a strong independent predictor of survival in patients with advanced head and neck cancer (11), prophylactic PEG is recommended in all patients with advanced head and neck cancer before CRT.

Recently, a randomized controlled trial showed evidence for prophylactic PEG placement in the prevention of malnutrition and improved quality of life in patients with advanced head and neck cancer (12). Moreover, Raykher reported that PEG feeding allowed CRT to continue without interruption in 93% of patients with head and neck cancer (13). However, Lee et al. reported that prophylactic PEG had no effect in the rate of treatment interruption in patients undergoing intensive radiation therapy for head and neck cancer (14). In the present study, based on our indication criteria for PEG placement including CRT-induced mucositis of grade 3 or worse and inadequate oral intake of less than one third of the usual intake, 11 patients (25%) did not meet our indication criteria, but completed CRT uninterrupted without PEG. Therefore, it is suggested that prophylactic PEG placement is not needed before CRT in all head and neck cancer patients and therapeutic PEG placement is preferred in response to inadequate oral intake during CRT. Further study is necessary to examine whether prophylactic or therapeutic PEG placement is warranted in the treatment of advanced head and neck cancer by CRT (15).

The pull method of PEG placement in patients with head and neck cancer is widely applied, because it is easy to perform and can be accomplished without general anesthesia, though there is a possibility of exit site metastasis due to the pull method. However, the risk is accepted, because it is very low (< 1%) (16).

There is also the possibility that PEG placement during CRT increases the risk of surgical site infection and bleeding of CRT-induced mucositis. To reduce the risk, PEG was placed more than a week before or after chemotherapy in the study. Accordingly, no surgical complications developed.

In conclusion, in patients undergoing CRT for advanced head and neck cancer, the efficacy of PEG on its unplanned interruption was examined. Therapeutic PEG placement was useful in preventing unplanned interruption of CRT. After severe mucositis and inadequate oral intake have developed during CRT, PEG placement should be considered before the dose of 30 Gy.
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