Hospital pharmacist interventions for the management of oral mucositis in patients with head and neck cancer receiving chemoradiotherapy

Kensuke Yoshida^{1,2}, Shinichi Watanabe³, Naoto Hoshino⁴, Kyongsun Pak⁵, Noriaki Hidaka⁶, Noboru Konno⁷, Masaki Nakai⁶, Chinami Ando⁸, Tsuyoshi Yabuki⁹, Kouji Katsura¹⁰, Kei Tomihara², Munetoshi Sugiura¹

¹Department of Drug Safety and Risk Management, School of Pharmacy, Tokyo University of Pharmacy and Life Sciences, ² Division of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, Faculty of Dentistry & Graduate School of Medical and Dental Sciences, Niigata University, ³Department of Clinical Pharmaceutical Sciences, Matsuyama University, ⁴Division of Hospital Pharmacy, Niigata University Medical and Dental Hospital, ⁵Division of Biostatistics, Center for Clinical Research, National Center for Child Health and Development, ⁶Division of Pharmacy, Ehime University Hospital, ⁷Department of Pharmacy, Tohoku Central Hospital, ⁸Department of Pharmacy, Yamagata University Hospital, ⁹Department of Pharmacy, Uonuma Kikan Hospital, ¹⁰Division of Oral Radiology, Niigata University Medical and Dental Hospital

Introduction

Oral mucositis (OM) is a frequent adverse event in head and neck cancer (HNC) patients undergoing concurrent chemoradiotherapy (CCRT). While oral care by dental professionals helps prevent severe OM, the role of pharmacists remains unclear. Pharmacist oral care intervention may improve adherence to oral care agents and reduce oral complications such as OM.

Purpose

To evaluate the effectiveness of pharmacist oral care interventions in reducing OM in patients with HNC undergoing CCRT.

Materials & Methods

A multicenter, prospective cohort study was conducted between September 2019 and August 2022. The association between OM occurrence during CCRT and various factors was assessed. Comparing patients who received direct medication counseling and oral care intervention from hospital pharmacists with those who did not. This study was approved by the Research Ethics Committee of Niigata University (approval number: 2021-0269).

Results

Each oral care intervention program

	Pharmacist	Control
	intervention group	group
Professional oral care [*]	Yes	Yes
Type of moisturizer and mouth rinse used	Sodium azulene sulfonate hydrate preparation, dimethylisopropyla zulene ointment, lidocaine hydrochloride viscos, oral liquid	Others
The need to continue using a mouthwash and a moisturizer	Yes	No
Frequency of mouthwash more than six times a day	Yes	No
Moisturizer after mouthwash used	Yes	No
The proper storage of mouthwash (in the dark)	Yes	No

*A dentist or dental hygienist explains at the time of hospital admission on how to use a tooth brush, floss, sponge brush, mouth rinse, and moisturizer

Patients cha

Age^a

Sex (male: female) Steroid use (%) Immunosuppressant u Radiotherapy modalit (IMRT: 3DCRT: MIX) Total radiation dose (70 Gy≥: 70 Gy<) Cancer stage (%) 1:2:3:4 Type of mouthwash a moisturizer used (%) Sodium azulene s hydrate prepar Dimethylisopropyl ointment Sodium azulene s hydrate + sodium Steroidal anti-inflamm Japanese tradition Hangeshashi Lidocaine hydrochlo Others³ Length of hospital sta IMRT, intensity-modulate radiotherapy

*Others: Amphotericin B, benzethonium chloride, betamethasone valerate, and gentamicin sulfate, diclofenac sodium, glycerin, sodium alginate, sodium bicarbonate, tranexamic acid, and white petroleum ^a Data are presented as the median (interquartile range [IQR]), unless otherwise indicated. ^b Mann-Whitney U test, ^c Fisher's exact test

- oral moisture.

- maintain stability.

aracter	ristics			F
	Pharmacist	Control		L
	intervention group	group	Р	
	(n = 68)	(n = 105)		
	62.0 (53.3 - 70.5)	65.0 (58.5 - 70.0)	0.1 ^b	Gr 2
	58:10	89:16	1.0 ^c	of (
	2.9	21.9	<0.01 ^c	sitis
use (%)	0.0	1.0	1.0 ^c	nuco
es	62:3:3	58:40:7	<0.01 ^c	t oral r
	53:15	58:47	<0.01 ^c	ty withou
nd	13.3:16.7:11.7:58.3	7.1:18.4:19.4:55.1	0.4 ^c	Probabili
ation	87.7	41.5	<0.01 ^c	
azulene	84.6	28.6	<0.01 ^c	
ulfonate				
	55.4	43.4	0.2 ^c	
atory agent	4.7	3.8	1.0 ^c	
nal drug nto	1.6	8.5	0.1 ^c	
ride viscos	46.2	64.2	<0.05 ^c	Ac
	0.0	50.9	<0.01 ^c	
ys (day) ^a	60.0 (57.0 - 70.0)	62.0 (53.5 - 77.0)	0.5 ^b	
d radiotherap	y; 3DCRT, three-dimer	sional conformal		
•	-			•

Logistic Regression and Kaplan–Meier Survival Analysis with og-Rank Test for Grade 2 Oral Mucositis



• Explain the importance of gargling and maintaining adequate

• Verify whether the patient has adhered to the recommended usage frequency of six or more times per day.

• struct patients to apply moisturizing agents immediately after gargling. • Ensure that the gargling solution is stored in a dark place to

*The intervention was administered once per week throughout the treatment period

This multicenter, prospective cohort study is the first to demonstrate that pharmacist oral care intervention, supported by e-learning, significantly reduce the incidence of Gr 2 in patients with HNC undergoing concurrent CCRT.

 Oral care education instruction by pharmacist on gargle and moisturizer can significantly reduce Gr 2 OM. Pharmacists, as medication specialists, worked with dental professionals to enhance patient's oral care compliance.

and steroid use, which may have influenced results.

pharmacist involvement in oral healthcare teams can benefit patient care.

 Future studies should aim to establish structured pharmacist roles in oral care for broader clinical implementation.

entions: I, 0.29–0.97)ª	The median Gr 2 OM-free periods were approximately 55.5 (min–max, 14.0–101.0) in the pharmacist oral care intervention group and 44.0 (13.0–91.0) days in the control groups, respectively. The time to onset of Gr 2 OM was significantly longer in patients receiving pharmacist oral care intervention group than in patients in the control group (hazard ratio 0.53; 95% CI, 0.29–0.97; P = 0.04).
100	
⁶ P	Logistic regression analysis of independent factors for Gr 2 OM was
6) <mark>0.04</mark> -	significantly lower in patients receiving pharmacist oral care interventions group than in patients in the control group (adjusted odds ratio, 0.42 ; 95% CI, 0.18 – 0.96; P = 0.04).
eroid use,	and type of mouthwash

Discussion & Conclusion

- There were biases such as differences in radiation modality (more IMRT in the intervention group)
- Despite variability across hospitals in pharmacist-dentist collaboration, the findings suggest that