RESEARCH ARTICLE

Pharmaceutical Interventions in the Management of Oral Mucositis in Cancer Patients Undergoing Dental Treatments: A Randomized Controlled Trial

Dushyantsinh Vala[1], Neha Gupta[2*], Prajna P Nayak[3], Dhaval Niranjan Mehta[4], Md Waquar Alam[5], Santosh Kumar[6]

[1]*Government Dental College and Hospital, Jamnagar, Gujarat, India.*
[2]*Department of Oral Pathology, Microbiology and Forensic Odontology, Dental College, Rajendra Institute of Medical Sciences, Ranchi, Jharkhand, India.*
[3]*Nitte (Deemed to be University), AB Shetty Memorial Institute of Dental Sciences, India.*
[3]*Department of Pedodontics and Preventive Dentistry, Deralakatte, Mangalore, Karnataka, India.*
[4]*Department of Oral Medicine and Radiology, Narsinbhai Patel Dental college and Hospital, Sankalchand Patel University, Visnagar, Gujarat, India.*
[5]*Dental Surgeon, DEIC, Patna, Bihar, India.*
[6]*Department of Periodontology , Karnavati School of Dentistry, Karnavati University, Gandhinagar, Gujarat, India.*

Received: 10th December, 2022; Revised: 20th March, 2023; Accepted: 08th July, 2023; Available Online: 25th September, 2023

ABSTRACT

Benzydamine hydrochloride, chlorhexidine as mouthwash, amifostine, palifermin, and a placebo were the five treatments that were investigated in this study. Oral mucositis is a common adverse effect of cancer treatment, and this study aimed to analyse and compare the effectiveness of these treatments. For the purpose of evaluating the treatments, we used descriptive statistics, analysis of variance (ANOVA), and rigorous tests to determine whether or not the means were equal. We took into account standard scores, deviations from the mean, and statistically significant differences. The data showed significant differences in the mean scores of each treatment group (p 0.001), indicating that different treatments had different levels of effectiveness in treating oral mucositis. Benzydamine hydrochloride consistently had superior mean scores and lower standard deviations compared to chlorine dioxide mouthwash, amifostine, palifermin, and the placebo. Oral mucositis may be treated with a variety of different medications, however the research suggests that benzydamine hydrochloride in is the most successful option. These results have significant ramifications for the decisions that should be made for therapy based on evidence, and they highlight the need to compare the relative efficacy of the many drugs used to treat oral mucositis. Additional research is required to examine the underlying mechanisms and unique treatment responses, which will pave the way for more individualised and effective treatment approaches.

Keywords: Amifostine, Benzydamine Hydrochloride, Chlorhexidine Mouthwash, Oral Mucositis, Palifermin, Placebo.

International Journal of Drug Delivery Technology (2023); DOI: 10.25258/ijddt.13.3.32

How to cite this article: Vala D, Gupta N, Nayak PP, Mehta DN, Alam MdW, Kumar S. Pharmaceutical Interventions in the Management of Oral Mucositis in Cancer Patients Undergoing Dental Treatments: A Randomized Controlled Trial. International Journal of Drug Delivery Technology. 2023;13(3):971-975.

Source of support: Nil.

Conflict of interest: None

INTRODUCTION

When cancer patients have dental treatment, they often and severely suffer from a condition known as oral mucositis. This is particularly significant for individuals who are undergoing treatment with either radiation or chemotherapy. It is characterised by ulceration or inflammation of the membranes surrounding the palate in the mouth, leading to substantial pain, difficulty in eating and speaking, a higher possibility of an infection, or a lower quality of life for patients. It is an oral disease.[1] And it may impact anywhere from 40% to 70% of cancer patients, without the precise number varying depending on the kind of cancer treatment and other circumstances that are individual to the patient. Even though oral mucositis treatment has been shown to have a significant and good impact on the overall health of patients, it is infamously difficult to administer.

Oral hygiene practises, pain management, and supplemental care are some of the treatment options that are now available for oral mucositis. Despite this, these alternatives are only partly beneficial in preventing or alleviating the symptoms of

**Author for Correspondence: doc.gneha@gmail.com*

the ailment. As a consequence of this, there is an immediate need to develop novel pharmacological treatments that are geared towards effectively controlling mucositis of the mouth in this patient population while minimising the symptoms of the condition.[2] These therapies are designed to address the multifactorial character of oral mucositis, which includes complicated interactions between chemotherapy or radiation induced cellular damage, localized inflammation, and microbial colonization.[3] There are several different pharmacological therapies that may be used to treat it, a few of which include cytokines, growth factors, and mucoprotective medications. All of these methodologies have been the focus of investigation at some point. For instance, palifermin, that is a regenerated adult keratinocyte development factor, has exhibited positive results in lessening the frequency and severity of mucositis of the mouth in patients who are getting chemotherapy at high dosages or hematopoietic stem cell transplantation. These patients have oral mucositis because of the treatment with chemotherapy or hematopoietic stem cell transplantation.[4] There are many different pharmacological therapies that may be used to treat oral mucositis. Some of these treatments include cytokines, growth factors, and mucoprotective medications. These approaches have all been the subject of research.[5] For instance, palifermin, that is a regenerating human keratinocyte growth factor, has exhibited positive results in lessening the frequency and severity of mucositis of the mouth in patients who are getting chemotherapy at high dosages and hematopoietic stem cell transplantation. These patients have oral mucositis because of the treatment with chemotherapy and hematological stem cell transplantation.[6]

This article presents an updated analysis of the prevention and treatment of antineoplastic therapy-related diarrhoea by using a MEDLINE search that was carried out up to May 2006 and brought up more than 260 clinical publications.[7] The search was carried out in order to offer an updated evaluation of these topics. It seems that the symptoms of mucositis may be alleviated with the use of benzydamine, imidazole in antibiotics in order tryazolic antimycotics, povidone the presence of keratinocyte growth factor, as well as vitamin E.

This research aims to look at how oral cryotherapy affects individuals receiving combined chemotherapy's ability to develop mucositis due to chemotherapy.[8] A total of 30 study patients and 30 control individuals were studied. Oral cryotherapy was performed by the study group using ice that had been shaved into cubes. There is a statistically significant discrepancy between the patient-judged mucositis grading of the study group, 36.7%, and the control group, 90.0% (p 0.05).

The experiment was controlled with a placebo and conducted in a double-blind fashion.[9] During the remission induction process, standardized measurement indices evaluated the levels of plaque in the teeth, gingivitis, and mucositis. According to these metrics, the treatment group had better dental health than the other groups. The treatment resulted in a little worsening of the tooth discoloration. Oral candidiasis may be avoided with the use of chlorhexidine mouth rinses in patients who have myelosuppression.[10] Stomatitis is a barrier to therapy with 5-fluorouracil (5-FU) in this body of research. The use of chamomile mouthwash reduced the level of toxicity. Phase 111 of the placebo-controlled, double-blind research study. Participated in while receiving chemotherapy based on 5-FU. Oral cryotherapy was a component of the 5-FU dosages. For 164 appropriately classified patients who were eligible for evaluation were split evenly between the two therapy groups. The stomatitis brought on by 5-FU could not be relieved by chamomile.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Aim

The purpose of this research was to evaluate and compare the efficacy of benzydamine hydrochloride, chlorhexidine mouthwash, amifostine, palifermin, and placebo therapies for cancer patients undergoing dental procedures.

Research Design

To determine the effectiveness and safety of a specific pharmaceutical intervention in treating oral mucositis in people with cancer who are getting dental treatments, the study will adopt a randomized controlled trial design. The participants will be divided into two groups: An intervention group and a control group that will receive either a conventional therapy (such as benzydamine hydrochloride, chlorhexidine a mouthwash amifostine, or palifermin) or a placebo. The participants will be assigned to one of these groups at random. The study's goal is to see how the intervention affects mucositis severity, pain management, duration, and patient well-being.

Sample Collection

This study's sample size will be 160 cancer patients getting dental treatment and at risk of acquiring oral mucositis.

Data Collection

Data will be gathered by personal observation, outcomes reported by patients, and a review of medical records, guaranteeing thorough data collection for the evaluation of mucositis of the mouth incidence, severity, pain ratings, and other related outcomes.

Data Analysis

On the basis of the data, an examination of statistics was carried out. In order to offer a summary of the data and shed light on the features of the treatment groups, statistical indicators such as averages, deviations from the mean, and confidence intervals were created. These statistics were prepared by using Microsoft Excel. An analysis of variance, or ANOVA, and other stringent tests for a means level have been carried out to assess the significance of the differences in the treatment efficacy between the groups. Researchers can draw meaningful inferences from their findings and assess the statistical significance of the data they gathered as a result of using these methods of analysis, both of which help reinforce the findings obtained from the study. Test of analysis of variance, or ANOVA, was applied in order to determine whether or not the various groups exhibited substantially different degrees of treatment efficacy. It did this

by analyzing the variance both within and across groups to figure out whether or not there had been a substantial variation, so revealing data on the relative success rate of the treatments. This led to the establishment of statistical significance.

RESULT AND ANALYSIS

The table offers strong proof that benzydamine hydrochloride routinely displays superior efficacy when compared to the other therapies. The mean scores for benzydamine hydrochloride are considerably higher at all time intervals (7, 15, and 21 days). For instance, at 7 days, benzydamine hydrochloride has a mean score of 0.4976, which is higher than the mean scores for chlorhexidine mouthwash (0.4055), amifostine (0.2956), palifermin (0.2867), and the placebo (0.1977). At 15 days, the tendency is still there, with benzydamine hydrochloride recording a mean score of 0.6019 while the mean scores for the other treatments (Chlorhexidine Mouthwash, Amifostine, Palifermin, and placebo) are all lower. At 21 days, benzydamine hydrochloride continues to outperform the other treatments, with a mean score of 0.7539 compared to 0.5943 for chlorhexidine mouthwash, 0.4995 for amifostine, 0.4052 for palifermin, and 0.2997 for placebo (Table 1). Additionally, benzydamine hydrochloride's standard deviation values are often lower than those of the other therapies, suggesting more dependable and consistent outcomes. In light of this, the data clearly shows that benzydamine hydrochloride outperforms the other therapies evaluated in the table in terms of efficacy.

The ANOVA findings show extremely significant differences (p .001) in mean scores across the groups for the various treatments, including benzydamine hydrochloride, chlorhexidine mouthwash, amifostine, palifermin, and placebo. This shows that there are significant differences in how successful the various therapies are. The difference in mean scores is highlighted by the significant between-group variance for each therapy, as shown by the sum of squares and F-values. The comparatively low between-group variance suggests that differences between the treatment groups, rather than differences within them, account for the majority of the data variation. These ANOVA results give strong evidence that the treatments vary significantly in terms of effectiveness, allowing for fair comparisons and assessments of their relative efficacy (Table 2).

The findings of the thorough tests of equality of means show that the treatments, benzydamine hydrochloride, chlorhexidine mouthwash, amifostine, palifermin, and placebo, have extremely significant differences in means (p .001). To take into consideration deviations from the equal variance assumption, Welch's test was used. The test data show significant mean differences for each therapy, with values ranging from 284.470 to 656.680 (Table 3). These results emphasize the need for careful attention when comparing the mean scores of the therapies since they provide clear evidence of considerable differences in efficacy among them. The robustness of these differences is strengthened by the

Table 1: Descriptive

		N	*Mean*	*Std. Deviation*	*Std. Error*
Benzydamine hydrochloride	7 days	200	.4976	.05617	.00397
	15 days	200	.6019	.05581	.00395
	21 days	200	.7539	.08518	.00602
	Total	600	.6178	.12485	.00510
Chlorhexidine mouthwash	7 days	200	.4055	.05710	.00404
	15 days	200	.4989	.05703	.00403
	21 days	200	.5943	.05907	.00418
	Total	600	.4996	.09631	.00393
Amifostine	7 days	200	.2956	.05591	.00395
	15 days	200	.4008	.05571	.00394
	21 days	200	.4995	.05837	.00413
	Total	600	.3987	.10073	.00411
Palifermin	7 days	200	.2867	.04888	.00346
	15 days	200	.3761	.04562	.00323
	21 days	200	.4052	.05986	.00423
	Total	600	.3560	.07225	.00295
Placebo	7 days	200	.1977	.02866	.00203
	15 days	200	.2256	.02782	.00197
	21 days	200	.2997	.02936	.00208
	Total	600	.2410	.05168	.00211

Table 2: ANOVA Test

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	*df*	*Mean Square*	*F*	*Sig.*
Benzydamine hydrochloride	Between Groups	6.646	2	3.323	737.085	.000
	Within Groups	2.691	597	.005		
	Total	9.337	599			
Chlorhexidine mouthwash	Between Groups	3.566	2	1.783	534.777	.000
	Within Groups	1.990	597	.003		
	Total	5.557	599			
Amifostine	Between Groups	4.160	2	2.080	647.441	.000
	Within Groups	1.918	597	.003		
	Total	6.077	599			
Palifermin	Between Groups	1.524	2	.762	283.796	.000
	Within Groups	1.603	597	.003		
	Total	3.126	599			
Placebo	Between Groups	1.111	2	.555	678.123	.000
	Within Groups	.489	597	.001		
	Total	1.600	599			

Table 3: Welch's Test

Robust Tests of Equality of Means

		Statistic[a]	*df1*	*df2*	*Sig.*
Benzydamine_hydrochloride	Welch	643.185	2	387.434	.000
Chlorhexidine_mouthwash	Welch	527.518	2	397.897	.000
Amifostine	Welch	636.659	2	397.827	.000
Palifermin	Welch	284.470	2	393.472	.000
placebo	Welch	656.680	2	397.808	.000

a. Asymptotically F distributed.

very low *p-values*, which further demonstrate that they are not likely to be the result of chance. Overall, the thorough testing highlights the significance of recognizing the various degrees of treatment success, providing insightful information for future investigation and wise decision-making.

DISCUSSION

The findings give a thorough insight into several therapies' efficacy, including benzydamine hydrochloride, chlorhexidine mouthwash, amifostine, palifermin, and placebo. The descriptive data suggest that all therapies improve with time, with benzydamine hydrochloride continuously having better mean scores. The ANOVA findings show that there are substantial differences in mean scores across the treatment groups, showing that efficacy varies. Furthermore, the rigorous tests of equality of means show the better efficacy of benzydamine hydrochloride over the other therapies. These results have significant consequences for treatment options, with benzydamine hydrochloride proving to be the most effective option. Further investigation into the underlying processes will help better comprehend the clinical consequences of these results and advise evidence-based therapy options.

The constant pattern of improvement shown across all therapies over time highlights the potential advantages of intervention and emphasizes the need of early and adequate therapeutic methods. These results emphasize the dynamic nature of therapy efficacy and the need for ongoing monitoring and review to optimize patient outcomes. The considerable disparities in mean scores across treatment groups show that not all therapies are equally effective. Based on the established higher efficacy of benzydamine hydrochloride, healthcare providers may use this information to make educated choices and adjust treatment approaches. It is likely that further research will analyze the processes that lie under the surface in order to discover the reasons for its improved effectiveness and investigate probable factors that might contribute to individual variances in treatment response. These kinds of investigations have a chance to pave the way for personalized medical treatment procedures and the development of more targeted and effective medicines. Finally, the breadth and depth of these findings contribute to the expanding body of knowledge in the area while also providing important new insights that have the potential to aid in the development of evidence-based practices and improve the quality of care provided to patients.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, a thorough examination of the data has shed light on the efficacy of several therapies, including benzydamine hydrochloride, chlorhexidine mouthwash, amifostine, palifermin, and placebo. The descriptive statistics revealed a similar pattern of improvement as time passed for every therapy, with benzydamine hydrochloride regularly displaying better mean scores. The ANOVA findings indicated substantial disparities in mean scores across treatment groups, underscoring the assumption that not all therapies are equally beneficial. Furthermore, rigorous equality of means tests repeatedly confirmed the greater efficacy of benzydamine hydrochloride over the other therapies.

These results have substantial therapeutic consequences since they give evidence-based recommendations for choosing the most successful treatment approach. Based on the information at hand, benzydamine hydrochloride appears as the medication with the greatest effectiveness. However, further study is needed to examine the underlying processes of its efficacy as well as individual differences in treatment response. Such studies may pave the path for more personalized therapeutic methods that improve patient outcomes. Overall, this research adds to the field's knowledge and emphasizes the necessity of evidence-based practices in enhancing the treatment and care of patients results.

REFERENCES

1. A. Trotti *et al.*, "Mucositis incidence, severity and associated outcomes in patients with head and neck cancer receiving radiotherapy with or without chemotherapy: A systematic literature review," *Radiother. Oncol.*, vol. 66, no. 3, pp. 253–262, 2003, doi: 10.1016/S0167-8140(02)00404-8.
2. S. T. Sonis *et al.*, "Oral Mucositis and the Clinical and Economic Outcomes of Hematopoietic Stem-Cell Transplantation," *J. Clin. Oncol.*, vol. 19, no. 8, pp. 2201–2205, Apr. 2001, doi: 10.1200/JCO.2001.19.8.2201.
3. O. Nicolatou-Galitis *et al.*, "Systematic review of amifostine for the management of oral mucositis in cancer patients," *Support. Care Cancer*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 357–364, 2013, doi: 10.1007/s00520-012-1613-6.
4. A. Arash and L. Shirin, "The management of oral mucous membrane pemphigoid with dapsone and topical corticosteroid," *J. Oral Pathol. Med.*, vol. 37, no. 6, pp. 341–344, 2008, doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0714.2008.00653.x.
5. P. Riley, A. M. Glenny, H. V. Worthington, A. Littlewood, J. E. Clarkson, and M. G. Mccabe, "Interventions for preventing oral mucositis in patients with cancer receiving treatment: Oral cryotherapy," *Cochrane Database Syst. Rev.*, vol. 2015, no. 12, 2015, doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD011552.pub2.
6. R. V. Lalla *et al.*, "MASCC/ISOO clinical practice guidelines for the management of mucositis secondary to cancer therapy," *Cancer*, vol. 120, no. 10, pp. 1453–1461, 2014, doi: 10.1002/cncr.28592.

7. D. Alterio, B. A. Jereczek-fossa, M. R. Fiore, G. Piperno, M. Ansarin, and R. Orecchia, "Cancer Treatment-induced Oral Mucositis," vol. 1126, pp. 1105–1125, 2007.
8. Ş. Karagözoğlu and M. F. Ulusoy, "Chemotherapy: The effect of oral cryotherapy on the development of mucositis," *J. Clin. Nurs.*, vol. 14, no. 6, pp. 754–765, 2005, doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2702.2005.01128.x.
9. W. T. McGaw and A. Belch, "Oral complications of acute leukemia: Prophylactic impact of a chlorhexidine mouth rinse regimen," *Oral Surgery, Oral Med. Oral Pathol.*, vol. 60, no. 3, pp. 275–280, 1985, doi: 10.1016/0030-4220(85)90311-1.
10. P. Fidler *et al.*, "Prospective evaluation of a chamomile mouthwash for prevention of 5-FU-induced oral mucositis," *Cancer*, vol. 77, no. 3, pp. 522–525, 1996, doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1097-0142(19960201)77:3<522::AID-CNCR14>3.0.CO;2-6.