

# COG Supportive Care Endorsed Guidelines

Version date: July 22, 2021

The Children's Oncology Group (COG) Supportive Care Endorsed Guidelines are comprised of evidence-based guidelines which have been developed by other organizations and endorsed by the COG. The COG guideline endorsement process is available on the COG Supportive Care Guidelines [webpage](#). The endorsed guideline developers' assessment of the strength of each recommendation and the quality of the evidence to support the recommendation is provided whenever possible (see [Appendix 1](#)). When the endorsed guideline developers used another method to communicate the strength of each recommendation and the quality of the evidence to support the recommendation, the method is provided in the guideline summary.

Supportive Care Guidelines Currently Endorsed by COG	
1. Guideline for <b>Antibacterial Prophylaxis</b> Administration in Pediatric Cancer and Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation Date of endorsement: June 2020	<a href="#">See page 3</a>
2. Clinical Practice Guideline for Systemic <b>Antifungal Prophylaxis</b> in Pediatric Patients with Cancer and Hematopoietic Stem-Cell Transplantation Recipients Date of endorsement: August 2020	<a href="#">See page 6</a>
3. <b>Atraumatic (pencil-point) versus conventional needles for lumbar puncture</b> : a clinical practice guideline Date of endorsement: May 2019	<a href="#">See page 10</a>
4. Prevention and Treatment of <b>Chemotherapy-induced Nausea and Vomiting</b> in Children Receiving Chemotherapy Dates of endorsement: Oct 2016, Jan 2018 and July 2021.	<a href="#">See page 11</a>
5. Guidelines on the Management of <b>Chronic Pain</b> in Children Date of endorsement: July 2021	<a href="#">See page 18</a>
6. Prevention of <b>cisplatin-induced ototoxicity</b> in children and adolescents with cancer: a clinical practice guideline Date of endorsement: August 2020	<a href="#">See page 21</a>
7. Guideline for the Management of <b>Clostridium Difficile</b> Infection in Children and Adolescents With Cancer and Pediatric Hematopoietic Stem-Cell Transplantation Recipients Date of endorsement: February 2019	<a href="#">See page 22</a>
8. Management of <b>Fatigue</b> Children and Adolescents with Cancer and in Pediatric Recipients of Hematopoietic Stem-Cell Transplants Date of endorsement: September 2018	<a href="#">See page 23</a>
9. <b>Fertility Preservation</b> for Patients with Cancer Date of endorsement: November 2018	<a href="#">See page 24</a>

10. Management of <b>Fever and Neutropenia</b> in Children with Cancer and/or Undergoing Hematopoietic Stem-Cell Transplantation Date of endorsement: September 2017	<a href="#">See page 28</a>
11. <b>Platelet Transfusion</b> for Patients with Cancer Dates of endorsement: October 2018	<a href="#">See page 31</a>
12. Treatment of Pediatric Venous <b>Thromboembolism</b> Date of endorsement: May 2019	<a href="#">See page 35</a>

To discuss any aspect of the COG Supportive Care Guidelines please contact a member of the COG Supportive Care Guideline Committee.

DISCLAIMER

**For Informational Purposes Only:** The information and contents offered in or in connection with the *Children’s Oncology Group Supportive Care Endorsed Guidelines* (the “Guidelines”) is provided only for informational purposes to children affected by cancer, their families and their health care providers. The Guidelines are not intended to substitute for medical advice, medical care, diagnosis or treatment obtained from doctors or other healthcare providers.

While the Children’s Oncology Group tries to provide accurate and up-to-date information, the information in the Guidelines may be or may become out of date or incomplete. The information and guidelines may not conform to current standard of care, state-of-the art, or best practices for a particular disease, condition, or treatment. Some information in the Guidelines may be intended to be used by clinical researchers in special clinical settings or situations that may not apply to you, your child or your patient.

**Special Notice to cancer patients and their parents and legal guardians:** The Children’s Oncology Group is a research organization and does not provide individualized medical care or treatment.

*The Guidelines are not intended to replace the independent clinical judgment, medical advice, screening, health counseling, or other intervention performed by your or your child’s doctor or other healthcare provider. Please do not rely on this information exclusively and seek the care of a doctor or other medical professional if you have any questions regarding the Guidelines or a specific medical condition, disease, diagnosis or symptom.*

*Please contact “911” or your emergency services for any health emergency!*

**Special Notice to physicians and other healthcare providers:** This document is aimed specifically at members of the Children’s Oncology Group or Member affiliates who have agreed to collaborate with the Children’s Oncology Group in accordance with the relevant procedures and policies for study conduct and membership participation. Requirements and restrictions applicable to recipients of U.S. governmental funds or restrictions governing certain private donations may apply to the use and distribution of the Guidelines and the information contained herein.

The Guidelines are not intended to replace your independent clinical judgment, medical advice, or to exclude other legitimate criteria for screening, health counseling, or intervention for specific complications of childhood cancer treatment. The Guidelines provided are not intended as a sole source of guidance in the evaluation of childhood cancer patients. Nor are the Guidelines intended to exclude other reasonable alternative care. Specific patient care decisions are the prerogative of the patient, family and healthcare provider.

**Warranty or Liability Assumed by Children’s Oncology Group and Related Parties:** While the Children's Oncology Group has tried to assure that the Guidelines are accurate and complete as of the date of publication, no warranty or representation, express or implied, is intended to be made in or with the Guidelines. No liability is assumed by the Children's Oncology Group or any affiliated party or member thereof for damage resulting from the use, review, or access of the Guidelines.

[Table of Contents](#)

**1. Guideline for Antibacterial Prophylaxis Administration in Pediatric Cancer and Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation**

The “Guideline for Antibacterial Prophylaxis Administration in Pediatric Cancer and Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation” developed by the Pediatric Oncology Group of Ontario was endorsed by the COG Supportive Care Guideline Committee in June 2020.

The source clinical practice guideline is published (Lehrnbecher T, Fisher BT, Phillips B, et al. Guideline for antibacterial prophylaxis administration in pediatric cancer and hematopoietic stem cell transplantation. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2020; 71 (1): 226-36.) and is available at: <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciz1082>.

The purpose of the source clinical practice guideline is to provide recommendations for systemic antibacterial prophylaxis administration in pediatric patients with cancer and recipients of hematopoietic stem cell transplant. These recommendations are presented in the table below.

**Summary of Recommendations for Antibacterial Prophylaxis Administration in Pediatric Cancer and Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation**

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence*
<b>Which pediatric patients with cancer and HSCT recipients (if any) should routinely receive systemic antibacterial prophylaxis?</b>	
<p>1. Consider systemic antibacterial prophylaxis administration in children with AML and relapsed ALL receiving intensive chemotherapy expected to result in severe neutropenia (absolute neutrophil count &lt;500/<math>\mu</math>L) for at least 7 days.</p> <p><i>Remarks:</i> This is a weak recommendation because the benefits of prophylaxis were closely balanced against its known and potential impacts on resistance. The panel valued what is known about efficacy and resistance outcomes of prophylaxis administered within the finite time frame of a clinical trial among enrolled participants but also considered the less certain impacts of a universal prophylaxis strategy at both the patient and institutional level. Limiting prophylaxis to patient populations at highest risk of fever and neutropenia, bacteremia, and infection-related mortality could limit antibiotic utilization to those most likely to benefit from prophylaxis. Careful discussion with patients and families about the potential risks and benefits of prophylaxis is important. Understanding local resistance epidemiology is critical to the decision of whether to implement prophylaxis.</p>	<p>Weak recommendation High-quality evidence</p>

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence*
<p>2. We suggest that systemic antibacterial prophylaxis not be used routinely for children receiving induction chemotherapy for newly diagnosed ALL.</p> <p><i>Remarks:</i> The panel acknowledged the paucity of direct contemporary randomized data applicable to children living in high-income countries. A recommendation to provide universal systemic prophylaxis to this group could have a substantial impact on institutions, given that ALL is the most common cancer diagnosis in children. There is great variability in duration of neutropenia and risk of bacteremia based on treatment protocol and patient-level characteristics. Further data are required to identify subgroups of pediatric patients with ALL who might particularly benefit from prophylaxis.</p>	<p>Weak recommendation Low-quality evidence</p>
<p>3. Do not use systemic antibacterial prophylaxis for children whose therapy is not expected to result in severe neutropenia (absolute neutrophil count severe neutropenia (absolute neutrophil count &lt;500/<math>\mu</math>L) for at least 7 days.</p> <p><i>Remarks:</i> This strong recommendation was based on reduced chance of benefit combined with continued risk of harm associated with systemic antibacterial prophylaxis.</p>	<p>Strong recommendation Moderate-quality evidence</p>
<p>4. We suggest that systemic antibacterial prophylaxis not be used routinely for children undergoing autologous HSCT.</p> <p><i>Remarks:</i> This weak recommendation against routine use of antibacterial prophylaxis in autologous HSCT recipients acknowledged the risk reduction of bacteremia among this cohort. However, the panel believed that the lower baseline risk of bacteremia resulted in the impact on resistance (known and potential) outweighing the benefits. The moderate quality of evidence reflected the lack of granular data specifically in autologous HSCT recipients rather than HSCT patients as a group.</p>	<p>Weak recommendation Moderate-quality evidence</p>
<p>5. We suggest that systemic antibacterial prophylaxis not be used routinely for children undergoing allogeneic HSCT.</p> <p><i>Remarks:</i> The panel acknowledged that the granularity of available data did not allow a different recommendation for allogeneic compared with autologous HSCT recipients. However, the panel noted that allogeneic HSCT recipients often have preceding conditions that could be associated with prophylaxis (eg, AML or relapsed ALL) and have prolonged neutropenia during the HSCT process, which could influence the effectiveness and adverse effects associated with prophylaxis.</p>	<p>Weak recommendation Moderate-quality evidence</p>

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence*
<b>Which agents should be used for systemic antibacterial prophylaxis in children with cancer and HSCT recipients?</b>	
<p>6. Levofloxacin is the preferred agent if systemic antibacterial prophylaxis is planned.</p> <p><i>Remarks:</i> The strong recommendation to use levofloxacin is related to direct contemporary data in children and its microbiological spectrum of activity. If levofloxacin is not available or not able to be used, ciprofloxacin is an alternative, although lack of activity against gram-positive bacteria including viridans group streptococci may reduce the benefits of prophylaxis. Patients and families should be informed about potential short- and long-term fluoroquinolone-related adverse effects. Understanding local resistance epidemiology is critical to the decision of whether to implement fluoroquinolone prophylaxis. If fluoroquinolones are not available or cannot be used, providing no systemic antibacterial prophylaxis is an important option to consider.</p>	<p>Strong recommendation Moderate-quality evidence</p>
<b>When should systemic antibacterial prophylaxis be started and stopped?</b>	
<p>7. If systemic antibacterial prophylaxis is planned, we suggest that administration be restricted to the expected period of severe neutropenia (absolute neutrophil count &lt;500/<math>\mu</math>L).</p> <p><i>Remarks:</i> This is a weak recommendation based on low-quality evidence because there are no trials that compared different start and stop criteria. In general, trials administered prophylaxis during severe neutropenia and thus this recommendation reflects the available evidence and the panel's desire to minimize duration of prophylaxis administration.</p>	<p>Weak recommendation Low-quality evidence</p>

\*see Appendix 1

[Table of Contents](#)

## 2. Clinical Practice Guideline for Systemic Antifungal Prophylaxis in Pediatric Patients with Cancer and Hematopoietic Stem-Cell Transplantation Recipients

The “Clinical Practice Guideline for Systemic Antifungal Prophylaxis in Pediatric Patients with Cancer and Hematopoietic Stem-Cell Transplantation Recipients” developed by the Pediatric Oncology Group of Ontario was endorsed by the COG Supportive Care Guideline Committee in August 2020.

The source clinical practice guideline is published (Lehrnbecher T, Fisher BT, Phillips B, et al. Clinical practice guideline for systemic antifungal prophylaxis in pediatric patients with cancer and hematopoietic stem-cell transplantation recipients. JCO 2020; [ePub May 27, 2020]) and is available at: <https://ascopubs.org/doi/full/10.1200/JCO.20.00158>

The purpose of the source clinical practice guideline is to provide recommendations for systemic antifungal prophylaxis administration in pediatric patients with cancer and hematopoietic stem cell transplant recipients. These recommendations are presented in the table below.

### Summary of Recommendations for Systemic Antifungal Prophylaxis in Pediatric Patients with Cancer and Hematopoietic Stem-Cell Transplantation Recipients

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence*
<b>Which pediatric patients with cancer and HSCT recipients should routinely receive systemic antifungal prophylaxis?</b>	
<b>Acute myeloid leukemia</b>	
1. Administer systemic antifungal prophylaxis to children and adolescents receiving treatment of acute myeloid leukemia that is expected to result in profound and prolonged neutropenia.  <i>Remarks:</i> This strong recommendation is based on the increasing benefit of systemic antifungal prophylaxis versus no prophylaxis to reduce proven or probable invasive fungal disease (IFD) as the risk for IFD increases. Although this recommendation advocates for a universal prophylaxis approach, future research should identify patient and treatment factors that may allow tailoring of prophylaxis to those at the highest risk for IFD.	Strong recommendation High-quality evidence

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence*
<b>Acute lymphoblastic leukemia</b>	
<p>2. Consider administering systemic antifungal prophylaxis to children and adolescents with newly diagnosed and relapsed acute lymphoblastic leukemia at high risk for IFD.</p> <p><i>Remarks:</i> Children and adolescents with acute lymphoblastic leukemia encompass a group with wide variability in IFD risk that is not solely accounted for by relapse status. Those with relapsed acute lymphoblastic leukemia receiving intensive myelosuppressive chemotherapy are most likely to warrant systemic antifungal prophylaxis, whereas greater uncertainty is present for those with newly diagnosed acute lymphoblastic leukemia. Given the heterogeneity in IFD risk across protocols overall and by phase of treatment, adaptation will be required for each protocol to recommend whether and when systemic antifungal prophylaxis should be administered.</p>	<p>Weak recommendation Low-quality evidence</p>
<p>3. Do not routinely administer systemic antifungal prophylaxis to children and adolescents with acute lymphoblastic leukemia at low risk for IFD.</p> <p><i>Remarks:</i> A low risk for IFD can be inferred based on absence of risk factors such as prolonged neutropenia and corticosteroid administration and observed IFD rates across different protocols. This group includes, for example, pediatric patients receiving maintenance chemotherapy for acute lymphoblastic leukemia.</p>	<p>Strong recommendation Low-quality evidence</p>
<b>Other malignancies including most patients with lymphomas and solid tumors</b>	
<p>4. Do not routinely administer systemic antifungal prophylaxis to children and adolescents with cancer at low risk for IFD, such as most pediatric patients with lymphomas and solid tumors.</p> <p><i>Remarks:</i> In pediatric patients at low risk for IFD, the benefit of systemic antifungal prophylaxis is likely to be small and outweighed by the risk for adverse effects, costs, and inconvenience. Thus, systemic antifungal prophylaxis should not routinely be administered in this setting.</p>	<p>Strong recommendation Moderate-quality evidence</p>

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence*
<b>HSCT</b>	
<p>5. Administer systemic antifungal prophylaxis to children and adolescents undergoing allogeneic HSCT pre-engraftment and to those receiving systemic immunosuppression for the treatment of graft-versus host disease.</p> <p><i>Remarks:</i> The panel recognized that these two phases of therapy are associated with different epidemiology of IFD. However, the nature of the trials included in the systematic review precluded the ability to make separate recommendations for them. This strong recommendation was influenced by the finding in the systemic prophylaxis versus no systemic prophylaxis stratified analysis that HSCT recipients experienced greater benefit in IFD reduction compared with chemotherapy recipients. In addition, the subgroup analysis showed that among the HSCT stratum, prophylaxis significantly reduced fungal infection–related mortality.</p>	<p>Strong recommendation Moderate-quality evidence</p>
<p>6. We suggest that systemic antifungal prophylaxis not be used routinely in children and adolescents undergoing autologous HSCT.</p> <p><i>Remarks:</i> This weak recommendation was based on the lower risk for IFD associated with autologous HSCT. There is less certainty in the setting of tandem transplantations where the cumulative duration of neutropenia may be longer.</p>	<p>Weak recommendation Low-quality evidence</p>
<b>If systemic antifungal prophylaxis is planned, which agents should be used?</b>	
<p>7. If systemic antifungal prophylaxis is warranted, administer a mold-active agent.</p> <p><i>Remarks:</i> This strong recommendation was based on the comparison of different systemic antifungal prophylaxis agents where mold-active agent versus fluconazole significantly reduced proven or probable IFD, mold infection, and invasive aspergillosis (IA), and reduced fungal infection–related mortality. Direct pediatric data were available, increasing quality of the evidence.</p>	<p>Strong recommendation High-quality evidence</p>
<p>8. In choosing a mold-active agent, administer an echinocandin or a mold-active azole.</p> <p><i>Remarks:</i> The choice of specific mold-active agent is influenced by multiple factors including local epidemiology, adverse effect profile, potential for drug interactions, costs, and jurisdictional availability. For children younger than 13 years of age, an echinocandin, voriconazole, or itraconazole is suggested based on efficacy and adverse effects. In those 13 years of age and older, posaconazole also is an option.</p>	<p>Strong recommendation Moderate-quality evidence</p>



RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence*
<p>9. Do not use amphotericin routinely as systemic antifungal prophylaxis.</p> <p><i>Remarks:</i> This strong recommendation was based on the finding that both conventional and lipid formulations of amphotericin were not more effective than fluconazole in reducing IFD. It is important to note that liposomal amphotericin was not included in studies comparing amphotericin versus fluconazole and, thus, there is less certainty about the benefits and risks of this formulation.</p>	<p>Strong recommendation Low-quality evidence</p>
<p><b>When should systemic antifungal prophylaxis be started and stopped?</b></p>	
<p>10. If systemic antifungal prophylaxis is warranted, consider administration during periods of observed or expected severe neutropenia. For allogeneic HSCT recipients, consider administration during systemic immunosuppression for graft-versus-host disease treatment.</p> <p><i>Remarks:</i> There are limited data that inform the decision of when to initiate and discontinue systemic antifungal prophylaxis. This recommendation was based on the criteria used in the included randomized trials and the anticipated highest risk period.</p>	<p>Weak recommendation Low-quality evidence</p>

\*see Appendix 1

[Table of Contents](#)

**3. Atraumatic (pencil-point) versus conventional needles for lumbar puncture: a clinical practice guideline**

The “Atraumatic (pencil-point) versus conventional needles for lumbar puncture: a clinical practice guideline” developed by the MAGIC group and The BMJ was endorsed by the COG Supportive Care Guideline Committee in May 2019.

The source guideline is published (Rochweg B, Almenawer SA, Siemieniuk RAC, Vandvik PO, Agoritsas T, Lytvyn L, et al. BMJ 2018; 361:k1920.) and is available at:  
<https://www.bmj.com/content/361/bmj.k1920>

The purpose of the source clinical practice guideline is to create a recommendation on the type of needle (atraumatic versus conventional) that should be used when performing a lumbar puncture. The recommendation from the endorsed clinical practice guideline is presented in the table below.

**Recommendation on atraumatic (pencil-point) versus conventional needles for lumbar puncture**

RECOMMENDATION	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence*
<b>Which needles should be used for lumbar puncture for any indication?</b>	
We recommend the use of atraumatic over conventional needles in lumbar puncture for any indication in all patients (adults and children).	Strong recommendation Moderate to high quality evidence

\*see [Appendix 1](#)

[Table of Contents](#)

#### 4. Guidelines on Chemotherapy-induced Nausea and Vomiting in Pediatric Cancer Patients

This document summarizes three clinical practice guidelines on the topic of chemotherapy-induced nausea and vomiting:

- I. The "[Classification of the Acute Emetogenicity of Chemotherapy in Pediatric Patients: A Clinical Practice Guideline](#)" (endorsed by the COG Supportive Care Guideline Committee in August 2019).
- II. The "[Guideline for the Prevention of Acute Nausea and Vomiting due to Antineoplastic Medication in Pediatric Cancer Patients](#)" (endorsed by the COG Supportive Care Guideline Committee in January 2018) and the "[Antiemetics: ASCO Guideline Update](#)" (endorsed by the COG Supportive Care Guideline Committee in December 2020) and
- III. The "[Prevention and treatment of anticipatory chemotherapy-induced nausea and vomiting in pediatric cancer patients and hematopoietic stem cell recipients: Clinical practice guideline update](#)" (endorsed by the COG Supportive Care Guideline Committee in July 2021).

##### 4.1 Classification of Chemotherapy Emetogenicity

The "Classification of the Acute Emetogenicity of Chemotherapy in Pediatric Patients: A Clinical Practice Guideline" developed by the Pediatric Oncology Group of Ontario was endorsed by the COG Supportive Care Guideline Committee in August 2019.

The source guideline is published (Paw Cho Sing E, Robinson PD, Flank J et al. *Pediatr Blood Cancer*. 2019; 66: e27646.) and is available at <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1002/pbc.27646>. It is an update of an earlier guideline that was published in 2011.

The purpose of this guideline is to provide evidence-based recommendations regarding the acute emetic potential of chemotherapy in pediatric oncology patients aged 1 month to 18 years. The recommendations of the endorsed guideline are presented below.

##### Summary of Recommendations for the Classification of Chemotherapy Emetogenicity

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence*
<b>1. Which chemotherapy regimens are highly emetogenic?</b>	
Single-agent regimens: Asparaginase ( <i>Erwinia</i> ) IV ≥ 20,000 IU/m <sup>2</sup> /dose Busulfan IV ≥ 0.8mg/kg/dose Busulfan PO ≥ 1mg/kg/dose Carboplatin IV ≥ 175 mg/m <sup>2</sup> /dose Cisplatin IV ≥ 12 mg/m <sup>2</sup> /dose Cyclophosphamide IV ≥ 1,200 mg/m <sup>2</sup> /dose Cytarabine IV ≥ 3g/m <sup>2</sup> /day Dactinomycin IV ≥ 1.35 mg/m <sup>2</sup> /dose Doxorubicin IV ≥ 30 mg/m <sup>2</sup> /dose Idarubicin PO ≥ 30 mg/m <sup>2</sup> /dose Melphalan IV Methotrexate IV ≥ 12 g/m <sup>2</sup> /dose	Strong recommendation Very low to high quality of evidence

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence*
<p>Multiple-agent regimens:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cyclophosphamide <math>\geq 600 \text{ mg/m}^2/\text{dose}</math> + dactinomycin <math>\geq 1 \text{ mg/m}^2/\text{dose}</math></li> <li>Cyclophosphamide <math>\geq 400 \text{ mg/m}^2/\text{dose}</math> + doxorubicin <math>\geq 40 \text{ mg/m}^2/\text{dose}</math></li> <li>Cytarabine IV <math>\geq 90 \text{ mg/m}^2/\text{dose}</math> + methotrexate IV <math>\geq 150 \text{ mg/m}^2/\text{dose}</math></li> <li>Cytarabine IV + teniposide IV</li> <li>Dacarbazine IV <math>\geq 250 \text{ mg/m}^2/\text{dose}</math> + doxorubicin IV <math>\geq 60 \text{ mg/m}^2/\text{dose}</math></li> <li>Dactinomycin IV <math>\geq 900 \text{ }\mu\text{g/m}^2/\text{dose}</math> + ifosfamide IV <math>\geq 3 \text{ g/m}^2/\text{dose}</math></li> <li>Etoposide IV <math>\geq 60 \text{ mg/m}^2/\text{dose}</math> + ifosfamide IV <math>\geq 1.2 \text{ g/m}^2/\text{dose}</math></li> <li>Etoposide IV <math>\geq 250 \text{ mg/m}^2/\text{dose}</math> + thiotepa IV <math>\geq 300 \text{ mg/m}^2/\text{dose}</math></li> </ul>	
<b>2. Which single-agent and multiple-agent chemotherapy regimens are moderately emetogenic?</b>	
<p>Single-agent regimens:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cyclophosphamide IV <math>1000 \text{ mg/m}^2/\text{dose}</math></li> <li>Cytarabine IV <math>75 \text{ mg/m}^2/\text{dose}</math></li> <li>Dactinomycin IV <math>10 \text{ }\mu\text{g/kg}/\text{dose}</math></li> <li>Doxorubicin IV <math>25 \text{ mg/m}^2/\text{dose}</math></li> <li>Gemtuzumab IV <math>3\text{--}9 \text{ mg/m}^2/\text{dose}</math></li> <li>Imatinib PO <math>&gt; 260 \text{ mg/m}^2/\text{day}</math></li> <li>Interferon alpha IV <math>15\text{--}30 \text{ million U/m}^2/\text{day}</math></li> <li>Ixabepilone IV <math>3\text{--}10 \text{ mg/m}^2/\text{dose}</math></li> <li>Methotrexate IV <math>5 \text{ g/m}^2/\text{dose}</math></li> <li>Methotrexate IT</li> <li>Topotecan PO <math>0.4\text{--}2.3 \text{ mg/m}^2/\text{day}</math></li> </ul> <p>Multiple-agent regimens:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cytarabine IV <math>100 \text{ mg/m}^2/\text{dose}</math> + daunorubicin IV <math>45 \text{ mg/m}^2/\text{dose}</math> + etoposide IV <math>100 \text{ mg/m}^2/\text{dose}</math> + prednisolone PO + thioguanine PO <math>80 \text{ mg/m}^2/\text{dose}</math></li> <li>Cytarabine <math>60 \text{ or } 90 \text{ mg/m}^2/\text{dose}</math> + methotrexate <math>120 \text{ mg/m}^2/\text{dose}</math></li> <li>Liposomal doxorubicin IV <math>20\text{--}50 \text{ mg/m}^2/\text{dose}</math> + topotecan PO <math>0.6 \text{ mg/m}^2/\text{day}</math></li> </ul>	<p>Strong recommendation Very low to high quality of evidence</p>

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence*
<b>3. Which single-agent and multiple-agent chemotherapy regimens are of low emetogenicity?</b>	
<p>Single-agent regimens:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cyclophosphamide IV 500 mg/m<sup>2</sup>/dose</li> <li>Cyclophosphamide PO 2–3 mg/kg/dose</li> <li>Dasatinib PO 60–120 mg/m<sup>2</sup>/dose</li> <li>Erlotinib PO 35–150 mg/m<sup>2</sup>/day</li> <li>Everolimus PO 0.8–9 mg/m<sup>2</sup>/day</li> <li>Gefitinib PO 150–500 mg/m<sup>2</sup>/day</li> <li>Imatinib PO 260 mg/m<sup>2</sup>/day</li> <li>Mafofosfamide IT 1–6.5 mg/dose</li> <li>Melphalan PO 0.2 mg/kg/dose</li> <li>Mercaptopurine PO ≤ 4.2 mg/kg/dose</li> <li>Methotrexate 38–83 mg/m<sup>2</sup>/dose IV</li> <li>Mitoxantrone IV ≤ 33 mg/m<sup>2</sup>/dose</li> <li>Procarbazine PO 50–100 mg/m<sup>2</sup>/day</li> <li>Ruxolitinib PO 15–21 mg/m<sup>2</sup>/dose</li> <li>Selumetinib PO 20–30 mg/m<sup>2</sup>/dose</li> <li>Sorafenib PO 150–325 mg/m<sup>2</sup>/dose</li> <li>Temozolomide PO 200 mg/m<sup>2</sup>/dose</li> </ul> <p>Multiple-agent regimens:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cytarabine IV 60 mg/m<sup>2</sup>/dose + methotrexate IV 90 mg/m<sup>2</sup>/dose</li> </ul>	<p>Strong recommendation Very low to moderate quality of evidence</p>
<b>4. Which single-agent and multiple-agent chemotherapy regimens are minimally emetogenic?</b>	
<p>Single-agent regimens:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Asparaginase (<i>E. coli</i>) IM ≤ 6000 IU/m<sup>2</sup>/dose</li> <li>Asparaginase (<i>Erwinia</i>) IM ≤ 25 000 IU/m<sup>2</sup>/dose</li> <li>Chlorambucil ≤ 0.2 mg/kg/day PO</li> <li>Doxorubicin IV 10 mg/m<sup>2</sup>/dose</li> <li>Liposomal doxorubicin IV ≤ 50 mg/m<sup>2</sup>/dose</li> <li>Mercaptopurine PO ≤ 4.2 mg/kg/dose</li> <li>Methotrexate PO/SC ≤ 10 mg/m<sup>2</sup>/dose</li> <li>Pracinostat PO 25–45 mg/m<sup>2</sup>/dose</li> <li>Vincristine IV ≤ 1.5 mg/m<sup>2</sup>/dose</li> </ul> <p>Multiple-agent regimens:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cisplatin ≤ 60 mg/m<sup>2</sup>/dose intra-arterially + doxorubicin ≤ 30 mg/m<sup>2</sup>/dose intra-arterially</li> <li>Cisplatin ≤ 60 mg/m<sup>2</sup>/dose intra-arterially + pirarubicin ≤ 30 mg/m<sup>2</sup>/dose intra-arterially</li> <li>Mercaptopurine PO ≤ 2.5 mg/kg/dose + methotrexate PO ≤ 0.1 mg/kg/day</li> </ul>	<p>Strong recommendation Very low to low quality of evidence</p>

\*see [Appendix 1](#)

#### 4.2 Prevention of Acute Chemotherapy-induced Nausea and Vomiting

The “Guideline for the Prevention of Acute Nausea and Vomiting due to Antineoplastic Medication in Pediatric Cancer Patients” developed by the Pediatric Oncology Group of Ontario was endorsed by the COG in January 2018. The “Antiemetics: ASCO Update” developed by the American Society of Clinical Oncology was endorsed by the COG in December 2020.

The source guidelines are published Patel P, Robinson PD, Thackray J, et al. *Pediatr Blood Cancer*. 2017; 2017; 64: e26542. and Hesketh P, Kris MG, Basch E et al. *JCO* 2020; 38 (24): 2782-97.) and are available at: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/pbc.26542/epdf> and <https://ascopubs.org/doi/10.1200/JCO.20.01296>

Implementation tools developed by the guideline developer are available at: <https://www.pogo.ca/healthcare/practiceguidelines/chemotherapy-induced-nausea-and-vomiting-cinv/>

The purpose of this guideline is to provide evidence-based recommendations for the prevention of acute chemotherapy-induced nausea and vomiting in children. The recommendations of the endorsed guideline are presented below.

### Summary of Recommendations for the Prevention of Acute Chemotherapy-induced Nausea and Vomiting (CINV)

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence
<b>1. What pharmacological interventions provide optimal control of acute CINV in children receiving highly emetogenic chemotherapy (HEC)?</b>	
<p>We recommend that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Children ≥ 6 months old receiving HEC which is <i>not</i> known or suspected to interact with aprepitant receive: <i>granisetron, ondansetron or palonosetron + dexamethasone + aprepitant/fosaprepitant</i></li> <li>• Children &lt; 6 months old receiving HEC receive: <i>granisetron, ondansetron or palonosetron + dexamethasone</i></li> <li>• Children ≥ 6 months old receiving HEC which is known or suspected to interact with aprepitant/fosaprepitant receive: <i>granisetron, ondansetron or palonosetron + dexamethasone</i></li> <li>• Children ≥ 6 months old receiving HEC which is <i>not</i> known or suspected to interact with aprepitant/fosaprepitant and who cannot receive dexamethasone for CINV prophylaxis receive: <i>palonosetron + aprepitant/fosaprepitant</i></li> </ul> <p>(POGO 2017 and ASCO 2020)</p>	<p>Strong recommendation Moderate quality evidence</p> <p>Strong recommendation Moderate quality evidence</p> <p>Strong recommendation Moderate quality evidence</p> <p>Strong recommendation Moderate quality evidence</p>

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence
<p>We suggest that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Children &lt; 6 months old receiving HEC and who <i>cannot</i> receive dexamethasone for CINV prophylaxis receive: <i>palonosetron</i></li> <li>Children receiving HEC which is known or suspected to interact with aprepitant/fosaprepitant and who <i>cannot</i> receive dexamethasone for CINV prophylaxis receive: <i>palonosetron</i></li> </ul> <p>(POGO 2017 and ASCO 2020)</p>	<p>Weak recommendation Moderate quality evidence</p> <p>Weak recommendation Moderate quality evidence</p>
<p><b>2. What pharmacological interventions provide optimal control of acute CINV in children receiving moderately emetogenic chemotherapy (MEC)?</b></p>	
<p>We recommend that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Children receiving MEC receive: <i>granisetron, ondansetron or palonosetron + dexamethasone</i></li> </ul> <p>We suggest that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Children ≥ 6 months old receiving MEC who <i>cannot</i> receive dexamethasone for CINV prophylaxis receive: <i>granisetron, ondansetron or palonosetron + aprepitant/fosaprepitant</i></li> <li>Children &lt; 6 months old receiving MEC who cannot receive dexamethasone for CINV prophylaxis receive: <i>palonosetron</i></li> <li>Children receiving MEC which is known or suspected to interact with aprepitant/fosaprepitant and who <i>cannot</i> receive dexamethasone for CINV prophylaxis receive: <i>palonosetron</i></li> </ul> <p>(POGO 2017 and ASCO 2020)</p>	<p>Strong recommendation Moderate quality evidence</p> <p>Weak recommendation Moderate quality evidence</p> <p>Weak recommendation Moderate quality evidence</p> <p>Weak recommendation Moderate quality evidence</p>
<p><b>3. What doses of aprepitant and palonosetron are known to be effective in children receiving chemotherapy?</b></p>	
<p>We suggest the following <b>aprepitant</b> dose for children ≥ 6 months old:</p> <p><i>Day 1: 3 mg/kg/dose (maximum: 125mg) PO x 1;</i> <i>Days 2 and 3: 2 mg/kg/dose (maximum: 80mg) PO once daily</i></p> <p>(POGO 2017)</p>	<p>Weak recommendation Moderate quality evidence</p>
<p>We suggest the following <b>palonosetron</b> dose for children:</p> <p><i>1 month to &lt; 17 years: 0.02 mg/kg/dose (maximum 1.5 mg) IV once pre-therapy</i> <i>≥ 17 years: 0.5 mg/dose PO once pre-therapy</i></p> <p>(POGO 2017)</p>	<p>Weak recommendation Moderate quality evidence</p>

\*see [Appendix 1](#)

### 4.3 Prevention and Treatment of Anticipatory Chemotherapy-Induced Nausea and Vomiting

The “Prevention and treatment of anticipatory chemotherapy-induced nausea and vomiting in pediatric cancer patients and hematopoietic stem cell recipients: Clinical practice guideline update” was endorsed by the COG in July 2021.

The source guideline is published (Patel P, Robinson PD, Devine KA, et al. *Pediatr Blood Cancer* 2021; e28947.) and is available at: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1002/pbc.28947>

The purpose of this guideline is to provide those caring for pediatric oncology or hematopoietic stem cell recipients up to 18 years of age with updated recommendations for the prevention of anticipatory CINV. The recommendations of the endorsed guideline are presented below.

#### Summary of Recommendations for the Prevention and Treatment of Anticipatory Chemotherapy-induced Nausea and Vomiting (CINV)

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence*
<b>1. What strategies are recommended for primary prevention of anticipatory CINV in pediatric patients?</b>	
<p>1.1 Optimize acute and delayed CINV control to minimize the risk of anticipatory CINV</p> <p><i>Remarks:</i> This recommendation places high value on the consistent evidence that a history of acute or delayed CINV is a risk factor for anticipatory CINV. This recommendation also considers the other benefits of optimized acute or delayed CINV control including improved quality of life and the low risk of toxicities anticipated with CPG-consistent antiemetics.</p>	<p>Strong recommendation Moderate- quality evidence</p>
<b>2. What strategies are recommended for secondary prevention of anticipatory CINV in pediatric patients?</b>	
<p>2.1: Consider offering cooperative patients one or more of the following nonpharmacological interventions for secondary prevention of anticipatory CINV: hypnosis, systematic desensitization, or relaxation techniques.</p> <p><i>Remarks:</i> This recommendation places a high value on the minimal risks associated with these interventions. A conditional recommendation was made as the supporting evidence was limited to a small number of studies, the direct pediatric experience is scant and reports of the benefits of these interventions are inconsistent.</p>	<p>Conditional recommendation Low-quality evidence</p>



RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence*
<p>2.2 Consider using lorazepam for secondary prevention of anticipatory CINV.</p> <p><i>Remarks:</i> This recommendation remained unchanged from the 2014 CPG. It places a high value on the limited data demonstrating improved anticipatory CINV control in adults given benzodiazepines. It is a conditional recommendation because there is no direct pediatric evidence among included studies describing the use of benzodiazepines for this purpose.</p>	<p>Conditional recommendation Very low-quality evidence</p>
<p>2.3 We suggest that ginger not be used routinely for secondary prevention of anticipatory CINV.</p> <p><i>Remarks:</i> The panel made a conditional recommendation against the routine use of ginger given inconsistent study results in adult patients and the absence of pediatric data to support the use of ginger for this purpose. The panel also appreciated that the ginger formulations evaluated in included studies may not be comparable because doses of the components thought to be medically active are not uniformly reported.</p>	<p>Conditional recommendation Low-quality evidence</p>
<p>2.4 Do not use clonidine for secondary prevention of anticipatory CINV.</p> <p><i>Remarks:</i> The panel made a strong recommendation against the use of clonidine given its poor safety profile, lack of clear benefit, and lack of direct data for its use in pediatric patients for anticipatory CINV prevention.</p>	<p>Strong recommendation Low-quality evidence</p>
<p><b>3. What strategies are recommended for acute treatment of anticipatory CINV in pediatric patients?</b></p>	
<p>No recommendation can be made.</p> <p><i>Remarks:</i> No identified study directly evaluated an intervention aimed at the treatment of anticipatory CINV. The evidence describing primary and secondary anticipatory CINV prevention could not be extrapolated to make a recommendation.</p>	

\*See Appendix 1.

[Table of Contents](#)

## 5. Management of Chronic Pain in Children

The “Guidelines on the management of chronic pain in children” developed by the World Health Organization was endorsed by the COG Supportive Care Guideline Committee in July 2021.

The source clinical practice guideline is published (Guidelines on the management of chronic pain in children. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2020. Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO.) and is available at: <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240017870>

The purpose of the source clinical practice guideline is to assist World Health Organization Member States and their partners in developing and implementing national and local policies, regulations, pain management protocol and best practices. The source clinical practice guidelines focus on physical, psychological and pharmacological interventions for the management of primary and secondary chronic pain in children 0 to 19 years old. The guiding principles, recommendations and best principles of the source clinical practice guideline are presented in the tables below.

**Table 1. Guiding Principles for Guidelines on the Management of Chronic Pain in Children**

<b>GUIDING PRINCIPLES</b>
1. Access to pain management is a fundamental human right.
2. Children have the right to enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of health.
3. Member States and healthcare providers should ensure that children, and their families and caregivers, know their rights to self-determination, non-discrimination, accessible and appropriate health services, and confidentiality.

**Table 2. Summary of Recommendations on the Management of Chronic Pain in Children**

<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence*</b>
1. In children with chronic pain, physical therapies may be used, either alone or in combination with other treatments.	Conditional recommendation Very low certainty evidence
2.a) In children with chronic pain, psychological management through cognitive behavioural therapy and related interventions (acceptance and commitment therapy, behavioural therapy and relaxation therapy) may be used.	Conditional recommendation Moderate certainty evidence
b) Psychological therapy may be delivered either face-to-face or remotely, or using a combined approach.	Conditional recommendation Moderate certainty evidence

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence*
3. In children with chronic pain, appropriate pharmacological management tailored to specific indications and conditions may be used.	Conditional recommendation Low certainty evidence
4.a) Appropriate pharmacological management tailored to specific indications may include the use of morphine under the principles of opioid stewardship, for end-of-life-care.  b) In children with chronic pain associated with life-limiting conditions, morphine may be given by appropriately trained healthcare providers, under the principles of opioid stewardship.	Conditional recommendation Very low certainty evidence  Conditional recommendation Very low certainty evidence

\*see [Appendix 1](#)

**Table 3. Summary of Best Practices on the Management of Chronic Pain in Children**

BEST PRACTICES FOR THE CLINICAL MANAGEMENT OF CHRONIC PAIN IN CHILDREN
1. Children with chronic pain and their families and caregivers must be cared for from a biopsychological perspective; pain should not be treated simply as a biomedical problem.
2. A comprehensive biopsychosocial assessment is essential to inform pain management and planning. As a component of this assessment, healthcare providers should use age-, context- and culturally appropriate tools to screen for, and monitor, pain intensity and its impact on the quality of life of the child and family.
3. Children with chronic pain must have a thorough evaluation of any underlying conditions and access to appropriate treatment for those conditions, in addition to appropriate interventions for the management of pain. Chronic pain in childhood often exists with comorbid conditions affecting the child’s health, and social and emotional well-being, which require concurrent management.
4. Children presenting with chronic pain should be assessed by healthcare providers who are skilled and experienced in the evaluation, diagnosis and management of chronic pain.
5. Management, whether with physical therapies, psychological or pharmacological interventions, or combinations thereof, should be tailored to the child’s health; underlying condition; developmental age; physical, language and cognitive abilities; and social and emotional needs.
6. Care of children with chronic pain should be child- and family-centred. That is, the child’s care should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. focus on, and be organized around, the health needs, preferences and expectations of the child, and their families and communities;</li> <li>ii. be tailored to the family’s values, culture, preferences and resources; and</li> <li>iii. promote engagement and support children and their families to play an active role in care through informed and shared decision-making.</li> </ul>
7. Families and caregivers must receive timely and accurate information. Shared decision-making and clear communication are essential to good clinical care. Communication with patients should correspond to their cognitive, development and language abilities. There must be adequate time in a comfortable space for discussions and questions regarding care management plans and progress.

## BEST PRACTICES FOR THE CLINICAL MANAGEMENT OF CHRONIC PAIN IN CHILDREN

8. The child and their family and caregivers should be treated in a comprehensive and integrated manner: all aspects of the child's development and well-being must be attended to, including their cognitive, emotional and physical health. Moreover, the child's educational, cultural and social needs and goals must be addressed as part of the care management plan.

9. In children with chronic pain, an interdisciplinary, multimodal approach should be adopted which is tailored to the needs and desires of the child, family and caregivers, and to available resources. The biopsychosocial model of pain supports the use of multiple modalities to address the management of chronic pain.

10. Policy-makers, programme managers and healthcare providers, as well as families and caregivers must attend to opioid stewardship to ensure the rational and cautious use of opioids. The essential practices of opioid stewardship in children include:

- i. Opioids must only be used for appropriate indications and prescribed by trained providers, with careful assessments of the benefits and risks. The use of opioids by individuals, their impact on pain and their adverse effects must be continuously monitored and evaluated by trained providers.
- ii. The prescribing provider must have a clear plan for the continuation, tapering or discontinuation of opioids according to the child's condition. The child and family must be apprised of the plan and its rationale.
- iii. There must be due attention to procurement, storage and the disposal of unused opioids.

[Table of Contents](#)

## 6. Prevention of cisplatin-induced ototoxicity in children and adolescents with cancer

The clinical practice guideline “Prevention of cisplatin-induced ototoxicity in children and adolescents with cancer” developed by the Pediatric Oncology Group of Ontario was endorsed by the COG Supportive Care Guideline Committee in August 2020.

The source clinical practice guideline is published (Freyer DR, Brock PR, Chang KW, et al. Prevention of cisplatin-induced ototoxicity in children and adolescents with cancer: a clinical practice guideline. *Lancet Child Adolescent Health* 2020; 4(2): 141-50.) and is available open access at: [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanchi/article/PIIS2352-4642\(19\)30336-0/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanchi/article/PIIS2352-4642(19)30336-0/fulltext).

The purpose of the source clinical practice guideline is to address the clinical question: what adjuvant interventions should be offered in conjunction with cisplatin to prevent ototoxicity in children and adolescents with cancer?

### Summary of Recommendations for Prevention of Cisplatin-induced Ototoxicity in Children and Adolescents with Cancer

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence*
1. Do not use amifostine for the prevention of cisplatin-induced ototoxicity in children and adolescents with cancer	Strong recommendation High quality evidence
2. Do not use sodium diethyldithiocarbamate for the prevention of cisplatin-induced ototoxicity in children and adolescents with cancer	Strong recommendation Low quality evidence
3. Use sodium thiosulfate for the prevention of cisplatin-induced ototoxicity in children and adolescents with non-metastatic hepatoblastoma	Strong recommendation High quality evidence
4. Consider sodium thiosulfate for the prevention of cisplatin-induced ototoxicity in children and adolescents with non-metastatic cancers other than hepatoblastoma	Weak recommendation Low quality evidence
5. We suggest sodium thiosulfate not be used routinely for the prevention of cisplatin-induced ototoxicity for children and adolescents with metastatic cancers	Weak recommendation Low quality evidence
6. Do not use intratympanic middle ear therapy for the prevention of cisplatin-induced ototoxicity in children and adolescents with cancer	Strong recommendation Low quality evidence
7. Do not alter cisplatin infusion duration, as a means in itself, to reduce ototoxicity in children and adolescents with cancer	Strong recommendation Low quality evidence

\*see Appendix 1

[Table of Contents](#)

**7. Management of *Clostridium Difficile* Infection in Children and Adolescents with Cancer and Pediatric Hematopoietic Stem-Cell Transplantation Recipients**

The “Guideline for the Management of *Clostridium Difficile* Infection in Children and Adolescents with Cancer and Pediatric Hematopoietic Stem-Cell Transplantation Recipients” developed by the Pediatric Oncology Group of Ontario (POGO) was endorsed by the COG Supportive Care Guideline Committee in February 2019.

The source guideline is published (Diorio C, Robinson PD, Ammann R, et al. Guideline for the management of *Clostridium difficile* infection in children and adolescents with cancer and pediatric hematopoietic stem cell transplantation recipients. J Clin Oncol 2018; 36:31, 3162-3171.) and is available at: <https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.18.00407>

The purpose of the source guideline is to create a clinical practice guideline for the prevention and treatment of *Clostridium difficile* in children and adolescents with cancer and pediatric HSCT patients. Recommendations from the endorsed clinical practice guideline are presented in the table below.

**Summary of Recommendations for the Management of *Clostridium Difficile* Infection in Children and Adolescents with Cancer and Pediatric HSCT Recipients**

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence*
<b>What interventions should be used for the prevention of <i>Clostridium difficile</i> infection (CDI) in children and adolescents with cancer and pediatric HSCT patients?</b>	
1. We suggest that probiotics not be used routinely for the prevention of CDI in children and adolescents with cancer and pediatric HSCT patients	Weak recommendation Low quality evidence
<b>What interventions should be used for the treatment of CDI in children and adolescents with cancer and pediatric HSCT patients?</b>	
2. Use either oral metronidazole or oral vancomycin for the treatment of nonsevere CDI in children and adolescents with cancer and pediatric HSCT patients	Strong recommendation Low quality evidence
3. Use oral vancomycin for the treatment of severe CDI in children and adolescents with cancer and pediatric HSCT patients	Strong recommendation Low quality evidence
4. Consider fidaxomicin for the treatment of recurrent CDI in children and adolescents with cancer and pediatric HSCT patients	Weak recommendation Low quality evidence
5. Do not use fecal microbiota transplantation routinely for the treatment of CDI in children and adolescents with cancer and pediatric HSCT patients	Strong recommendation Low quality evidence
6. We suggest that monoclonal antibodies not be used routinely for the treatment of CDI in children and adolescents with cancer and pediatric HSCT patients	Weak recommendation Low quality evidence
7. We suggest that probiotics not be used routinely for the treatment of CDI in children and adolescents with cancer and pediatric HSCT patients.	Weak recommendation Low quality evidence

\*see [Appendix 1](#)

[Table of Contents](#)

**8. Management of Fatigue in Children and Adolescents with Cancer and in Pediatric Recipients of Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplants**

The “Management of Fatigue in Children and Adolescents with Cancer and in Paediatric Recipients of Haematopoietic stem-cell Transplants: a Clinical Practice Guideline” was endorsed by the COG Supportive Care Guideline Committee in September 2018.

The source guideline is published (Robinson PD, Oberoi S, Tomlinson D, et al. Guideline for the management of fatigue in children and adolescents with cancer and pediatric hematopoietic stem cell transplantation recipients. The Lancet Child and Adolescent Health 2018; 2: 371-8.) and is available at: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2352-4642\(18\)30059-2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2352-4642(18)30059-2)

The purpose of this guideline is to provide guidance for management of fatigue in children and adolescents with cancer and paediatric recipients of hematopoietic stem cell transplantation recipients.

The recommendations of the endorsed guideline are presented below.

**Summary of Recommendations for the Management of Fatigue in Children and Adolescents with Cancer and Paediatric Recipients of Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation**

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence*
<b>What are effective interventions for the management of fatigue in children and adolescents with cancer or paediatric HSCT recipients?</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use physical activity interventions to manage fatigue in children and adolescents with cancer or paediatric HSCT recipients</li> </ul>	Strong recommendation, Moderate quality evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not routinely use pharmacological approaches to manage fatigue in children and adolescents with cancer or paediatric HSCT recipients</li> </ul>	Strong recommendation, Moderate quality evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use relaxation or mindfulness, or both, for children and adolescents with cancer or pediatric HSCT recipients who can participate in these approaches to manage fatigue</li> </ul>	Strong recommendation, Moderate quality evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In settings where other recommended approaches are not feasible or were not successful, cognitive or cognitive behavioural therapies may be offered to children and adolescents with cancer or paediatric HSCT recipients who can participate in these approaches</li> </ul>	Weak recommendation, Moderate quality evidence

\*see [Appendix 1](#)

[Table of Contents](#)

**9. Fertility Preservation for Patients with Cancer**

The “Fertility Preservation for Patients with Cancer: ASCO Clinical Practice Guideline Update” guideline was endorsed by the COG Supportive Care Guideline Committee in November 2018. It is an update to the 2014 clinical practice guideline that was also endorsed by the COG and is now archived. The 2018 document and implementation tools provided by the guideline developers are available at: <https://www.asco.org/practice-guidelines/quality-guidelines/guidelines/patient-and-survivor-care#/9661>

A summary is published in the Journal of Clinical Oncology 2018 36:19, 1994-2001. <http://ascopubs.org/doi/pdf/10.1200/JCO.2018.78.1914>

The goal of this guideline is to provide oncologists, other health care providers and caregivers with recommendations regarding fertility preservation for adults, adolescents and children with cancer. The recommendations of the source clinical practice guideline are presented below. Note that recommendations 1, 4 and 5 are most pertinent to pediatric oncology.

**Summary of Recommendations for Fertility Preservation for Patients with Cancer**

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence
1.1 People with cancer are interested in discussing fertility preservation. Health care providers caring for adult and pediatric patients with cancer (including medical oncologists, radiation oncologists, gynecologic oncologists, urologists, hematologists, pediatric oncologists, surgeons, and others) should address the possibility of infertility as early as possible before treatment starts.	<b>No formal grading system used</b>
1.2 Health care providers should refer patients who express an interest in fertility preservation (and those who are ambivalent) to reproductive specialists.	<b>No formal grading system used</b>
1.3 To preserve the full range of options, fertility preservation approaches should be discussed as early as possible, before treatment starts. The discussion can ultimately reduce distress and improve quality of life. Another discussion and/or referral may be necessary when the patient returns for follow up after completion of therapy and/or if pregnancy is being considered. The discussions should be documented in the medical record.	<b>No formal grading system used</b>
<b>Adult Males</b>	
2.1 Sperm cryopreservation: Sperm cryopreservation is effective, and health care providers should discuss sperm banking with postpubertal males receiving cancer treatment.	<b>No formal grading system used</b>
2.2 Hormonal gonadoprotection: Hormonal therapy in men is not successful in preserving fertility. It is not recommended.	<b>No formal grading system used</b>



RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence
<p>2.3 Other methods to preserve male fertility: Other methods, such as testicular tissue cryopreservation and reimplantation or grafting of human testicular tissue, should be performed only as part of clinical trials or approved experimental protocols.</p>	<p><b>No formal grading system used</b></p>
<p>2.4 Postchemotherapy: Men should be advised of a potentially higher risk of genetic damage in sperm collected after initiation of therapy. It is strongly recommended that sperm be collected before initiation of treatment because the quality of the sample and sperm DNA integrity may be compromised after a single treatment. Although sperm counts and quality of sperm may be diminished even before initiation of therapy, and even if there may be a need to initiate chemotherapy quickly such that there may be limited time to obtain optimal numbers of ejaculate specimens, these concerns should not dissuade patients from banking sperm. Intracytoplasmic sperm injection allows the future use of a very limited amount of sperm; thus, even in these compromised scenarios, fertility may still be preserved.</p>	<p><b>No formal grading system used</b></p>
<p><b>Adult Women</b></p>	
<p>3.1 Embryo cryopreservation: Embryo cryopreservation is an established fertility preservation method, and it has routinely been used for storing surplus embryos after in vitro fertilization.</p>	<p><b>No formal grading system used</b></p>
<p>3.2 Cryopreservation of unfertilized oocytes: Cryopreservation of unfertilized oocytes is an option, and may be especially well suited to women who do not have a male partner, do not wish to use donor sperm, or have religious or ethical objections to embryo freezing. Oocyte cryopreservation should be performed in centers with the necessary expertise. As of October 2012, the American Society for Reproductive Medicine no longer deems this procedure experimental.</p> <p><i>Qualifying statement:</i> More flexible ovarian stimulation protocols for oocyte collection are now available. Timing of this procedure no longer depends on the menstrual cycle in most cases, and stimulation can be initiated with less delay compared with old protocols. Thus, oocyte harvesting for the purpose of oocyte or embryo cryopreservation is now possible on a cycle day-independent schedule. Of special concern in estrogen-sensitive breast and gynecologic malignancies is the possibility that these fertility preservation interventions (eg, ovarian stimulation regimens that increase estrogen levels) and/or subsequent pregnancy may increase the risk of cancer recurrence. Aromatase inhibitor-based stimulation</p>	<p><b>No formal grading system used</b></p>

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence
<p>protocols are now well established and may ameliorate this concern. Studies do not indicate increased cancer recurrence risk as a result of aromatase inhibitor–supplemented ovarian stimulation and subsequent pregnancy.</p>	
<p>3.3 Ovarian transposition: Ovarian transposition (oophoropexy) can be offered when pelvic irradiation is performed as cancer treatment. However, because of radiation scatter, ovaries are not always protected, and patients should be aware that this technique is not always successful. Because of the risk of remigration of the ovaries, this procedure should be performed as close to the time of radiation treatment as possible.</p>	<p><b>No formal grading system used</b></p>
<p>3.4 Conservative gynecologic surgery: It has been suggested that radical trachelectomy (surgical removal of the uterine cervix) should be restricted to stage IA2 to IB cervical cancer with diameter &lt; 2 cm and invasion &lt; 10 mm. In the treatment of other gynecologic malignancies, interventions to spare fertility have generally centered on doing less radical surgery, with the intent of sparing the reproductive organs as much as possible. Ovarian cystectomy can be performed for early-stage ovarian cancer.</p>	<p><b>No formal grading system used</b></p>
<p>3.5 Ovarian suppression: There is conflicting evidence to recommend GnRHa and other means of ovarian suppression for fertility preservation. The Panel recognizes that, when proven fertility preservation methods such as oocyte, embryo, or ovarian tissue cryopreservation are not feasible, and in the setting of young women with breast cancer, GnRHa may be offered to patients in the hope of reducing the likelihood of chemotherapy-induced ovarian insufficiency. However, GnRHa should not be used in place of proven fertility preservation methods.</p>	<p><b>No formal grading system used</b></p>
<p>3.6 Ovarian tissue cryopreservation and transplantation: Ovarian tissue cryopreservation for the purpose of future transplantation does not require ovarian stimulation and can be performed immediately. In addition, it does not require sexual maturity and hence may be the only method available in children. Finally, this method may also restore global ovarian function. However, it should be noted further investigation is needed to confirm whether it is safe in patients with leukemias.</p> <p><i>Qualifying statement:</i> As of the time of this publication, ovarian tissue cryopreservation remains experimental. However, emerging data may prompt reconsideration of this designation in the future (this technique is already considered nonexperimental in some countries, and its experimental status is undergoing evaluation in the United States).</p>	<p><b>No formal grading system used</b></p>

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence
<b>Role of Health Care Providers</b>	
4.1 All oncologic health care providers should be prepared to discuss infertility as a potential risk of therapy. This discussion should take place as soon as possible once a cancer diagnosis is made and can occur simultaneously with staging and the formulation of a treatment plan. There are benefits for patients in discussing fertility information with providers at every step of the cancer journey.	<b>No formal grading system used</b>
4.2 Encourage patients to participate in registries and clinical studies, as available, to define further the safety and efficacy of these interventions and strategies.	<b>No formal grading system used</b>
4.3 Refer patients who express an interest in fertility, as well as those who are ambivalent or uncertain, to reproductive specialists as soon as possible.	<b>No formal grading system used</b>
4.4 Refer patients to psychosocial providers when they are distressed about potential infertility.	<b>No formal grading system used</b>
<b>Special Considerations: Children</b>	
5.1 Suggest established methods of fertility preservation (eg, semen or oocyte cryopreservation) for postpubertal children, with patient assent and parent or guardian consent.  For prepubertal children, the only fertility preservation options are ovarian and testicular cryopreservation, which are investigational.	<b>No formal grading system used</b>

[Table of Contents](#)

## 10. Management of Fever and Neutropenia in Children with Cancer and/or Undergoing Hematopoietic Stem-Cell Transplantation

The “Guideline for the Management of Fever and Neutropenia in Children with Cancer and/or Undergoing Hematopoietic Stem-Cell Transplantation” was endorsed by the COG Supportive Care Guideline Committee in September 2017.

The source guideline is published in the Journal of Clinical Oncology 2017; 35: 2082-94:  
<http://ascopubs.org/doi/abs/10.1200/JCO.2016.71.7017>

The purpose of this guideline is to provide evidence-based recommendations for the empiric management of pediatric febrile neutropenia. The recommendations of the endorsed guideline are presented below.

### Summary of Recommendations for the Empiric Management of Febrile Neutropenia

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence*
<b>A. Initial Management of Febrile Neutropenia</b>	
<b>Risk Stratification</b>	
A1. Adopt a validated risk stratification strategy and incorporate it into routine clinical management	Strong recommendation Low quality evidence
<b>Evaluation</b>	
A2. Obtain blood cultures at onset of febrile neutropenia from all lumens of central venous catheters	Strong recommendation Low quality evidence
A3. Consider obtaining peripheral-blood cultures concurrent with central venous catheter cultures	Weak recommendation Moderate quality evidence
A4. Consider urinalysis and urine culture in patients in whom a clean-catch, midstream specimen is readily available	Weak recommendation Low quality evidence
A5. Obtain chest radiography only in patients with respiratory signs or symptoms	Strong recommendation Moderate quality evidence
<b>Treatment</b>	
A6a. In high-risk febrile neutropenia: Use monotherapy with an antipseudomonal $\beta$ -lactam, fourth generation cephalosporin, or a carbapenem as empirical therapy in pediatric high-risk febrile neutropenia	Strong recommendation High quality evidence
A6b. In high-risk febrile neutropenia: Reserve addition of second gram-negative agent or a glycopeptide for patients who are clinically unstable, when a resistant infection is suspected or for centers with a high rate of resistant pathogens.	Strong recommendation Moderate quality evidence
A7a. In low-risk febrile neutropenia: Consider initial or step-down outpatient management if infrastructure is in place to ensure careful monitoring and follow-up.	Weak recommendation Moderate quality evidence
A7b. In low-risk febrile neutropenia: Consider oral antibiotic administration if the child is able to tolerate this route of administration reliably.	Weak recommendation Moderate quality evidence

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence
<b>B. Ongoing Management of Febrile Neutropenia</b>	
<b>Modification of Treatment</b>	
B1. In patients who are responding to initial empiric antibiotic therapy, discontinue double coverage for gram-negative infection or empiric glycopeptide (if initiated) after 24 to 72 hours if there is no specific microbiologic indication to continue combination therapy	Strong recommendation Moderate quality evidence
B2. Do not modify initial empirical antibacterial regimen based solely on persistent fever in children who are clinically stable	Strong recommendation Low quality evidence
B3. In children with persistent fever who become clinically unstable, escalate the initial empirical antibacterial regimen to include coverage for resistant gram-negative, gram-positive, and anaerobic bacteria	Strong recommendation Very low quality evidence
<b>Cessation of Treatment</b>	
B4. In all patients, discontinue empirical antibiotics in patients who have negative blood cultures at 48 hours, who have been afebrile for at least 24 hours, and who have evidence of marrow recovery	Strong recommendation Low quality evidence
B5. In patients with low-risk febrile neutropenia, consider discontinuation of empirical antibiotics at 72 hours in patients who have negative blood cultures and who have been afebrile for at least 24 hours, irrespective of marrow recovery status, as long as careful follow-up is ensured	Weak recommendation Moderate quality evidence
<b>C. Empiric Antifungal Treatment ≥96 Hours after Initiation of Empiric Antibacterial Treatment</b>	
<b>Risk Stratification</b>	
C1. Patients at high risk of invasive fungal disease are those with AML, high-risk ALL, or relapsed acute leukemia and children undergoing allogeneic HSCT. Children with prolonged neutropenia and children receiving high-dose corticosteroids are also at high risk of invasive fungal disease. All others should be categorized as Invasive Fungal Disease low risk.	Strong recommendation Low quality evidence
<b>Evaluation</b>	
C2a. In terms of biomarkers to guide empirical antifungal management for prolonged (≥ 96 hours) febrile neutropenia in invasive fungal disease high-risk patients: Consider not using serum galactomannan	Weak recommendation Moderate quality evidence
C2b. In terms of biomarkers to guide empirical antifungal management for prolonged (≥ 96 hours) febrile neutropenia in invasive fungal disease high-risk patients: Do not use β-D-glucan.	Strong recommendation Low quality evidence
C2c. In terms of biomarkers to guide empirical antifungal management for prolonged (≥ 96 hours) febrile neutropenia in invasive fungal disease high-risk patients: Do not use fungal PCR testing in blood	Strong recommendation Moderate quality evidence

<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence</b>
C3a. In terms of imaging for the evaluation of prolonged (≥ 96 hours) febrile neutropenia in invasive fungal disease high-risk patients: Perform CT of the lungs.	Strong recommendation Low quality evidence
C3b. In terms of imaging for the evaluation of prolonged (≥ 96 hours) febrile neutropenia in invasive fungal disease high-risk patients: Consider imaging of abdomen in patients without localizing signs or symptoms.	Weak recommendation Low quality evidence
C3c. In terms of imaging for the evaluation of prolonged (≥ 96 hours) febrile neutropenia in invasive fungal disease high-risk patients: Consider not routinely performing CT of sinuses in patients without localizing signs or symptoms.	Weak recommendation Low quality evidence
<b>Treatment</b>	
C4. In invasive fungal disease patients with prolonged (≥ 96 hours) febrile neutropenia unresponsive to broad-spectrum antibacterial agents, initiate caspofungin or liposomal amphotericin B for empirical antifungal therapy.	Strong recommendation High quality evidence
C5. In invasive fungal disease low risk patients with prolonged (≥ 96 hours) febrile neutropenia, consider withholding empirical antifungal therapy.	Weak recommendation Low quality evidence

\*see [Appendix 1](#)

[Table of Contents](#)

**11. Platelet Transfusion for Patients with Cancer**

The evidence-based recommendations included in the “Platelet Transfusion for Patients with Cancer: American Society of Clinical Oncology (ASCO) Clinical Practice Guideline Update” were endorsed by the COG Supportive Care Guideline Committee in October, 2018.

The source guideline is published Schiffer CA, Bohlke K, Delaney M, et al. J Clin Oncol. 2018;36(3):283-299. doi:10.1200/JCO.2017.76.1734) and is available at: <http://ascopubs.org/doi/pdf/10.1200/JCO.2017.76.1734>

The purpose of the source guideline is to provide evidence-based recommendations regarding the use of platelet transfusion in people with cancer. They are limited to people aged 4 months and older.

Recommendations from the endorsed clinical practice guideline are presented in the table below. Recommendations deemed not to be generalizable to pediatric patients by the source clinical practice guideline panel have been omitted.

**Summary of Recommendations for Platelet Transfusion for Patients with Cancer**

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence*
<b>How should platelets for transfusion be prepared?</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Platelets for transfusion can be prepared either by separation of units of platelet concentrates (PCs) from whole blood using either the buffy coat (BC) or the platelet-rich plasma (PRP) method, which can be pooled before administration, or by apheresis from single donors. Comparative studies have shown that the post-transfusion increments, hemostatic benefit, and adverse effects are similar with any of these platelet products. Thus, in routine circumstances, they can be used interchangeably. In most centers, pooled PCs are less costly. Single-donor platelets from selected donors are necessary when histocompatible platelet transfusions are needed. (ASCO Q1)</li> </ul>	<p>Evidence quality: High Strength of recommendation: Strong</p>
<b>Should platelet transfusions be given prophylactically or therapeutically?</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prophylactic platelet transfusion should be administered to patients with thrombocytopenia resulting from impaired bone marrow function to reduce the risk of hemorrhage when the platelet count falls below a predefined threshold level. This threshold level for transfusion varies according to the patient’s diagnosis, clinical condition, and treatment modality. (ASCO Q4)</li> </ul>	<p>Evidence quality: High Strength of recommendation: Strong</p>

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence*
<b>What platelet transfusion threshold should be used?</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <b>Patients with Hematologic Malignancies:</b> The Panel recommends a threshold of <math>&lt;10 \times 10^9/L</math> for prophylactic platelet transfusion in patients receiving therapy for hematologic malignancies. Transfusion at higher levels may be advisable in patients with signs of hemorrhage, high fever, hyperleukocytosis, rapid fall of platelet count, or coagulation abnormalities (eg, acute promyelocytic leukemia) and in those undergoing invasive procedures or in circumstances in which platelet transfusions may not be readily available in case of emergencies, as might be the case for outpatients who live at a distance from the treatment center. (ASCO Q5) </li> <li> <b>Patients in the Setting of Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplant:</b> The Panel recommends a threshold of <math>&lt; 10 \times 10^9/L</math> for prophylactic platelet transfusion in adult and pediatric patients undergoing allogeneic HSCT. Prophylactic platelet transfusion may be administered at higher counts based on clinician judgment. (ASCO Q6) </li> <li> <b>Platelet Count at which Surgical or Invasive Procedures may be Performed:</b> The Panel recommends a threshold of <math>40 \times 10^9/L</math> to <math>50 \times 10^9/L</math> for performing major invasive procedures in the absence of associated coagulation abnormalities. Certain procedures, such as bone marrow aspirations and biopsies, and removal of central venous catheters, can be performed safely at counts <math>&lt; 20 \times 10^9/L</math>. There are sparse data, and no randomized trials, addressing the safety of other invasive procedures at much lower count levels. If platelet transfusions are administered before a procedure, it is critical that a post-transfusion platelet count be obtained to prove that the desired platelet count level has been reached. Platelet transfusions should also be available on short notice, in case intraoperative or post-operative bleeding occurs. For alloimmunized patients, histocompatible platelets must be available in these circumstances. (ASCO Q9) </li> </ul>	<p>Evidence quality: High Strength of recommendation: Strong</p> <p>Evidence quality: High Strength of recommendation: Moderate</p> <p>Evidence quality: Low Strength of recommendation: Weak</p>



RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence*
<b>In what circumstances should providers take steps to prevent Rh alloimmunization resulting from platelet transfusion?</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prevention of RhD alloimmunization resulting from platelet transfusions to RhD-negative recipients can be achieved either through the exclusive use of platelet products collected from RhD-negative donors or via anti-D immune prophylaxis. These approaches may be used for female children and female adults of child-bearing potential being treated with curative intent. However, because of the low rate of RhD alloimmunization in patients with cancer, these approaches need not be applied universally. (ASCO Q2)</li> </ul>	<p>Evidence quality: Intermediate Strength of recommendation: Moderate</p>
<b>How should refractoriness to platelet transfusion be managed?</b>	
<p><b>Implementation tip from the COG Supportive Care Guideline Committee:</b> The recommendation below applies to platelet refractoriness due to alloimmunization. Other causes of platelet refractoriness should be excluded.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alloimmunization is usually due to antibody against HLA antigens and only rarely to platelet-specific antigens. Patients with alloimmune-refractory thrombocytopenia, as defined previously,<sup>†</sup> are best managed with platelet transfusions from histocompatible donors matched for HLA-A and HLA-B antigens. Many blood suppliers have access to computerized lists of such donors. For patients (1) whose HLA type cannot be determined, (2) who have uncommon HLA types for whom suitable donors cannot be identified, or (3) who do not respond to HLA-matched platelets, histocompatible platelet donors can often be identified using platelet cross-matching techniques. In many patients, these two techniques are complementary. (ASCO Q11)</li> </ul> <p><sup>†</sup>A diagnosis of refractoriness to platelet transfusion should be made only when at least two transfusions of ABO-compatible units, stored for &lt; 72 hours, result in poor increments. See: Schiffer CA, et al. J Clin Oncol. 2018; 36(3):283-99.</p>	<p>Evidence quality: High Strength of recommendation: Strong</p>

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence*
<b>In what circumstances should providers use leukoreduced blood products to prevent alloimmunization?</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The incidence of alloantibody-mediated refractoriness to platelet transfusion can be decreased in patients with acute myeloid leukemia (AML) receiving induction chemotherapy when both platelet and RBC products are leukoreduced before transfusion. It is therefore appropriate to provide leukoreduced blood products to patients with AML from the time of diagnosis to ameliorate this important clinical problem. Although randomized trials have not been conducted in other patient groups, it is likely that alloimmunization can also be decreased in patients with other types of leukemia and in other patients with cancer who are receiving chemotherapy. There are fewer data in patients who are not receiving chemotherapy in the same time periods that the transfusions are being administered (eg, aplastic anemia, myelodysplasia), although the consensus would favor its use in these patients as well. In the United States and in several other countries, the overwhelming majority of blood products are now leukoreduced at the time of blood collection and component preparation. Other advantages of prestorage leukoreduction include a substantial reduction in transfusion reactions and in transmission of cytomegalovirus infection. (ASCO Q3)</li> </ul>	<p>Evidence quality: High Strength of recommendation: Strong</p>

\*see [Appendix 1](#)

[Table of Contents](#)

## 12. Treatment of Pediatric Venous Thromboembolism

The “Guidelines for Management of Venous Thromboembolism: Treatment of Pediatric Venous Thromboembolism” developed by the American Society of Hematology were endorsed by the COG Supportive Care Guideline Committee in May 2019.

The source clinical practice guideline is published (Monagle P, Cuello CA, Augustine C, Bonduel M, Brandao LR, Capman T et al. American Society of Hematology 2018 Guidelines for management of venous thromboembolism: treatment of pediatric venous thromboembolism. Blood Advances 2018; 2 (22): 3293-3316.) and is available at: <http://www.bloodadvances.org/content/2/22/3292>. Implementation resources provided by the source clinical practice guideline developers may be found at: <https://hematology.org/vte/>

The purpose of the source clinical practice guideline is to support patients, clinicians, and other health care professionals in their decisions about management of pediatric venous thromboembolism. Recommendations from the endorsed clinical practice guideline are presented in the table below.

### Summary of Recommendations for Treatment of Pediatric Venous Thromboembolism

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Certainty in Evidence*
<b>Anticoagulation in symptomatic and asymptomatic deep vein thrombosis (DVT) or pulmonary embolism (PE)</b>	
Should anticoagulation vs no anticoagulation be used in pediatric patients with symptomatic DVT or PE?	
1. The American Society of Hematology (ASH) guideline panel recommends using anticoagulation rather than no anticoagulation in pediatric patients with symptomatic deep vein thrombosis (DVT) or pulmonary embolism (PE)	Strong recommendation Very low certainty in evidence
Should anticoagulation vs no anticoagulation be used in pediatric patients with asymptomatic DVT or PE?	
2. The ASH guideline panel suggests either using anticoagulation or no anticoagulation in pediatric patients with asymptomatic DVT or PE	Conditional recommendation Very low certainty in evidence
<b>Thrombolysis, thrombectomy, and inferior vena cava filters</b>	
Should thrombolysis followed by anticoagulation vs anticoagulation alone be used in pediatric patients with DVT?	
3. The ASH guideline panel suggests against using thrombolysis followed by anticoagulation; rather, anticoagulation alone should be used in pediatric patients with DVT	Conditional recommendation Very low certainty in evidence
Should thrombolysis followed by anticoagulation vs anticoagulation alone be used in pediatric patients with submassive PE?	
4. The ASH guideline panel suggests against using thrombolysis followed by anticoagulation; rather, anticoagulation alone should be used in pediatric patients with submassive PE	Conditional recommendation Very low certainty in evidence

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Certainty in Evidence*
Should thrombolysis followed by anticoagulation vs anticoagulation alone be used in pediatric patients with PE with hemodynamic compromise?	
5. The ASH guideline panel suggests using thrombolysis followed by anticoagulation, rather than anticoagulation alone, in pediatric patients with PE with hemodynamic compromise	Conditional recommendation Very low certainty in evidence
Should thrombectomy followed by anticoagulation vs anticoagulation alone be used in pediatric patients with symptomatic DVT or PE?	
6. The ASH guideline panel suggests against using thrombectomy followed by anticoagulation; rather, anticoagulation alone should be used in pediatric patients with symptomatic DVT or PE	Conditional recommendation Very low certainty in evidence
Should IVC filter vs anticoagulation be used in pediatric patients with symptomatic DVT or PE?	
7. The ASH guideline panel suggests against using inferior vena cava (IVC) filter; rather anticoagulation alone should be used in pediatric patients with symptomatic DVT or PE	Conditional recommendation Very low certainty in evidence
<b>Thrombolysis, thrombectomy, and inferior vena cava filters</b>	
Should antithrombin (AT) replacement in addition to standard anticoagulation vs standard anticoagulation alone be used in pediatric patients with DVT or cerebral sino venous thrombosis (CSVT) or PE?	
8a. The ASH guideline panel suggests against using AT-replacement therapy in addition to standard anticoagulation; rather, standard anticoagulation alone should be used in pediatric patients with DVT/CSVT/PE	Conditional recommendation Very low certainty in evidence
8b. The ASH guideline panel suggests using AT-replacement therapy in addition to standard anticoagulation rather than standard anticoagulation alone in pediatric patients with DVT/CSVT/PE who have failed to respond clinically to standard anticoagulation treatment and in whom subsequent measurement of AT concentrations reveals low AT levels based on age appropriate reference ranges	Conditional recommendation Very low certainty in evidence
<b>Central venous access device (CVAD)-related thrombosis</b>	
Should removal of a functioning CVAD vs no removal be used in pediatric patients with symptomatic CVAD-related thrombosis who continue to require access?	
9. The ASH guideline panel suggests no removal, rather than removal, of a functioning CVAD in pediatric patients with symptomatic CVAD-related thrombosis who continue to require venous access	Conditional recommendation Very low certainty in evidence
Should removal of a nonfunctioning or unneeded CVADs vs no removal be used in pediatric patients with symptomatic CVAD-related thrombosis?	
10. The ASH guideline panel recommends removal, rather than no removal, of a nonfunctioning or unneeded CVAD in pediatric patients with symptomatic CVAD-related thrombosis	Strong recommendation Very low certainty in evidence

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Certainty in Evidence*
Should immediate removal of a nonfunctioning or unneeded CVAD vs delayed removal be used in pediatric patients with symptomatic CVAD-related thrombosis?	
11. The ASH guideline panel suggests delayed removal of a CVAD until after initiation of anticoagulation (days), rather than immediate removal in pediatric patients with symptomatic central venous line-related thrombosis who no longer require venous access or in whom the CVAD is nonfunctioning	Conditional recommendation Very low certainty in evidence
Should removal of a functioning CVAD vs no removal be used in pediatric patients with symptomatic CVAD-related thrombosis with worsening signs or symptoms, despite anticoagulation, who continue to require access?	
12. The ASH guideline panel suggests either removal or no removal of a functioning CVAD in pediatric patients who have symptomatic CVAD-related thrombosis with worsening signs or symptoms, despite anticoagulation, and who continue to require venous access	Conditional recommendation Very low certainty in evidence
<b>Low-molecular-weight heparin vs vitamin K antagonists</b>	
Should low-molecular-weight heparin vs vitamin K antagonists be used in pediatric patients with symptomatic DVT or PE as maintenance therapy after the first few days?	
13. The ASH guideline panel suggests using either low-molecular weight heparin or vitamin K antagonists in pediatric patients with symptomatic DVT or PE	Conditional recommendation Very low certainty in evidence
<b>Provoked DVT or PE</b>	
Should anticoagulation for > 3 months vs anticoagulation for up to 3 months be used in pediatric patients with provoked DVT or PE?	
14. The ASH guideline panel suggests using anticoagulation for ≤ 3 months rather than anticoagulation for > 3 months in pediatric patients with provoked DVT or PE	Conditional recommendation Very low certainty in evidence
<b>Unprovoked DVT or PE</b>	
Should anticoagulation for > 6 to 12 months vs anticoagulation for 6 to 12 months be used in pediatric patients with unprovoked DVT or PE?	
15. The ASH guideline panel suggests using anticoagulation for 6 to 12 months rather than anticoagulation for > 6 to 12 months in pediatric patients with unprovoked DVT or PE	Conditional recommendation Very low certainty in evidence
<b>CVAD-related superficial vein thrombosis</b>	
Should anticoagulation vs no anticoagulation be used in pediatric patients with CVAD-related superficial vein thrombosis?	
16. The ASH guideline panel suggests using either anticoagulation or no anticoagulation in pediatric patients with CVAD-related superficial vein thrombosis	Conditional recommendation Very low certainty in evidence

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Certainty in Evidence*
<b>Right atrial thrombosis</b>	
Should anticoagulation vs no anticoagulation be used in neonates and pediatric patients with right atrial thrombosis?	
17. The ASH guideline panel suggests using anticoagulation, rather than no anticoagulation, in pediatric patients with right atrial thrombosis	Conditional recommendation Very low certainty in evidence
Should thrombolysis or surgical thrombectomy followed by standard anticoagulation vs anticoagulation alone be used in neonates and pediatric patients with right atrial thrombosis?	
18. The ASH guideline panel suggests against using thrombolysis or surgical thrombectomy, followed by standard anticoagulation; rather, anticoagulation alone should be used in pediatric patients with right atrial thrombosis	Conditional recommendation Very low certainty in evidence
<b>Portal vein thrombosis (PVT)</b>	
Should anticoagulation vs no anticoagulation be used in pediatric patients with PVT?	
21a. The ASH guideline panel suggests using anticoagulation, rather than no anticoagulation, in pediatric patients with PVT with occlusive thrombus, postliver transplant, and idiopathic PVT	Conditional recommendation Very low certainty in evidence
21b. The ASH guideline panel suggests using no anticoagulation, rather than anticoagulation, in pediatric patients with PVT with nonocclusive thrombus or portal hypertension	Conditional recommendation Very low certainty in evidence
<b>Cerebral sino venous thrombosis (CSVT)</b>	
Should anticoagulation vs no anticoagulation be used in pediatric patients with CSVT?	
22a. The ASH guideline panel recommends using anticoagulation, rather than no anticoagulation, in pediatric patients with CSVT without hemorrhage	Strong recommendation Very low certainty in evidence
22b. The ASH guideline panel suggests using anticoagulation, rather than no anticoagulation, in pediatric patients with CSVT with hemorrhage	Conditional recommendation Very low certainty in evidence
Should thrombolysis followed by standard anticoagulation vs anticoagulation alone be used in pediatric patients with CSVT?	
23. The ASH guideline panel suggests against using thrombolysis followed by standard anticoagulation; rather, anticoagulation alone should be used in pediatric patients with CSVT	Conditional recommendation Very low certainty in evidence

\*see [Appendix 1](#)

## Appendix 1: Systems for Classifying Recommendations and Evidence used by the Source Clinical Practice Guidelines

I. GRADE: used by Nahirniak S, Slichter SJ, Tanael S, et al. *Transfusion Medicine Reviews* 2015; 29; 3-13.

### Strength of Recommendations:

<b>Strong Recommendation</b>	When using GRADE, panels make strong recommendations when they are confident that the desirable effects of adherence to a recommendation outweigh the undesirable effects.
<b>Weak or Conditional Recommendation</b>	Weak or conditional recommendations indicate that the desirable effects of adherence to a recommendation probably outweigh the undesirable effects, but the panel is less confident.

### Strength of Recommendations Determinants:

Factor	Comment
Balance between desirable and undesirable effects	The larger the difference between the desirable and undesirable effects, the higher the likelihood that a strong recommendation is warranted. The narrower the gradient, the higher the likelihood that a weak recommendation is warranted
Quality of evidence	The higher the quality of evidence, the higher the likelihood that a strong recommendation is warranted
Values and preferences	The more values and preferences vary, or the greater the uncertainty in values and preferences, the higher the likelihood that a weak recommendation is warranted
Costs (resource allocation)	The higher the costs of an intervention—that is, the greater the resources consumed—the lower the likelihood that a strong recommendation is warranted

### Quality of Evidence or Certainty in Evidence

<b>High Quality/Certainty</b>	Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect
<b>Moderate Quality/Certainty</b>	Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate
<b>Low Quality/Certainty</b>	Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate
<b>Very Low Quality/Certainty</b>	Any estimate of effect is very uncertain

Guyatt, G.H., et al., *GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations*. *BMJ*, 2008; 336: 924-926.

Guyatt, G.H., et al., *GRADE: going from evidence to recommendations*. *BMJ*, 2008; 336: 1049-1051.

II. American Society of Clinical Oncology: used by: Schiffer CA, Bohlke K, Delaney M, et al. Platelet Transfusion for Patients With Cancer: American Society of Clinical Oncology Clinical Practice Guideline Update. JCO 2018 36:3, 283-299.

### Guide for Strength of Recommendations

Rating for Strength of Recommendation	Definition
<b>Strong</b>	There is high confidence that the recommendation reflects best practice. This is based on (1) strong evidence for a true net effect (eg, benefits exceed harms); (2) consistent results, with no or minor exceptions; (3) minor or no concerns about study quality; and/or (4) the extent of Expert Panelists' agreement. Other compelling considerations (discussed in the guideline's literature review and analyses) may also warrant a strong recommendation.
<b>Moderate</b>	There is moderate confidence that the recommendation reflects best practice. This is based on (1) good evidence for a true net effect (eg, benefits exceed harms); (2) consistent results, with minor and/or few exceptions; (3) minor and/or few concerns about study quality; and/or (4) the extent of Expert Panelists' agreement. Other compelling considerations (discussed in the guideline's literature review and analyses) may also warrant a moderate recommendation.
<b>Weak</b>	There is some confidence that the recommendation offers the best current guidance for practice. This is based on (1) limited evidence for a true net effect (eg, benefits exceed harms); (2) consistent results, but with important exceptions; (3) concerns about study quality; and/or (4) the extent of Expert Panelists' agreement. Other considerations (discussed in the guideline's literature review and analyses) may also warrant a weak recommendation.

### Guide for Quality of Evidence

Rating for Strength of Evidence	Definition
<b>High</b>	High confidence that the available evidence reflects the true magnitude and direction of the net effect (i.e., balance of benefits v harms) and that further research is very unlikely to change either the magnitude or direction of this net effect.
<b>Intermediate</b>	Moderate confidence that the available evidence reflects the true magnitude and direction of the net effect. Further research is unlikely to alter the direction of the net effect; however, it might alter the magnitude of the net effect.
<b>Low</b>	Low confidence that the available evidence reflects the true magnitude and direction of the net effect. Further research may change either the magnitude and/or direction this net effect.
<b>Insufficient</b>	Evidence is insufficient to discern the true magnitude and direction of the net effect. Further research may better inform the topic. The use of the consensus opinion of experts is reasonable to inform outcomes related to the topic.