American Journal of
Oral Medicine and Radiology

ISSN - 2394-7721

www.mcmed.us/journal/ajomr

Research Article

A PROSPECTIVE STUDY OF A SCORING SYSTEM TO ASSIST THE DECISION FOR A NEW SYSTEMIC THERAPY FOR METASTATIC MALIGNANCIES FOLLOWING AT LEAST TWO LINES OF PALLIATIVE RADIATION-THERAPY

Dr. Prakash kulithungan[1*], Dr. Revanth V[2]

[*1]Associate Professor, Sri lakshminarayana Institute of medical sciences, Puducherry.
[2]Assistant Professor, Sri lakshminarayana Institute of medical sciences, Pondicherry

ABSTRACT

A provider's preference, rather than the case preference, determines how "ordinary care is provided." "Proven strategy practices are underutilized, proven unsuccessful practices are overutilized," according to the National Cancer Policy Board. Developing a scoring system to assist in the selection of a systemic therapy for metastatic tumours after two rounds of palliative radiation therapy can help. We examined all the baseline variables in an exploratory prognostic study. The prognosis was better for women, ovarian initial tumor site, and group A when analyzed univariately, but not for age, past therapy response, and the number and type of current therapy lines. Between 0% (death) and 100% are possible scores. Survival has been reasonably predicted by the score multiple times. A retrospective study using PPS evaluated the outcomes of advanced cancer patients prior to beginning a new cycle of treatment. Among the study's limitations are its few participants and the diversity of the group's original tumor types.

Key words:- Metastatic malignancy, radiation therapy, cisplatin, scoring

Access this article online	
Home page: http://www.mcmed.us/journal/ajomr	Quick Response code

Received:25.10.19	**Revised**:12.11.19	**Accepted**:14.02.22

INTRODUCTION

There is only one treatment that is effective against metastatic tumours: palliative systemic therapy, which helps to prolong and enhance quality of life. Radiation therapy has been proven effective only in two to three lines. Outside of experimental settings, it is not appropriate to consider the possibility of worsening quality of life beyond these accepted therapy options. As determined by the Society of Clinical Oncology expert group [1] in 2012, the top five oncology items are as follows.

Corresponding Author:
Dr. Prakash kulithungan

The additional antitumor therapy should not be given to patients with low performance statuses (3 or 4), who have not received previous evidence-based interventions, who are not eligible to participate in experiments, and who lack convincing evidence of its clinical efficacy. Radiation therapy, on the other hand, has serious adverse effects, yet instances frequently want it. Using cisplatinum-based radiation therapy to treat non-small cell respiratory tumours, the minimum survival benefit needed to accept the harm of radiation therapy was determined. A week of extra survival would only be worth 6% of patients' efforts according to [2]. Radiation therapy was tolerated by many tumour cases in the initial instance despite an extremely

slim chance of benefit [3]; however, a greater chance of living without a cure was not an option. In order to provide cancer care that is as supportive as possible, oncologists must know when to halt intense anticancer treatment. It has been observed that ordinary care involves utilizing treatment methods of dubious efficacy based on provider whim, while proven strategy practices are underutilized and proven ineffective practices are overutilized." A review of [7] focused on the idea of overly combative tumour treatment, a sign that ordinary treatment is taking place; key points were the overuse of radiation therapy, which can result in high hospital admissions or visits to a medical crisis unit for serious cases, as well as the underuse of the medical crisis unit. 177 hospitalized patients with various tumours and an expected survival of less than six months were already assessed for their predictive value using a basic score based on four characteristics [8]. A case-physician relationship can be used in this scoring system to determine treatment plans and life projections during this critical time, for example, by defining cases with a median prognosis. Short-lived cancer patients who require additional anti-tumor therapies like radiation-therapy. However, more research is needed before the prediction score can be used in clinical practice. Radiation therapy beyond the second line for tumour cases had this grading approach prospectively tested.

Targets and Goals

In the case of metastatic cancer, the branding system can assist in deciding if another therapy is needed after two lines of palliative radiation treatment have been administered.

Cases and techniques

Arrangement of the study

A prospective, unicentric trial was carried out at our Comprehensive Cancer Center in which we enrolled adults over 18 with solid tumours getting at least their third session of radiation treatment. Cases of breast cancer and participants in planned trials were eliminated after a series of systemic therapies proved effective beyond the second line of treatment.

Method of grading

A grading system was created by Barbot et al. [8] based on four variables: performance status, the number of changeover sites, serum LDH levels, and albumin levels. Clinical factors were evaluated on the first day of the new radiation therapy, and biological parameters were examined in a blood sample drawn the day before. The Karnofsky Performance Status scale was used to evaluate PS in the seminal paper; we used the Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group scale [10] and its equivalent to the previously published KPS scale [11]: ECOG PS 0 = KPS 100 percent, PS 1 = KPS 90-80 percent, PS 2 = KPS 70-60 percent, PS 3 = KPS 50-40 percent, and PS 4 = KPS 30- ECOG PS 0-1, 0 point (pt); ECOG PS On a scale of one to ten, the scores ranged from 0 to 10. Based on their ratings, we separated the participants into three groups: group A, which had a score range of 0 to 3, group B, which had a score range of 4 to 7, and group C, which had a score range of 8 to 10.

Statistical analysis

Fisher's exact test was used to compare groups based on baseline case and disease characteristics. Overall survival, which was calculated from enrollment to death, was our primary outcome. Censoring was conducted at the final contact point when the cases were still alive. From enrollment through the last contact with event-free instances, we determined the follow-up period. For the purpose of comparing groups and forecasting survival curves, we used the log-rank test and the Kaplan-Meier method.

A Cox regression analysis was used to examine OS univariately and multivariate. We include in the multivariate analysis any variables whose p value was below 5% in the univariate analysis. As well as sensitivity, specificity, and the area under the receiver-operating characteristic curve, Harrell's concordance index [12] was used to assess OS at 2, 4, and 6 months. A 5% level of significance was applied to all statistical tests. Statisticians used R's survival package to analyze the data.

Results

The baseline variables were used as a basis for an exploratory prognostic study. A multivariate analysis indicated that group A, colorectal origin, and female gender were all related to better prognoses [Table 1], whereas age, past therapy response, and current therapy lines were not. Multivariate analyses are performed whenever possible.

Table 1: Tumour Based Classification

Characteristics		HR
Age		1.02
Sex	M VS F	3.28
Primary Tumour Type	respiratory vs Colorectal	0.48
	Ovary vs Colorectal	0.22
	Sarcoma vs Colorectal	0.43
	Other vs Colorectal	0.87

Median Number of Previous Therapeutic Lines	3VS2	0.67
	4VS2	0.61
	5VS2	1.89
	6VS2	0.42
	7VS2	2.77
Best Response Obtained with Previous Therapy	PRVSPD	0.76
	SDVS PD	1.28
New Systemic therapy	Poly CT vs Mono CT	1.11
	Targeted Therapy vs Mono CT	0.73
Score Based Group	B VS A	5.46
	C VS A	6.42

Discussion

The previously created score system, as well as new lines of systemic radiation therapy beyond the second line and standard guidelines, were found to be prognostic of survival in a group of steadily pretreated tumor cases [8]. In 1999, SEER data showed that 11.6% of people who died within 14 days of receiving radiation treatment received it, despite evidence that overly aggressive tumour therapy is not the best option. Various reasons were given for such choices by the authors [21]. Since most physicians had anecdotal experience with them, they were often easier to recommend. Often, assertive therapy is required because of irrational beliefs about their prognosis. Researchers found that people were more likely to receive radiation therapy, be admitted to the critical care unit, and visit medical crisis units as they aged [22]. Over time, cancer care became more assertive near the end of life. The US' healthcare system differs significantly from China's, which is likely why the two countries have different rates of critical care and radiation therapy. Radiation therapy was more likely to be administered in the last month of life in 2012 than in 2005 and 2010. In a recent study of 1193 cases in the United States, 69% of lung cancer patients and 81% of colorectal cancer patients failed to understand that radiation therapy might not cure their illness, making informed decisions about treatment impossible. The patient's satisfaction will also be improved if the doctor understands the issue better. Communication graded higher by patients was associated with inflated expectations. According to several studies, if tumour patients could choose to accept harmful treatments in exchange for a 1% chance of a cure, they would not. Devastation planning and handling might be hindered by this misconception. It is necessary to develop new procedures for shared decision making when there is little evidence to support a therapy's effectiveness or when patients have incurable conditions.

As a result, we must place a high priority on doctors. In a study of 722 patients with metastatic respiratory or colorectal cancer who died in their last month, 18% received radiation therapy. As an interesting side note, this same ratio was found among patients aware of their tumour's inefficacy to treat with radiation therapy (21.7%) as well as those unaware of such information (15.8%).

Several biochemical and clinical markers will be used. There were three types of case studies scored in the crucial study: one concerning average survival, one concerning superior survival, and one concerning intermediate survival. At least two validated radiation-therapy regimens were administered to our group of individuals with a poor clinical outcome.

Three distinct groups with different survival rates were identified using the same score-based case classification, which may be helpful in better tailoring therapy: patients in group A had a median survival of 9 months, while those in group B and C had median survivals of 2.3 and 1.6 months, respectively. Group A patients with performance levels 0 to 2 at inclusion had a median OS of 9 months, compared to group B patients with performance levels 2.7 months. The method used in this study differs from Barbot et al. This score was derived using Karnofsky.

There are several metrics that can be used for assessing palliative care prognoses. In this study, a score based on six prognostic variables was used, the Palliative Prognostic Score [14], which is the most widely used and validated. This score measures dyspnea, anorexia, KPS, total white blood cell count, lymphocyte percentage, and clinical survival prediction. Calculated using the PaP Score, you have a 30 percent chance of living for at least 30 days. Victoria Hospital created and updated the palliative performance score in 1996. As part of a second version of this score, the KPS considers the case's ambulation capacity, active level, signs of illness relevance, and level of consciousness, as well as self-care, food intake, and self-care. In this scale, 0 represents death and 100 represents success. Many studies have shown that the score predicts survival with reasonable accuracy [15, 16]. In retrospective studies, PPS was also used to evaluate patients' progress prior to starting a new round of chemotherapy. Radiation-therapy cycles are rarely started again for patients with low PS, according to doctors. Similarly, a cohort study found 68 to 5 days of median survival (PPI > 6) in people with PPI 4-6 [18]. According to studies comparing these ratings, they are not

significantly different from ECOG or KPS in terms of predicting mortality [19].

According to a recent study [20-24], these prognostic scores are more accurate than subjective assessments such as the CPS because they incorporate clinical and biochemical outcomes. Our study, on the other hand, aimed to assess the prognosis of patients nearing the end of their lives and to provide medical professionals and tumour patients with information that will allow them to avoid experimental systemic therapies in patients who have already been treated with radiation for at least two lines of cancer. Such occurrences are common, according to a recent study.

Conclusion

Patients receiving radiation therapy after the second line who have solid tumours can benefit from this straightforward scoring system based on four criteria. Because of the small sample size and diversity in original tumor types and prior radiation treatment lines, this study had major limitations in assessing this score. We did not justify a sample size because we were trying to determine if this score would be useful in a small cohort of cases over a specified timeframe.

REFERENCE:

1. Chanez B, Bertucci F, Gilabert M, Madroszyk A, Rousseau F, Perrot D, Viens P, Raoul JL.(2017). A scoring system to guide the decision for a new systemic treatment after at least two lines of palliative chemotherapy for metastatic cancers: a prospective study. *Support Care Cancer*. Sep25(9), 2715-2722.
2. Złoch M, Maślak E, Kupczyk W, Jackowski M, Pomastowski P, Buszewski B. (2021). Culturomics Approach to Identify Diabetic Foot Infection Bacteria. *Int J Mol Sci*. Sep 3, 22(17), 9574.
3. Wadee AN, Aref MHF, Nassar AA, Aboughaleb IH, Fahmy SM. (2021). The influence of low- intensity laser irradiation versus hyperbaric oxygen therapy on transcutaneous oxygen tension in chronic diabetic foot ulcers: a controlled randomized trial. *J Diabetes Metab Disord.* Sep 3, 20(2), 1489-1497.
4. Reynès C, Perez-Martin A, Ennaifer H, Silva H, Knapp Y, Vinet A. (2021). Mechanisms of Venoarteriolar Reflex in Type 2 Diabetes with or without Peripheral Neuropathy. *Biology (Basel)*. Apr 15, 10(4), 333.
5. Duan Y, Ren W, Xu L, Ye W, Jan YK, Pu F. (2021). The effects of different accumulated pressure-time integral stimuli on plantar blood flow in people with diabetes mellitus. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord.* Jun 18, 22(1), 554.
6. Silva V, Almeida L, Gaio V, Cerca N, Manageiro V, Caniça M, Capelo JL, Igrejas G, Poeta P. (2021) Biofilm Formation of Multidrug-Resistant MRSA Strains Isolated from Different Types of Human Infections. *Pathogens.* Jul 30, 10(8), 970.
7. Zahedi L, Ghourchi Beigi P, Shafiee M, Zare F, Mahdikia H, Abdouss M, Abdollahifar MA, Shokri B. (2021) Development of plasma functionalized polypropylene wound dressing for betaine hydrochloride controlled drug delivery on diabetic wounds. *Sci Rep*. May 5, 11(1), 9641.
8. Oliver TI, Mutluoglu M. Diabetic Foot Ulcer. (2021). Aug 19. In: StatPearls [Internet]. Treasure Island (FL): *StatPearls Publishing*; 30726013.
9. Murphy-Lavoie HM, Ramsey A, Nguyen M, Singh S. Diabetic Foot Infections. 2021 Jul 10. In: StatPearls [Internet]. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing; 2021 Jan–. PMID: 28722943.
10. Veikutiene, A., Sirvinskas, E., Grybauskas, P., Cimbolaityte, J., Mongirdiene, A., & Veikutis, V. (2005). Baumann Kreuziger, L., Karkouti, K., Tweddell, J., & Massicotte, M. P. (2018). Antithrombotic therapy management of adult and pediatric cardiac surgery patients. *Journal of Thrombosis and Haemostasis*.
11. Influence of preoperative treatment with aspirin or heparin on platelet function and intensity of postoperative bleeding in early period after coronary artery bypass surgery. Medicina (Kaunas, Lithuania).
12. Sirvinskas, E., Veikutiene, A., Grybauskas, P., Cimbolaityte, J., Mongirdiene, A., Veikutis, V., & Raliene, L. (2006). Influence of aspirin or heparin on platelet function and postoperative blood loss after coronary artery bypass surgery. Perfusion.
13. Baumann Kreuziger, L., Karkouti, K., Tweddell, J., & Massicotte, M. P. (2018). Antithrombotic therapy management of adult and pediatric cardiac surgery patients. *Journal of Thrombosis and Haemostasis*.
14. Kern, S., Skoog, I., Östling, S., Kern, J., & Börjesson-Hanson, A. (2012). Does low-dose acetylsalicylic acid prevent cognitive decline in women with high cardiovascular risk? A 5-year follow-up of a non-demented population-based cohort of Swedish elderly women. BMJ Open.
15. Spinler, S. A., Hilleman, D. E., Cheng, J. W. M., Howard, P. A., Mauro, V. F., Lopez, L. M., … Nappi, J. M. (2001). New recommendations from the 1999 American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association acute myocardial infarction guidelines. *Annals of Pharmacotherapy*.
16. Ahmed B, Nasir K, Mehmood A, Abid MA, Zehra NA, Khan AH, Hussain SA, Kashif WU, Iqbal R. Effect of physical activity and vitamin D compared with vitamin D alone on muscle strength, back flexibility and aerobic activity in patients with chronic kidney disease: A comparative study from Pakistan. *Asia Pac J Clin Nutr*. 2021 Dec, 30(4), 566-572.

17. Bover J, Gunnarsson J, Csomor P, Kaiser E, Cianciolo G, Lauppe R.(2021) Impact of nutritional vitamin D supplementation on parathyroid hormone and 25-hydroxyvitamin D levels in non-dialysis chronic kidney disease: a meta-analysis. *Clin Kidney J*. Feb 5, 14(10), 2177-2186.
18. Arenas Jimenez MD, González-Parra E, Riera M, Rincón Bello A, López-Herradón A, Cao H, Hurtado S, Collado S, Ribera L, Barbosa F, Dapena F, Torregrosa V, Broseta JJ, Soto Montañez C, Navarro-González JF, Ramos R, Bover J, Nogués-Solan X, Crespo M, Dusso AS, Pascual J.(2021). Mortality in Hemodialysis Patients with COVID-19, the Effect of Paricalcitol or Calcimimetics. *Nutrients.* Jul 26, 13(8), 2559.
19. Al-Hashimi N, Abraham S. Cholecalciferol. 2021 Aug 27. In: StatPearls [Internet]. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing; 2021 Jan–. PMID: 31747175.
20. Drugs and Lactation Database (LactMed) [Internet]. Bethesda (MD): National Library of Medicine (US); 2006–. *Vitamin D*. 2021 Oct 18. PMID: 29999973.
21. Giannini S, Passeri G, Tripepi G, Sella S, Fusaro M, Arcidiacono G, Torres MO, Michielin A, Prandini T, Baffa V, Aghi A, Egan CG, Brigo M, Zaninotto M, Plebani M, Vettor R, Fioretto P, Rossini M, Vignali A, Fabris F, Bertoldo F. (2021). Effectiveness of In-Hospital Cholecalciferol Use on Clinical Outcomes in Comorbid COVID-19 Patients: A Hypothesis-Generating Study. *Nutrients*. Jan 14, 13(1), 219.
22. Lebwohl M, Kircik L, Lacour JP, Liljedahl M, Lynde C, Mørch MH, Papp KA, Perrot JL, Gold LS, Takhar A, Thaçi D, Warren RB, Wollenberg A.(2021). Twice-weekly topical calcipotriene/betamethasone dipropionate foam as proactive management of plaque psoriasis increases time in remission and is well tolerated over 52 weeks (PSO-LONG trial). *J Am Acad Dermatol*. May, 84(5), 1269-1277.
23. Fassio A, Gatti D, Rossini M, Benini C, Fracassi E, Bertoldo E, Viapiana O, Milleri S, Gatti M, Adami G. (2021) Pharmacodynamics of Oral Cholecalciferol in Healthy Individuals with Vitamin D Deficiency: A Randomized Open-Label Study. *Nutrients.* Jul 2, 13(7), 2293.
24. Banerjee D, Chitalia N, Ster IC, Appelbaum E, Thadhani R, Kaski JC, Goldsmith D. Impact of vitamin D on cardiac structure and function in chronic kidney disease

Cite this article:
Dr. Prakash kulithungan & Dr. Revanth V. A Prospective Study of a Scoring System to Assist the Decision for A New Systemic Therapy for Metastatic Malignancies Following At Least Two Lines of Palliative Radiation-Therapy. *American Journal of Oral Medicine and Radiology*, 2019, 6(2),46-50.