

Guidelines on Pain Management

P. Bader (chair), G. De Meerleer, D. Echtler, V. Fonteyne,
K. Livadas, A. Paez Borda, E.G. Papaioannou, J.H. Vrancken

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

1.	INTRODUCTION	6
1.1	The Guideline	6
1.1.1	Methodology	6
1.2	Publication history	6
1.3	Level of evidence and grade of guideline recommendations	6
1.4	References	7
2.	BACKGROUND	7
2.1	Definition of pain	7
2.2	What is suffering?	7
2.3	Nociception and innervation	8
2.4	Neuropathic pain	8
2.5	Innervation of the urogenital system	8
2.6	Pain evaluation and measurement	8
2.6.1	Pain evaluation	8
2.6.2	Assessing pain intensity and quality of life (QoL)	9
2.7	References	10
3.	CANCER PAIN MANAGEMENT (GENERAL)	11
3.1	Classification of cancer pain	11
3.1.1	References	11
3.2	General principles of cancer pain management	11
3.3	Non-pharmacological therapies	12
3.3.1	Surgery	12
3.3.1.1	References	12
3.3.2	Radionuclides	13
3.3.2.1	Clinical background	13
3.3.2.2	Radiopharmaceuticals: physical characteristics	13
3.3.2.3	Indications and contraindications	13
3.3.2.4	Contraindications	14
3.3.2.5	References	14
3.3.3	Radiotherapy for metastatic bone pain	15
3.3.3.1	Clinical background	15
3.3.3.2	Mechanism of pain relief by radiotherapy	16
3.3.3.3	Imaging	16
3.3.3.4	Radiotherapy scheme	16
3.3.3.5	Spinal cord compression	16
3.3.3.6	Pathological fractures	17
3.3.3.7	Side-effects	17
3.3.3.8	References	17
3.3.4	Physical/psychological therapy	20
3.3.4.1	Physical therapies	20
3.3.4.2	Psychological therapies	21
3.3.4.3	References	21
3.4	Pharmacotherapy	21
3.4.1	Antibiotics	21
3.4.1.1	Reference	21
3.4.2	Chemotherapy	21
3.4.2.1	Reference	21
3.4.3	Bisphosphonates	21
3.4.3.1	Mechanisms of action	21
3.4.3.2	Effects and side-effects	22
3.4.3.3	References	22
3.4.4	Systemic analgesic pharmacotherapy - the analgesic ladder	22
3.4.4.1	Non-opioid analgesics	23
3.4.4.2	Opioid analgesics	23
3.4.4.3	References	27
3.4.5	Treatment of neuropathic pain	29

	3.4.5.1	Antidepressants	29
	3.4.5.2	Anticonvulsant medication	30
	3.4.5.3	Topical analgesics	30
	3.4.5.4	NMDA receptor antagonists	31
	3.4.5.5	Other drug treatments	31
	3.4.5.6	Invasive analgesic techniques	31
	3.4.5.7	References	33
3.5		Quality of life	35
	3.5.1	References	36
3.6		Conclusions	36
4.		PAIN MANAGEMENT IN UROLOGICAL CANCERS	36
4.1		Pain management in prostate cancer patients	36
	4.1.1	Clinical presentation	36
	4.1.2	Pain due to local impairment	36
	4.1.2.1	Invasion of soft tissue or a hollow viscus	36
	4.1.2.2	Bladder outlet obstruction	36
	4.1.2.3	Ureteric obstruction	36
	4.1.2.4	Lymphoedema	37
	4.1.2.5	Ileus	37
	4.1.3	Pain due to metastases	37
	4.1.3.1	Bone metastases	37
	4.1.4	Systemic analgesic pharmacotherapy (the analgesic ladder)	40
	4.1.5	Spinal cord compression	41
	4.1.6	Hepatic invasion	41
	4.1.7	Pain due to cancer treatment	41
	4.1.7.2	Chronic pain associated with hormonal therapy	41
	4.1.8	Conclusions	41
	4.1.9	Recommendations at a glance (stage M1)	42
	4.1.10	References	42
4.2		Pain management in transitional cell carcinoma patients	45
	4.2.1	Clinical presentation	45
	4.2.2	Origin of tumour-related pain	45
	4.2.2.1	Bladder TCC	45
	4.2.2.2	Upper urinary tract TCC	45
	4.2.3	Pain due to local impairment	45
	4.2.3.1	Bladder TCC	45
	4.2.3.2	Upper urinary tract TCC	46
	4.2.4	Pain due to metastases	46
	4.2.5	References	46
4.3.		Pain management in renal cell carcinoma patients	47
	4.3.1	Clinical presentation	47
	4.3.2	Pain due to local impairment	47
	4.3.3	Pain due to metastases	47
	4.3.4	References	48
4.4		Pain management in patients with adrenal carcinoma	49
	4.4.1	Malignant phaeochromocytoma	49
	4.4.2	Treatment of pain	49
	4.4.2.1	Adrenocortical carcinomas	49
	4.4.2.2	Treatment of the pain depending on its origin	49
	4.4.3	References	50
4.5		Pain management in penile cancer patients	50
	4.5.1	Clinical presentation	50
	4.5.2	Pain due to local impairment	51
	4.5.2.1	Soft-tissue and hollow-viscus invasion	51
	4.5.3	Lymphoedema	51
	4.5.4	Pain due to metastases	51
	4.5.4.1	Anticancer management for pain relief	51
	4.5.5	Conclusions	51
	4.5.6	References	51

4.6	Pain management in testicular cancer patients	51
4.6.1	Clinical presentation	51
4.6.2	Pain due to local impairment	51
4.6.3	Pain due to metastases	51
4.6.4	References	52
4.7	Recommendations at a glance	52
5.	POST-OPERATIVE PAIN MANAGEMENT	53
5.1	Background	53
5.2	The importance of effective post-operative pain management	53
5.2.1	Aims of effective post-operative pain management:	53
5.3	Pre- and post-operative pain management methods	54
5.3.1	Pre-operative patient preparation:	54
5.3.2	Pain assessment	54
5.3.3	Pre-emptive analgesia	54
5.3.4	Systemic analgesic techniques	54
5.3.4.1	Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs)	54
5.3.4.2	Paracetamol	55
5.3.4.3	Metamizole (dipyrone)	56
5.3.4.4	Opioids	56
5.3.4.5	Patient-controlled analgesia (PCA)	57
5.3.4.6	Opioid equi-analgesic doses	57
5.3.5	Regional analgesic techniques	58
5.3.5.1	Local anaesthetic agents	58
5.3.5.2	Epidural analgesia	58
5.3.5.3	Patient-controlled epidural analgesia (PCEA)	58
5.3.5.4	Neural blocks	59
5.3.5.5	Wound infiltration	59
5.3.5.6	Continuous wound instillation	59
5.3.6	Multi-modal analgesia	59
5.3.7	Special populations	59
5.3.7.1	Ambulatory surgical patients	59
5.3.7.2	Geriatric patients	60
5.3.7.3	Obese patients	60
5.3.7.4	Other groups	60
5.3.8	Post-operative pain management teams	60
5.4	Specific pain treatment after different urological operations	61
5.4.1	Extracorporeal shock wave lithotripsy (ESWL)	61
5.4.2	Endoscopic procedures	61
5.4.2.1	Transurethral procedures	61
5.4.2.2	Percutaneous endoscopic procedures	62
5.4.2.3	Laparoscopic procedures	62
5.4.3	Open surgery	63
5.4.3.1	Minor operations of the scrotum/penis and the inguinal approach	63
5.4.3.2	Transvaginal surgery	63
5.4.3.3	Perineal open surgery	64
5.4.3.4	Transperitoneal laparotomy	64
5.4.3.5	Suprapubic/retropubic extraperitoneal laparotomy	65
5.4.3.6	Retroperitoneal approach - flank incision - thoracoabdominal approach	66
5.5	Dosage and method of delivery of some important analgesics	66
5.5.1	NSAIDs	66
5.5.2	Drugs with antipyretic effect	67
5.5.3	Selective COX-2 inhibitor	67
5.5.4	Opioids	67
5.6	Peri-operative pain management in children	67
5.6.1	Peri-operative problems	67
5.6.2	Post-operative analgesia	68
5.7	References	69

6.	NON-TRAUMATIC ACUTE FLANK PAIN	74
6.1	Background	74
6.2	Initial diagnostic approach	74
6.2.1	Symptomatology	74
6.2.2	Laboratory evaluation	74
6.2.3	Diagnostic imaging	75
6.2.3.1	Ultrasonography	75
6.2.3.2	Intravenous urography (IVU)	75
6.2.3.3	Unenhanced helical CT (UHCT)	75
6.3	Initial emergency treatment	77
6.3.1	Systemic analgesia	77
6.3.2	Local analgesia	77
6.3.3	Supportive therapy	77
6.3.4	Upper urinary tract decompression	78
6.4	Aetiological treatment	78
6.4.1	Urolithiasis	78
6.4.2	Infectious conditions	78
6.4.3	Other conditions	78
6.4.3.1	Uretero-pelvic junction obstruction	78
6.4.3.2	Papillary necrosis	78
6.4.3.3	Renal infarction	78
6.4.3.4	RVT	78
6.4.3.5	Intra- or peri-renal bleeding	78
6.4.3.6	Testicular cord torsion	78
6.5	References	79
7.	ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THE TEXT	82

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Guideline

The European Association of Urology (EAU) Guidelines Working Group for Pain Management have prepared this guidelines document to assist medical professionals in appraising the evidence-based management of pain in urological practice. These guidelines include general advice on pain assessment, with a focus on treatment strategies relating to common medical conditions and painful procedures. No attempts have been made to exhaustingly cover the topic of pain.

The multidisciplinary panel of experts responsible for this document include three urologists, two radiotherapists and two anaesthesiologists.

1.1.1 Methodology

The recommendations provided in the current guidelines are based on systematic literature search using Medline, the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials, and reference lists in publications and review articles.

It has to be emphasised that the current guidelines contain information for the treatment of an individual patient according to a standardised general approach.

1.2 Publication history

The Pain Management Guidelines were first published in 2003, with a partial update in 2007, followed by a full text update in 2009. In 2010 two new topics were added, Section 5.6 “Peri-operative pain management in children” and Chapter 6 “Non-traumatic acute flank pain”. The quick reference guide was completely reworked. In the current 2011 print all chapters have been abridged.

A quick reference document presenting the main findings of the General Pain Management guidelines is also available. All texts can be viewed and downloaded for personal use at the EAU website: <http://www.uroweb.org/guidelines/online-guidelines/>.

1.3 Level of evidence and grade of guideline recommendations*

References used in the text have been assessed according to their level of scientific evidence (Table 1) and guideline recommendations have been graded (Table 2) according to the Oxford Centre for Evidence-based Medicine Levels of Evidence (1). The aim of grading recommendations is to provide transparency between the underlying evidence and the recommendation given.

Table 1: Level of evidence (LE)*

Level	Type of evidence
1a	Evidence obtained from meta-analysis of randomised trials
1b	Evidence obtained from at least one randomised trial
2a	Evidence obtained from one well-designed controlled study without randomisation
2b	Evidence obtained from at least one other type of well-designed quasi-experimental study
3	Evidence obtained from well-designed non-experimental studies, such as comparative studies, correlation studies and case reports
4	Evidence obtained from expert committee reports or opinions or clinical experience of respected authorities

*Modified from Sackett et al. (1)

It should be noted that when recommendations are graded, the link between the level of evidence and grade of recommendation is not directly linear. Availability of randomised controlled trials (RCTs) may not necessarily translate into a grade A recommendation where there are methodological limitations or disparity in published results.

Alternatively, absence of high level evidence does not necessarily preclude a grade A recommendation, if there is overwhelming clinical experience and consensus. In addition, there may be exceptional situations where corroborating studies cannot be performed, perhaps for ethical or other reasons and in this case unequivocal recommendations are considered helpful for the reader. The quality of the underlying scientific evidence - although a very important factor - has to be balanced against benefits and burdens, values and preferences and cost when a grade is assigned (2-4).

The EAU Guidelines Office do not perform cost assessments, nor can they address local/national preferences

in a systematic fashion. But whenever this data is available, the expert panels will include the information.

Table 2: Grade of recommendation (GR)*

Grade	Nature of recommendations
A	Based on clinical studies of good quality and consistency addressing the specific recommendations and including at least one randomised trial
B	Based on well-conducted clinical studies, but without randomised clinical trials
C	Made despite the absence of directly applicable clinical studies of good quality

*Modified from Sackett et al. (1)

1.4 References

1. Oxford Centre for Evidence-based Medicine Levels of Evidence (May 2001). Produced by Bob Phillips, Chris Ball, Dave Sackett, Doug Badenoch, Sharon Straus, Brian Haynes, Martin Dawes since November 1998.
<http://www.cebm.net/index.aspx?o=1025> [Access date January 2011]
2. Atkins D, Best D, Briss PA, et al; GRADE Working Group. Grading quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. *BMJ* 2004 Jun 19;328(7454):1490.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15205295>
3. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist GE, et al. GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. *BMJ* 2008;336(7650):924-6.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18436948>
4. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, et al; GRADE Working Group. Going from evidence to recommendations. *BMJ* 2008 May 10;336(7652):1049-51.
<http://www.bmj.com/content/336/7652/1049.long>

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 Definition of pain

Pain is the most common symptom of any illness, and is defined by the International Association for the Study of Pain (IASP) as 'an unpleasant sensory and emotional experience associated with either actual or potential tissue damage, or described in terms of such damage' (1).

The alerting function of pain evokes protective responses, and is intended to keep tissue damage to a minimum. The capacity to experience pain has a protective role. If tissue damage is unavoidable, a cascade of changes occurs in the peripheral and central nervous system responsible for the perception of pain (2).

Acute pain - usually occurring in response to an identifiable noxious event with stimulation of the nociceptive system - has a time-limited course during which treatment, if necessary, is aimed at correcting the underlying pathological process. In contrast, maladaptive (pathological) pain offers no biological advantage because it is uncoupled from a noxious stimulus or tissue healing, and is usually persistent or recurrent. It may occur in response to damage to the nervous system. It is known as neuropathic pain, and is pain as a disease (3-5).

2.2 What is suffering?

Pain is a complex experience entailing physiological, sensory, affective, cognitive, and behavioural components. An individual's perception of the intensity of pain relates to the interactions of physical, psychological, cultural and spiritual factors (6).

Pain and suffering are closely identified, but are nevertheless distinct. Patients can experience severe pain without suffering (e.g. during childbirth), and suffering can include physical pain, but it is by no means limited to it. Patient distress also results from factors other than pain that add to suffering, such as anxiety, depression, nightmares, change in body perception, and changes in professional and social function.

The differences between pain and suffering are most pronounced in cancer pain patients. Cancer is one of the medical conditions patients fear most, because of the expectation that it will end in death, and that that death will be while in excruciating pain (7,8).

2.3 Nociception and innervation

Structure of the peripheral neural apparatus

Sensory information from the skin is transmitted to the central nervous system (dorsal horn of the spinal cord) via three different types of primary sensory neurones: A β -, A δ -, and C-fibres.

These primary afferent neurones are responsible for transducing mechanical, chemical, and thermal information into electrical activity. Although all three classes can transmit non-nociceptive information, under physiological circumstances only C-fibres (dull pain) and A δ -fibres (sharp pain) are capable of transmitting nociceptive information from the periphery to the dorsal horn of the spinal cord. Thus, under normal circumstances, A β -fibres are responsive only to non-noxious mechanical stimuli, including touch, vibration and pressure (9-12). Nociceptive information for the viscera reaches the central nervous system along the sympathetic chains and pelvic parasympathetic chain. However, the density of visceral afferents is low compared with the skin, which can explain the poor localisation of noxious stimuli in the viscera (responsible for the diffuse nature of visceral pain) (13).

2.4 Neuropathic pain

Definition of neuropathic pain

Neuropathic pain is defined by the IASP as 'pain initiated or caused by a primary lesion or dysfunction of the nervous system' (2). Both negative and positive sensory symptoms may be present. Positive signs include pain, paraesthesia, dysaesthesia, hyperalgesia, and allodynia. Negative signs involve sensory deficits (hypoesthesia and hypoalgesia), weakness, and reflex changes. Clinically, patients may complain of spontaneous ongoing pain (stimulus-independent pain) that is burning, with intermittent shooting or electric shock-like (lancinating) sensations, and/or have pain hypersensitivity evoked in response to stimuli (stimulus-evoked pain) such as hyperalgesia and allodynia (14,15).

Mechanisms of neuropathic pain

A change in function, chemistry, and the structure of neurones (neural plasticity) leads to the production of the altered sensitivity characteristics of neuropathic pain. Peripheral sensitisation acts on the nociceptors, and central sensitisation takes place at various levels ranging from the dorsal horn to the brain. In addition, abnormal interactions between the sympathetic and sensory pathways contribute to mechanisms mediating neuropathic pain (16,17).

2.5 Innervation of the urogenital system

There are differences in the response properties of visceral afferents in the urinary tract (18-20).

Ureter

The only sensation that can be evoked from the ureter is pain, whereas other organs such as the bladder can give rise to several sensations ranging from mild fullness to pain.

Urinary bladder

Two distinct groups of afferent fibres capable of signalling noxious stimuli have been identified in the urinary bladder. Most visceral afferents from the urinary bladder are unmyelinated fibres, although a population of myelinated A-fibres is also present (18). The majority of visceral primary afferents from the bladder, urethra, and reproductive and other pelvic organs encode for both noxious and non-noxious stimuli (18-20).

Male reproductive organs

The sensory innervation of the testes (dog model) shows that more than 95% of the fibres of the superior spermatic nerve are unmyelinated, with the great majority having polymodal properties (i.e. responding to mechanical, chemical and thermal stimuli) (21). Myelinated and unmyelinated afferent fibres form a homogeneous group with polymodal receptors in testis and/or epididymis. Prostaglandins do not excite but sensitise the afferents to other stimuli (22).

2.6 Pain evaluation and measurement

2.6.1 *Pain evaluation*

Health professionals should ask about pain, and the patient's self-report should be the primary source of assessment. Clinicians should assess pain with easily administered rating scales, and should document the efficacy of pain relief at regular intervals after starting or changing treatment.

Systematic evaluation of pain involves the following steps.

- Evaluate its severity.
- Take a detailed history of the pain, including an assessment of its intensity and character.

- Evaluate the psychological state of the patient, including an assessment of mood and coping responses.
- Perform a physical examination, emphasising the neurological examination.
- Perform an appropriate diagnostic work-up to determine the cause of the pain, which may include tumour markers.
- Perform radiological studies, scans, etc.
- Re-evaluate therapy.

The initial evaluation of pain should include a description of the pain using the PQRST characteristics:

- P Palliative or provocative factors: 'What makes it less intense?'
 Q Quality: 'What is it like?'
 R Radiation: 'Does it spread anywhere else?'
 S Severity: 'How severe is it?'
 T Temporal factors: 'Is it there all the time, or does it come and go?'

Pain in patients with cancer is a complex phenomenon. Not all pains will be of malignant origin, they will often have more than one pain problem, and each pain must be individually assessed and evaluated. A key principle is constantly to re-evaluate pain and the effect and side-effects of analgesic therapy.

Pain in cancer patients could be caused by the cancer itself, be due to secondary muscular spasm, be secondary to cancer treatments, or have no relation to the cancer, e.g. arthritis.


In general, cancer pain consists of two broad diagnostic types: nociceptive and neuropathic pain. When evaluating pain, it is useful to try to determine whether the pain is one of these types or a mixture of the two. Nociceptive pain includes bone pain and soft tissue pain. Typically it is described as a dull, aching pain. This type of pain will be largely sensitive to non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) and opioids. Neuropathic pain results from damage to the peripheral or central nervous system. It is usually described as a burning or sharp, shooting pain. Neuropathic pain is usually not particularly responsive to NSAIDs or opioids. Adjuvant analgesics such as anti-depressants and anti-convulsants should be used in the first instance.

2.6.2 Assessing pain intensity and quality of life (QoL)

There are several rating scales available to assess pain. Rating pain using a visual analogue scale (VAS, Figure 1) or collection of VAS scales (such as the brief pain inventory) is an essential part of pain assessment. Its ease of use and analysis has resulted in its widespread adoption. It is, however, limited for the assessment of chronic pain.

Figure 1: Visual analogue scale

0 ————— 10



To study the effects of both physical and non-physical influences on patient well-being, an instrument must assess more dimensions than the intensity of pain or other physical symptoms. Several validated questionnaires to assess various QoL dimensions are available, including the Medical Outcomes Short-Form Health Survey Questionnaire 36 (SF-36), and the European Organisation for Research and Treatment of Cancer Quality of Life Core Questionnaire (EORTC QLQ-C30) (23-27).

2.7 References

1. Merskey H, Bogduk N (eds). Classification of chronic pain: descriptions of chronic pain syndromes and definitions of pain terms. Seattle: IASP Press, 1994.
2. Jacobson L, Mariano AJ. General considerations of chronic pain. In: Loeser JD, ed. Bonica's Management of Pain. Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 2001, pp. 241-254.
3. Woolf CJ. Pain: moving from symptom control toward mechanism-specific pharmacologic management. *Ann Intern Med* 2004 Mar;140(6):441-51.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15023710>
4. Scholtz J, Woolf CJ. Can we conquer pain? *Nat Neurosci* 2002 Nov;5 Suppl:1062-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12403987>
5. Wiertelak EP, Smith KP, Furness L, et al. Acute and conditioned hyperalgesic responses to illness. *Pain* 1994 Feb;56(2):227-34.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8008412>
6. Turk DC, Sist TC, Okifuji A, et al. Adaptation to metastatic cancer cancer pain, regional/local cancer pain and non-cancer pain: role of psychological and behavioral factors. *Pain* 1998 Feb;74(2-3):247-56.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9520239>
7. Portenoy RK, Lesage P. Management of cancer pain. *Lancet* 1999 May;353(9165):1695-700.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10335806>
8. Cassel EJ. The nature of suffering. *N Eng J Med* 1982 Mar;306(11):639-45.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7057823>
9. Belemonte C, Cervero F. Neurobiology of Nociceptors. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
10. Julius D, Basbaum AI. Molecular mechanisms of nociception. *Nature* 2001 Sep;413(6852):203-10.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11557989>
11. Willis WD, Westlund KN. Neuroanatomy of the pain system and of the pathways that modulate pain. *J Clin Neurophysiol* 1997 Jan;14(1):2-31.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9013357>
12. Romanelli P, Esposito V. The functional anatomy of neuropathic pain. *Neurosurg Clin NAm* 2004 Jul;15(3):257-68.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15246335>
13. Westlund KN. Visceral nociception. *Curr Rev Pain* 2000;4(6):478-87.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11060594>
14. Chong MS, Bajwa ZH. Diagnosis and treatment of neuropathic pain. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 2003 May;25(5 Suppl):S4-S11.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12694987>
15. Rasmussen PV, Sindrup SH, Jensen TS, et al. Symptoms and signs in patients with suspected neuropathic pain. *Pain* 2004 Jul;110(1-2):461-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15275799>
16. Millan MJ. The induction of pain: an integrative review. *Prog Neurobiol* 1999 Jan;57(1):1-164.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9987804>
17. Besson JM. The neurobiology of pain. *Lancet* 1999 May;353(9164):1610-15.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10334274>
18. Häbler HJ, Jänig W, Koltzenburg M. Activation of unmyelinated afferent fibres by mechanical stimuli and inflammation of the urinary bladder in the cat. *J Physiol* 1990 Jun;425:545-62.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2213588>
19. Bahns E, Ernsberger U, Jänig W, et al. Functional characteristics of lumbar visceral afferent fibres from the urinary bladder and the urethra in the cat. *Pflügers Arch* 1986 Nov;407(5):510-18.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/3786110>
20. Bahns E, Halsband U, Jänig W. Responses of sacral visceral afferent fibres from the lower urinary tract, colon, and anus to mechanical stimulation. *Pflügers Arch* 1987 Oct;410(3):296-303.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/3684516>
21. Kumazawa T. Sensory innervation of reproductive organs. *Prog Brain Res* 1986;67:115-31.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/3823468>
22. Meyer RA, Campbell JN, Raja SN. Peripheral neural mechanisms of nociception In: Wall PD, Melzack R(eds). *Textbook of Pain*. 3rd ed. Edinburgh: Churchill Livingstone, 1994, pp. 13-44.

23. Jensen MP. The validity and reliability of pain measures in adults with cancer. *J Pain* 2003 Feb;4(1): 2-21.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14622723>
24. Rosier EM, Iadarola MJ, Coghill RC. Reproducibility of pain measurement and pain perception. *Pain* 2002 Jul;98(1-2):205-16.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12098633>
25. Fosnocht DE, Chapman CR, Swanson ER, et al. Correlation of change in visual analog scale with pain relief in the ED. *Am J Emerg Med* 2005 Jan;23(1):55-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15672339>
26. Graham B. Generic health instruments, visual analog scales, and the measurement of clinical phenomena. *J Rheumatol* 1999 May;26(5):1022-3.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10332963>
27. Scott DL, Garrod T. Quality of life measures: use and abuse. *Ballieres Best Pract Research Clinical Rheumatol* 2000 Dec;14(4):663-87.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11092795>

3. CANCER PAIN MANAGEMENT (GENERAL)

3.1 Classification of cancer pain

The physical causes of pain are either nociceptive or neuropathic. In cancer patients, nociceptive pain tends to be caused by invasion of the bone, soft tissues or viscera (e.g. bowel, bladder), and neuropathic pain by nerve compression or infiltration.

Urogenital neoplasms frequently metastasise to bone (e.g. spine, pelvis, skull). Bone metastases are associated with pathological fractures, hypercalcaemia and neurological deficits, leading to substantial impairment of QoL. The release of algogenic substances in the tissue, microfractures and periosteal tension are the main mechanism for pain sensation (1).

Pain caused by bone metastasis is nociceptive, but can become neuropathic if the tumour invades or compresses a nerve, neural plexus or spinal cord. One-third of patients with tumour-related pain are affected by neuropathic pain components (2). Nociceptive pain is well localised. Initially it occurs on physical movement, but later might also occur at rest.

Neuropathic pain frequently has a constant 'burning' character. The efficacy of opioids may be diminished in neuropathic pain, making co-analgesia necessary (3). Patients with severe neuropathic pain are a special challenge. Psychological changes frequently occur, and specific therapeutic intervention may be necessary (4).

The World Health Organization (WHO) recommends a stepwise scheme for the treatment of cancer pain syndromes and neoplastic bone pain. Bisphosphonates and calcitonin are helpful for stabilising bone metabolism. Epidural and intrathecal opioids are sometimes useful in managing metastatic bone pain. Selected patients with neuropathic pain sometimes benefit from nerve destruction by intrathecal or epidural phenol (5).

3.1.1 References

1. Mercadante S. Malignant bone pain: pathophysiology and treatment. *Pain* 1997 Jan;69(1-2):1-18.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9060007>
2. Grond S, Zech D, Diefenbach C, et al. Assessment of cancer pain: a prospective evaluation of 2266 cancer patients referred to a pain service. *Pain* 1996 Jan;64(1):107-14.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8867252>
3. Sindrup SH, Jensen TS. Efficacy of pharmacological treatments of neuropathic pain: an update and effect related to mechanism of drug action. *Pain* 1999 Dec;83(3):389-400.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10568846>
4. Mercadante S, Portenoy RK. Opioid poorly-responsive cancer pain. Part 3. Clinical strategies to improve opioid responsiveness. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 2001 Apr;21(4):338-54.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11312049>
5. Stevens RA, Stotz A. Neurolytic blocks for management of oncologic pain. *Cancer Res Ther Control* 1999;9:345-53.

3.2 General principles of cancer pain management

The four goals of care are:

- prolonging survival;

- optimising comfort;
- optimising function;
- relieving pain.

Pain leads to a vicious cycle of sleeplessness, worry, despair, isolation, hopelessness, depression, and escalation of pain. The following hierarchy of general treatment principles is useful in guiding the selection of pain management choices.

1. Individualised treatment for each patient.
2. Causal therapy to be preferred over symptomatic therapy.
3. Local therapy to be preferred over systemic therapy.
4. Systemic therapy with increasing invasiveness (the WHO ladder).
5. Conformance with palliative guidelines.
6. Both psychological counselling and physical therapy from the very beginning.

The fundamental principle is the individualisation of therapy. Repeated evaluations allow the selection and administration of therapy to be individualised in order to achieve and maintain a favourable balance between pain relief and adverse effects.

The next steps in the hierarchy, especially points 2-4, necessitate a continuing risk-to-benefit assessment between therapeutic outcome versus tolerability and willingness to accept adverse effects.

The more invasive the therapy, the more difficult the decisions become. This is particularly true with palliative medicine, where the prospects of healing are limited and there is the problem of working against time.

If local therapy is not feasible or cannot be well tolerated, then symptomatic measures are appropriate, although local therapy is to be preferred over systemic treatment. In simple cases, measures such as drainage and stenting can make analgesic medication redundant, e.g. gastric probe, ureteral stent, percutaneous nephrostomy, bladder catheter. Patients with recurrent subileus caused by peritoneal carcinomatosis are immediately relieved of their pain when they are given an artificial anus.

The indication is in direct relation to the severity of the disease and the operation, especially if the aim is palliative, although such cases are sometimes in particular need of invasive measures, not only to relieve pain in the terminal phase, but also to improve the general QoL, despite the potential for surgery to have a negative impact on patients' wellbeing. Examples include evisceration to prevent cloaca in cervical carcinoma, or implanting a prosthetic hip due to a pathological fracture originating in metastasised bladder or kidney cancer.

When dose escalation of a systemically administered opioid proves unsatisfactory, the following gradual strategy can be considered (LE: 4):

- Switch to another opioid.
- Intervene with an appropriate primary therapy or other non-invasive analgesic approach.
- Pursue psychological, rehabilitative and neurostimulatory techniques (e.g. transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation).
- Use invasive analgesic techniques after careful evaluation of the likelihood and duration of the analgesic benefit, the immediate risks, and the morbidity of the procedure (epidural infusion).
- Use neurodestructive procedures (chemical or surgical neurolysis, coeliac plexus blockade).
- Some patients with advanced cancer where comfort is the overriding goal can elect to be deeply sedated.

The importance of physiotherapy and psychological counselling cannot be emphasised too strongly.

3.3 Non-pharmacological therapies

3.3.1 Surgery

Surgery may have a role in the relief of symptoms caused by specific problems, such as obstruction of a hollow viscus, unstable bony structures and compression of neural tissues or draining of symptomatic ascites (1-3). The potential benefits must be weighed against the risks of surgery, the anticipated length of hospitalisation and convalescence, and the predicted duration of benefit. Radical surgery to excise locally advanced disease in patients with no evidence of metastatic spread may be palliative, and potentially increase the survival of some patients (4) (LE: 2b).

3.3.1.1 References

1. Williams MR. The place of surgery in terminal care. In: Saunders C (ed) The management of terminal disease. London: Edward Arnold, 1984; pp. 148-153.

2. Boraas M. Palliative surgery. *Semin Oncol* 1985 Dec;12(4):368-74.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2417321>
3. Sundaresan N, DiGiacinto GV. Antitumor and antinociceptive approaches to control cancer pain. *Med Clin North Am* 1987 Mar;71(2):329-48.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2881035>
4. Temple WJ, Ketcham AS. Sacral resection for control of pelvic tumours. *Am J Surg* 1992 Apr; 163(4):370-4.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1373043>

3.3.2 **Radionuclides**

3.3.2.1 *Clinical background*

Bone metastases are the most frequent source of pain during the evolution of cancers (1). Approximately 30% of patients with osseous metastases have pain that requires analgesia, interfering with QoL, causing anxiety, isolation, immobility, depression, and sleeplessness (1).

In single lesions, bone stability and pain reduction can be achieved by external beam radiotherapy (LE: 1b) (GR: A). About 80-90% of patients will experience durable pain relief, but many will develop further multiple painful metastases (1).

3.3.2.2 *Radiopharmaceuticals: physical characteristics*

- Strontium-89 chloride (⁸⁹Sr) emits a beta particle with a maximum energy of 1.46 MeV, a mean energy of 0.58 MeV, an average soft-tissue range of 2.4 mm and 0.01% abundant gamma emission with a 0.91 MeV photopeak. The physical half-life is 50.5 days (2,3).
- Samarium-153 lexidronam (¹⁵³Sm) emits a beta particle with a maximum energy of 0.81 MeV, a mean energy of 0.23 MeV, an average soft-tissue range of 0.6 mm and 28% abundant 0.103 MeV gamma emission with a 0.103 MeV photopeak. The physical half-life is 1.9 days (4).
- Rhenium-186 etidronate (¹⁸⁶Re) emits a beta particle with a maximum energy of 1.07 MeV, a mean energy of 0.349 MeV, an average soft-tissue range of 1.1 mm and a 9% abundant gamma emission with a 0.137 MeV photopeak. The physical half-life is 3.7 days (5).
- Therapy in this context means the intravenous administration of ⁸⁹Sr or ¹⁵³Sm (¹⁵³Sm ethylenediaminetetramethylenephosphonate [EDTMP]).

The most important radiopharmaceuticals are ⁸⁹Sr, ¹⁵³Sm and, to a lesser extent, ¹⁸⁶Re. There is no clear difference in treatment response between them (2), but, because of the differences in half-life, there is a difference in onset and duration of response, and in toxicity. For ¹⁵³Sm and ¹⁸⁶Re, the onset of response is rapid but duration is shorter (6,7). Note that ¹⁸⁶Re is no longer used in many European countries.

3.3.2.3 *Indications and contraindications*

⁸⁹Sr and ¹⁵³Sm are indicated for the treatment of bone pain resulting from skeletal metastases involving more than one site and associated with an osteoblastic response on bone scan but without spinal cord compression (1,8-15) (LE: 2, GR: B).

⁸⁹Sr and ¹⁵³Sm have no place in the management of acute or chronic spinal cord compression or in treating pathological fracture (1,8,11) (LE: 2, GR: B).

Some 60-80% of patients presenting with osteoblastic metastases benefit from ⁸⁹Sr and/or ¹⁵³Sm (1) (LE: 2). The choice between the two depends solely on practical considerations. ⁸⁹Sr and/or ¹⁵³Sm should be administered by a slow (⁸⁹Sr) or bolus (¹⁵³Sm) injection using an intravenous (iv) catheter. The recommended doses are 148 MBq (⁸⁹Sr) (16) and 37 MBq/kg (¹⁵³Sm) (1,16) (LE: 2).

About 10% of patients experience a temporary increase in bone pain (pain flare) (3,6,7,17), generally 2-4 days after ¹⁵³Sm, and 1-2 weeks after ⁸⁹Sr (acute side-effect) (1,4,8,11,12,15,18). Pain flare is associated with a good clinical response (LE: 2) (3,6,7,17), and sometimes requires a transient increase in analgesia. Pain reduction is unlikely to occur within the first week, and can occur as late as 1 month after injection. Analgesics should therefore be continued until bone pain improves (GR: B). Late side-effects include temporary myelosuppression (platelets, white blood cells). Recovery occurs 4-6 weeks later depending on bone marrow reserve. There is generally no significant effect on haemoglobin.

The patient can pose a radiation exposure risk for 2-4 days after ¹⁵³Sm, and 7-10 days after ⁸⁹Sr (4,8,11,13-15,18,19,20-23) (LE: 2). Information about radioprotection should be provided (GR: B).

If the pain responds to the initial treatment, administration of ¹⁵³Sm can be repeated at intervals of 8-12 weeks in the presence of recurrent pain (1,2,23) (LE: 2, GR: B). The response rate for second and subsequent treatments may be lower than for the first (1,8,12,23) (LE: 2).

3.3.2.4 Contraindications

Absolute contraindications:

- During or within 4 weeks of myelotoxic chemotherapy (all compounds except cisplatin), or within 12 weeks of hemibody external radiation therapy. The delay between these treatments and metabolic radiotherapy is necessary to avoid severe haematopoietic toxicity. However, treatment can be safely combined with limited local field external beam radiotherapy (LE: 3, GR: C).
- Known hypersensitivity to EDTMP or similar phosphonate compounds for ¹⁵³Sm (1).
- Glomerular filtration rate (GFR) < 30 mL/min (1, 2).
- Pregnancy; continued breastfeeding (2).

Relative contraindications:

- Not recommended for women of child-bearing age (negative pregnancy test and contraception mandatory).
- In acute or chronic severe renal failure (GFR 30-60 mL/min), the dose administered should be adapted: if the GFR is > 60 mL/min, reduce the normal dosage by 25%; if the GFR is 30-60 mL/min, reduce the normal dosage by 50% (LE: 4). GFR should be measured if creatinine is > 20 mg/L.
- With a single painful lesion: external limited field radiotherapy should be performed (16,24) (LE: 1b).

Caution:

Caution must be used in the following circumstances.

- Risk of fracture.
- Nerve or spinal cord compression that requires other treatments in an emergency: external radiotherapy or surgery, or a combination of the two.
- Urinary incontinence: special recommendations including catheterisation before administration of the radionuclide. The catheter should remain in place for 4 days (⁸⁹Sr), 3 days (¹⁸⁶Re), and 24 hours (¹⁵³Sm), respectively (2) (GR: A).
- Compromised bone marrow reserve.
- White blood cell count of < 2500/μL (LE: 4) (preferably > 3500/μL according to European Association of Nuclear Medicine guidelines) (2).
- Platelets < 80,000/μL (LE: 4) (preferably > 100,000/μL according to the European Association of Nuclear Medicine guidelines) (2).
- Haemoglobin < 90 g/L (2).

3.3.2.5 References

1. Ackery D, Yardley J. Radionuclide-targeted therapy for the management of metastatic bone pain. *Semin Oncol* 1993 Jun;20(3)(Suppl 2):27-31.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7684862>
2. Bodei L, Lam M, Chiesa C, et al. EANM procedure guidelines for treatment of refractory metastatic bone pain. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging* 2008 Oct;35(10):1934-40.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18649080>
3. Taylor AR Jr. Strontium-89 for the palliation of bone pain due to metastatic disease. *J Nucl Med* 1994 Dec;35(12):2054.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7527458>
4. Farhanghi M, Holmes RA, Volkert WA, et al. Samarium-153-EDTMP: pharmacokinetic, toxicity and pain response using an escalating dose schedule in treatment of metastatic bone cancer. *J Nucl Med* 1992 Aug;33(8):1451-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1378887>
5. De Klerk JM, Zonnenberg BA, Blijham GH, et al. Treatment of metastatic bone pain using the bone seeking radiopharmaceutical Re-186-HEDP. *Anticancer Res* 1997 May;17:1773-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9179233>
6. Finlay IG, Mason MD, Shelley M. Radioisotopes for the palliation of metastatic bone cancer: a systematic review; *Lancet Oncol* 2005 Jun;6(6):392-400.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15925817>
7. Lewington VJ. Bone-seeking radiopharmaceuticals. *J Nucl Med* 2005 Jan;46 Suppl 1:38S-47S.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15653650>
8. Ahonen A, Joensuu H, Hiltunen J, et al. Samarium-153-EDTMP in bone metastases. *J Nucl Biol Med* 1994 Dec;38(4 Suppl1):123-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7543288>

9. Collins C, Eary JF, Donaldson G, et al. Samarium-153 -EDTMP in bone metastases of hormone refractory prostate carcinoma: a phase I/II trial. *J Nucl Med* 1993 Nov;34(11):1839-44.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8229221>
10. Crawford ED, Kozlowski JM, Debruyne FM, et al. The use of strontium 89 for palliation of pain from bone metastases associated with hormone-refractory prostate cancer. *Urology* 1994 Oct;44(4):481-5.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7524233>
11. Giammarile F, Mognetti T, Resche I. Bone pain palliation with strontium-89 in cancer patients with bone metastases. *Q J Nucl Med* 2001 Mar;45(1):78-83.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11456379>
12. Krishnamurthy GT, Krishnamurthy S. Radionuclides for metastatic bone pain palliation: a need for rational re-evaluation in the new millennium. *J Nucl Med* 2000 Apr;41(4):688-91.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10768570>
13. Laing AH, Ackery DM, Bayly RJ, et al. Strontium-89 chloride for pain palliation in prostatic skeletal malignancy. *Br J Radiol* 1991 Sep;64(765):816-22.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1717094>
14. Lee CK, Aeppli DM, Unger J, et al. Strontium-89 chloride (Metastron) for palliative treatment of bony metastases. The University of Minnesota experience. *Am J Clin Oncol* 1996 Apr;19(2):102-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8610630>
15. Lewington VJ. Targeted radionuclide therapy for bone metastases. *Eur J Nucl Med* 1993 Jan;20(1):66-74.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7678397>
16. Porter AT, McEwan AJ, Powe JE, et al. Results of a randomized phase-III trial to evaluate the efficacy of strontium-89 adjuvant to local field external beam irradiation in the management of endocrine resistant metastatic prostate cancer. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 1993 Apr;25(5):805-13.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8478230>
17. Resche I, Chatal JF, Pecking A, et al. A dose-controlled study of ¹⁵³Sm-ethylenediaminetetramethylenephosphonate (EDTMP) in the treatment of patients with painful bone metastases. *Eur J Cancer* 1997 Sep;33:1583-91.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9389919>
18. McEwan AJ, Porter AT, Venner PM, et al. An evaluation of the safety and efficacy of treatment with strontium-89 in patients who have previously received wide field radiotherapy. *Antibody Immunocconj Radiopharm* 1990;3(2):91-8.
19. Eary JF, Collins C, Stabin M, et al. Samarium-153-EDTMP biodistribution and dosimetry estimation. *J Nucl Med* 1993 Jul;34(7):1031-6.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7686217>
20. McEwan AJ, Amyotte GA, McGowan DG, et al. A retrospective analysis of the cost effectiveness of treatment with Metastron (⁸⁹Sr-Chloride) in patients with prostate cancer metastatic to bone. *Nucl Med Commun* 1994 Jul;15(7):499-504.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7970425>
21. Nightengale B, Brune M, Blizzard SP, et al. Strontium chloride Sr 89 for treating pain from metastatic bone disease. *Am J Health Syst Pharm* 1995 Oct;52(20):2189-95.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8564588>
22. Pons F, Herranz R, Garcia A, et al. Strontium-89 for palliation of pain from bone metastases in patients with prostate and breast cancer. *Eur J Nucl Med* 1997 Oct;24(10):1210-4.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9323260>
23. Sartor O, Reid RH, Bushnell DL, et al. Safety and efficacy of repeat administration of samarium Sm-153 lexidronam to patients with metastatic bone pain. *Cancer* 2007 Feb;109(3):637-43.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17167764>
24. Quilty PM, Kirk D, Bolger JJ, et al. A comparison of the palliative effects of strontium-89 and external beam radiotherapy in metastatic prostate cancer. *Radiother Oncol* 1994 Apr;31(1):33-40.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7518932>

3.3.3 **Radiotherapy for metastatic bone pain**

3.3.3.1 *Clinical background*

Radiotherapy is particularly useful in treating metastatic bone pain, alleviating it efficiently in the majority of patients (1-5) (LE: 1a). Studies show that complete pain relief is obtained in 20-50% of patients, with partial relief in 50-80% (LE: 1a). The onset of pain relief varies from a few days to 4 weeks. Re-irradiation should therefore not be considered sooner than 4-6 weeks after the first radiotherapy (6) (LE: 2b). Pain relief can be obtained for 3-6 months (3,4,7) (LE: 1a).

3.3.3.2 Mechanism of pain relief by radiotherapy

Tumour shrinkage and inhibition of the release of chemical pain mediators are the main mechanisms by which radiotherapy relieves pain (LE: 3). Tumour shrinkage is unlikely to account for early pain relief, which is hypothesised to involve early reacting and very sensitive cells, plus the molecules they produce. Obvious candidates are the inflammatory cells present in the bone metastasis microenvironment: reduction of these cells by ionising radiation inhibits the release of chemical pain mediators and is probably responsible for the rapid reaction seen in some patients (8-10) (LE: 3).

3.3.3.3 Imaging

The detection of bone metastases is usually based on ^{99m}technetium bone scintigraphy, which lacks diagnostic specificity (11) (LE: 3), but the addition of single photon emission computed tomography (SPECT) to planar acquisition has been reported to improve its diagnostic accuracy (12-14) (LE: 2b). Regions of increased uptake need further investigation. Plain films have a false-negative rate of 10-17% (LE: 3). At least 50% erosion must be present for a change to be seen on plain films (15) (LE: 3). The combination of bone scintigraphy and plain films results in specificity of 64% and sensitivity of 63% (16) (LE: 3).

Because of the complex anatomy of the vertebrae, computed tomography (CT) is more useful than conventional radiography for evaluating the location of lesions and analysing bone destruction and condensation (17). When combined with myelography, excellent information about the bony anatomy and an accurate view of the compressed neural elements is provided (18-19) (LE: 3). However, CT myelography is invasive and time-intensive, and so, particularly when spinal cord compression is suspected, magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) is currently the gold standard for detection and therapeutic management (20-24) (LE: 2b), with sensitivity of 93% (25) (LE: 3) and specificity of 96% (25) (LE: 3).

3.3.3.4 Radiotherapy scheme

Single-fraction radiotherapy is as effective as multifraction radiotherapy in relieving metastatic bone pain (4-5) (LE: 1a). However, the rates of retreatment and pathological fractures are higher after single fraction radiotherapy (4-5) (LE: 1a).

A single fraction is the treatment of choice for alleviating bone pain because of its greater convenience for the patient (4-5) (LE: 1a), as well as the faster patient turn-over for the radiotherapy unit and lower cost (26) (LE: 3). The recommended dose is 8 Gy (LE: 1a) (4-6, 26-28,30). Pain relief can be achieved in a significant number of patients with lower doses (LE: 1b), but studies have indicated that 4 Gy is less effective than 8 Gy (31-32) (LE: 1b). A dose of 6 Gy gives similar results to those obtained with 8 Gy, but has been insufficiently studied (32) (LE: 1b). These lower doses should be borne in mind if a third retreatment is necessary, or if there is concern about radiation tolerance (31-32) (LE: 2b).

In cases of oligometastases (< 5 metastases), a case can be made for aggressive therapy, such as radiosurgery or high-dose radiotherapy, in order to improve survival (33-35) (LE: 3).

3.3.3.5 Spinal cord compression

Metastatic epidural spinal cord compression is a common, severe complication of malignancy affecting 5-10% of patients (36). The most common symptom is back pain (83-95%); weakness is present in 35-75% (37).

The level of neurological function at the start of treatment determines the functional outcome. A delay in treatment, surgery or external radiotherapy is the most common cause of an unfavourable outcome (24,38) (LE: 3).

Corticosteroids reduce oedema and might have an oncolytic effect on certain tumours, e.g. lymphoma, breast cancer, leukaemia. However, both the extent of the benefit obtained from corticosteroids, and what the optimal dosage is, are unclear. High-dose corticosteroids carry a significant risk of adverse effects. One randomised controlled trial of patients with carcinomatous metastatic spinal cord compression compared radiotherapy with or without dexamethasone, and showed significantly better functional outcome when dexamethasone was added (39) (LE: 1b).

Radiotherapy is recommended as the primary treatment for patients who do not fulfil the recommendations for surgery listed below. For patients whose chances of survival are estimated to be poor, a short course of radiotherapy is advised (e.g. 1 x 8 Gy [40] or 2 x 8 Gy [41]) (LE: 3).

There have not been any trials comparing radiotherapy doses in patients with a good prognosis, so no conclusions can be drawn about the optimal dose of radiotherapy for those patients. However, in general, a multifraction regimen (10 x 3 Gy) is preferable in these patients as it allows for a higher dose and thus greater reduction in tumour size (42-43) (LE: 2a).

Until the mid-1980s, posterior **decompressive laminectomy** was viewed as the only surgical option for patients with spinal cord compression. However, several studies have shown that decompressive laminectomy offers no additional benefit over conventional radiotherapy in terms of maintaining and recovering neurological function and pain control (44) (LE: 2b). In addition, laminectomies are associated with important complications, most significantly wound infections, and new or worsened pre-existing spinal instability (44-45) (LE: 2b).

Several uncontrolled surgical trials (46-48) and one meta-analysis (49-51) have since indicated that **direct decompressive surgery** is superior to radiotherapy alone with regard to regaining ambulatory and sphincter function, and obtaining pain relief (LE: 1a). However, the decision to pursue surgery must be tempered by awareness of the attendant significant morbidity and mortality risks. Careful patient selection is of utmost importance; the criteria are shown in Table 3 (42-43,52) (LE: 3).

Table 3: Criteria for selecting patients for primary therapy for spinal cord compression

Absolute criteria	Surgery	Radiotherapy
Operability	Medically operable	Medically inoperable
Duration of paraplegia	< 48 h	≥ 48 h
Life expectancy	> 3 months	< 3 months
Radiosensitivity		Highly sensitive
Relative criteria		
Diagnosis of primary tumour	Unknown	Known
Bone fragments with compression	Present	Absent
Number of foci of compression	1 focus	> 1 foci

A randomised, prospective trial has demonstrated that patients treated with a combination of **surgery** followed by **radiotherapy** can remain ambulatory longer, and those who are not ambulatory at presentation have a better chance of regaining ambulatory function than those treated with radiotherapy alone (52) (LE: 1b).

3.3.3.6 Pathological fractures

In patients with impending pathological fracture, a prophylactic orthopaedic procedure should be considered. Several publications advise post-operative radiotherapy after (prophylactic) orthopaedic procedures for bone metastases (53) (LE: 3). Some authors argue that if bone cement is used for fixation, post-operative radiotherapy is not needed (53-55) (LE: 3).

3.3.3.7 Side-effects

Side-effects are related to the total dose, fractionation size, and the localisation of the metastases (56) (LE: 3). They are mostly transient, lasting a few days (56), and include:

- pain flare (within 24 h and due to oedema);
- symptoms depend on the treatment field and location and can include:
 - nausea (especially with larger fields);
 - diarrhoea;
 - irritation of the throat and oesophagus.

3.3.3.8 References

1. Bates T. A review of local radiotherapy in the treatment of bone metastases and cord compression. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 1992;23(1):217-21.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1374063>
2. Maher E. The use of palliative radiotherapy in the management of breast cancer. *Eur J Cancer* 1992;28(2-3):706-10.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1375488>
3. McQuay HJ, Collins SL, Carroll D. Radiotherapy for the palliation of painful bone metastases. *Cochrane Database Sys Rev* 2000;(2):CD001793.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10796822>
4. Wu JS, Wong R, Johnston M, et al; Cancer Care Ontario Practice Guidelines Initiative Supportive Care Group. Meta-analysis of dose-fractionation radiotherapy trials for the palliation of painful bone metastases. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2003 Mar;55(3):594-605.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12573746>

5. Sze WM, Shelley M, Held I, et al. Palliation of metastatic bone pain: single fraction versus multifraction radiotherapy--a systematic review of randomised trials. *Clin Oncol* 2003 Sep;15(6): 345-52.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14524489>
6. Agarawal JP, Swangsilpa T, van der Linden Y, et al. The role of external beam radiotherapy in the management of bone metastases. *Clin Oncol* 2006 Dec;18(10):747-60.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17168210>
7. The Bone Trial Working Party. 8 Gy single fraction radiotherapy for the treatment of metastatic skeletal pain: randomised comparison with a multifraction schedule over 12 months of patient follow-up. The Bone Trial Working Party. *Radiother Oncol* 1999 Aug;52(2):111-21.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10577696>
8. Mercadante S. Malignant bone pain: pathophysiology and treatment. *Pain* 1997 Jan;69(1-2):1-18.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9060007>
9. Vakaet LA, Boterberg T. Pain control by ionizing radiation of bone metastasis. *Int J Dev Biol* 2004;48(5-6):599-606.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15349834>
10. Price P, Hoskin PJ, Easton D, et al. Prospective randomised trial of single and multifraction radiotherapy schedules in the treatment of painful bony metastases. *Radiother Oncol* 1986 Aug;6(4):247-55.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/3775071>
11. Even-Sapir E, Metser U, Mishani E, et al. The detection of bone metastases in patients with high risk prostate cancer: ^{99m}Tc-MDP Planar bone scintigraphy, single- and multi-field-of-view SPECT, ¹⁸F-fluoride PET, and ¹⁸F-fluoride PET/CT. *J Nucl Med* 2006 Feb;47(2):287-97.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16455635>
12. Cook GJ, Fogelman I. The role of positron emission tomography in skeletal disease. *Semin Nucl Med* 2001 Jan;31(1):50-61.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11200205>
13. Gates GF. Bone SPECT imaging of the painful back. *Clin Nucl Med*. 1996 Jul;21(7):560-71.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8818471>
14. Ryan PJ, Evans PA, Gibson T, et al. Chronic low back pain: Comparison of bone SPECT with radiography and CT. *Radiology* 1992 Mar;182(3):849-54.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1531544>
15. Bach F, Larsen BH, Rohde K, et al. Metastatic spinal cord compression, occurrence, symptoms, clinical presentation and prognosis in 398 patients with spinal cord compression. *Acta Neurochir* 1990;107(1-2):37-43.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2096606>
16. Lecouvet FE, Geukens D, Stainier A, et al. Magnetic resonance imaging of the axial skeleton for detecting bone metastases in patients with high risk prostate cancer: diagnostic and cost-effectiveness and comparison with current detection strategies. *J Clin Oncol* 2007 Aug;25(22):3281-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17664475>
17. Rodallec MH, Feydy A, Larousserie F, et al. Diagnostic imaging of solitary tumors of the spine: what to do and say. *Radiographics* 2008 Jul-Aug; 28(4):1019-41.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18635627>
18. Helweg-Larsen S, Wagner A, Kjaer L, et al. Comparison of myelography combined with postmyelographic spinal CT and MRI in suspected metastatic disease of the spinal canal. *J Neurooncol* 1992 Jul;13(3):231-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1517800>
19. Hagenau C, Grosh W, Currie M, et al. Comparison of spinal magnetic resonance imaging and myelography in cancer patients. *J Clin Oncol* 1987 Oct;5(10):1663-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/3655863>
20. Ghanem N, Uhl M, Brink I, et al. Diagnostic value of MRI in comparison to scintigraphy, PET, MS-CT and PET-CT for the detection of metastases of bone. *Eur J Radiol* 2005 Jul;55(1):41-55.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15950100>
21. Gabriel K, Schiff D. Metastatic spinal cord compression by solid tumors. *Semin Neurol* 2004 Dec;24: 375-83.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15637649>
22. Baur A, Stabler A, Arbogast, et al. Acute osteoporotic and neoplastic vertebral compression fractures: fluid sign at MR imaging. *Radiology* 2002 Dec;225(3):730-5.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12461253>

23. Jung HS, Jee WH, McCauley TR, et al. Discrimination of metastatic from acute osteoporotic compression fractures with MR imaging. *Radiographics* 2003 Jan-Feb;23(1):179-87.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12533652>
24. Loblaw DA, Perry J, Chambers A, et al. Systematic review of the diagnosis and management of malignant extradural spinal cord compression: the Cancer Care Ontario Practice Guidelines Initiative's Neuro-Oncology Disease Site Group. *J Clin Oncol* 2005 Mar;23(9):2028-37.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15774794>
25. Li KC, Poon PY. Sensitivity and specificity of MRI in detecting malignant spinal cord benign compression fractures of vertebrae. *Magn Reson Imaging* 1988 Sep-Oct;6(5):547-56.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/3067022>
26. Steenland E, Leer JW, van Houwelingen H, et al. The effect of a single fraction compared to multiple fractions on painful bone metastases: a global analysis of the Dutch Bone metastasis study. *Radiother Oncol* 1999 Aug;52(2):101-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10577695>
27. Roos DE, Turner SL, O'Brien PC, et al; Tran-Tasman Radiation Oncology Group, TROG 96.05. Randomized trial of 8 Gy in 1 versus 20 Gy in 5 fractions of radiotherapy for neuropathic pain due to bone metastases (Trans-Tasman Radiation Oncology Group, TROG 96.05). *Radiother Oncol*, 2005 Apr;75(1):54-63.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15878101>
28. Hartsell WF, Scott CB, Bruner DW, et al. Randomized trial of short versus long-course radiotherapy for palliation of painful bone metastases. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2005 Jun;97(11):798-804.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15928300>
29. Agarawal JP, Swangsilpa T, van der Linden Y, et al. The role of external beam radiotherapy in the management of bone metastases. *Clin Oncol* 2006 Dec;18(10):747-60.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17168210>
30. Jeremic B. Single fraction external beam radiation therapy in the treatment of localized metastatic bone pain. A review. *J Pain Symptom Manag* 2001 Dec;22(6):1048-58.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11738168>
31. Hoskin PJ, Price P, Easton D, et al. A prospective randomized trial of 4 Gy or 8 Gy single doses in the treatment of metastatic bone pain. *Radiat Oncol* 1992 Feb;23(2):74-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1372126>
32. Jeremic B, Shibamoto Y, Acimovic L, et al. A randomized trial of three single-dose radiation therapy regimens in the treatment of metastatic bone pain. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 1998 Aug;42(1):161-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9747834>
33. Singh D, Yi WS, Brasacchio RA, et al. Is there a favourable subset of patients with prostate cancer who develop oligometastases?. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2004;58(2):3-10.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14697414>
34. Hellman S, Weichselbaum RR. Oligometastases. *J Clin Oncol* 1995 Jan;13(1):8-10.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7799047>
35. Downey RJ, Ng KK. The management of non-small-cell lung cancer with oligometastases. *Chest Surg Clin North Am* 2001 Feb;11(1):121-32.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11253594>
36. Klimo PJ, Schmidt MH. Surgical management of spinal metastases. *Oncologist* 2004 Apr;9(2):188-96.
<http://theoncologist.alphamedpress.org/cgi/content/full/9/2/188>
37. Helweg-Larsen S, Sorenson PS. Symptoms and signs in metastatic spinal cord compression: a study of progression from first symptom until diagnosis in 153 patients. *Eur J Cancer*, 1994;30A(3):396-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8204366>
38. Rades D, Stalpers LJ, Veninga T, et al. Evaluation of functional outcome and local control after radiotherapy for metastatic spinal cord compression in patients with prostate cancer. *J Urol* 2006 Feb;175:552-6.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16406994>
39. Sorensen PS, Helweg-Larsen S, Mouridsen H, et al. Effect of high-dose dexamethasone in carcinomatous metastatic spinal cord compression treated with radiotherapy: a randomized trial. *Eur J Cancer* 1994;30A(1):22-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8142159>
40. Rades D, Stalpers LJ, Veninga T, et al. Evaluation of five radiation schedules and prognostic factors for metastatic spinal cord compression. *J Clin Oncol* 2005 May;23(15):3366-75.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15908648>

41. Maranzano E, Bellavita R, Rossi R, et al. Short-course versus split-course radiotherapy in metastatic spinal cord compression: results of a phase III, randomized multicenter trial. *J Clin Oncol* 2005 May;23(15):3358-65.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15738534>
42. George R, Jeba J, Ramkumar G, et al. Interventions for the treatment of metastatic extradural spinal cord compression in adults. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2008 Oct;8(4):CD006716.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18843728>
43. Rades D, Lange M, Veninga T, et al. Preliminary results of spinal cord compression recurrence evaluation (score-1) study comparing short-course versus long-course radiotherapy for local control of malignant epidural spinal cord compression. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2009 Jan;73(1):228-34.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18539406>
44. Young RF, Post EM, King GA. Treatment of spinal epidural metastases. Randomized prospective comparison of laminectomy and radiotherapy. *J Neurosurg* 1980 Dec;53(6):741-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7441333>
45. Findlay GF. Adverse effects of the management of spinal cord compression. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 1984 Aug;47(8):761-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/6470717>
46. Fournay DR, Abi-Said D, Lang FF, et al. Use of pedicle screw fixation management of malignant spinal disease: experience in 100 consecutive procedures. *J Neurosurg* 2001 Jan;94(1Suppl):25-37.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11147865>
47. North RB, LaRocca VR, Schwartz J, et al. Surgical management of spinal metastases: analysis of prognostic factors during a 10-year experience. *J Neurosurg* 2005 May;2(5):564-73.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15945430>
48. Wang JC, Boland P, Mitra N, et al. Single-stage posterolateral transpedicular approach for resection of epidural metastatic spine tumors involving the vertebral body with circumferential reconstruction: results in 140 patients. *J Neurosurg* 2004 Oct;1(3):287-98.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15478367>
49. Klimo P, Thompson CJ, Kestle JRW, et al. A meta-analysis of surgery versus conventional radiotherapy for the treatment of metastatic spinal epidural disease. *Neuro Oncol* 2005 Jan;7(1):64-76.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15701283>
50. Witham TF, Khavkin YA, Gallia GL, et al. Surgery insight: current management of epidural spinal cord compression from metastatic spine disease. *Nat Clin Pract Neurol* 2006 Feb;2(2):87-94.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16932530>
51. Cole JS, Patchell RA. Metastatic epidural spinal cord compression. *Lancet Neurol* 2008 May;7(5):459-66.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18420159>
52. Patchell RA, Tibbs PA, Regine WF, et al. Direct decompressive surgical resection in the treatment of spinal cord compression caused by metastatic cancer: a randomised trial. *Lancet* 2005 Aug;366(9486):643-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16112300>
53. Townsed PW, Smalley SR, Cozad SC, et al. Role of postoperative radiation therapy after stabilization of fractures caused by metastatic disease. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 1995 Jan;31(1): 43-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7995767>
54. Haentjens P, De Neve W, Opdecam P. Prosthesis for the treatment of metastatic bone disease of the hip: effects of radiotherapy. *Bull Cancer* 1995 Nov;82(11):961-70.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8535023>
55. Dijkstra S, Stapert J, Boxma H, et al. Treatment of pathological fractures of the humeral shaft due to bone metastases: a comparison of intramedullary locking nail and plate osteosynthesis with adjunctive bone cement. *Eur J Surg Oncol* 1996 Dec;22(6):621-6.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9005151>
56. Saarto T, Janes R, Tnehunen M, et al. Palliative radiotherapy in the treatment for skeletal metastases. *Eur J Pain* 2002;6(5):323-30.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12160506>

3.3.4 **Physical/psychological therapy**

3.3.4.1 *Physical therapies*

Physical techniques such as electrical stimulation, heat or cryotherapy can be used to optimise function or enhance analgesia in patients with chronic cancer pain. The treatment of lymphoedema with wraps, pressure stockings or pneumatic pump devices can improve function, and relieve pain and the feeling of heaviness. The use of orthotic devices can immobilise and support painful or weakened structures, and assistive devices can

be of great value to patients with pain precipitated by weight-bearing or ambulation (LE: 4).

3.3.4.2 *Psychological therapies*

The perception of pain and the suffering it causes derive from a combination of physical, emotional, spiritual, and social constructs. Psychological assessment and support are an integral and beneficial part of treating pain in cancer patients (1,2). Therapies include:

- Cognitive-behavioural interventions can help patients to develop new coping skills and modify the thoughts, feeling and behaviours engendered by the pain.
- Relaxation methods may be able to reduce muscular tension and emotional arousal, or enhance pain tolerance (3).
- Other approaches reduce anticipatory anxiety, which can lead to avoidant behaviours, or lessen the distress associated with the pain.

3.3.4.3 *References*

1. Fishman B. The treatment of suffering in patients with cancer pain: cognitive behavioral approaches. In: Foley K M, Bonica J J, Ventafridda V, eds. Second International Congress on Cancer Pain. Advances in pain research and therapy, vol 16. NY: Raven Press, 1990, USA, pp. 301-316.
2. Turk D, Meichenbaum D, Genest M. Pain and behavioral medicine: A Cognitive-Behavioral Perspective. NY: Guilford Press, 1983, USA.
3. Linton SL, Melin L. Applied relaxation in the management of cancer pain. Behav Psychother 1983;11:337-50.

3.4 **Pharmacotherapy**

The successful treatment of cancer pain depends on the clinician's ability to assess the presenting problems, identify and evaluate pain syndromes, and formulate a plan for comprehensive continuing care. This requires familiarity with a range of therapeutic options and responsiveness to the changing needs of the patient. The treatment of pain must be part of the broader therapeutic agenda, in which tumour control, symptom palliation (physical and psychological), and functional rehabilitation are addressed concurrently.

3.4.1 **Antibiotics**

Antibiotics may be analgesic when the source of the pain involves infection (e.g. pyonephrosis, abscess, osteitis pubis). In some cases, infection may be occult and confirmed only by the symptomatic relief provided by empirical treatment with these drugs (1) (LE: 2b).

3.4.1.1 *Reference*

1. Coyle N, Portenoy RK. Infection as a cause of rapidly increasing pain in cancer patients. J Pain Symptom Manage 1991 May;6(4):266-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2030303>

3.4.2 **Chemotherapy**

A successful effect on pain is generally related to tumour response. There is a strong clinical impression that tumour shrinkage is generally associated with relief of pain, although there are some reports of analgesic value even in the absence of significant tumour shrinkage (1) (LE: 1a).

3.4.2.1 *Reference*

1. Patt YZ, Peters RE, Chuang VP, et al. Palliation of pelvic recurrence of colorectal cancer with intraarterial 5-fluorouracil and mitomycin. Cancer 1985 Nov;56(9):2175-80.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2996749>

3.4.3 **Bisphosphonates**

Bisphosphonates are pyrophosphate analogues.

3.4.3.1 *Mechanisms of action*

- Inhibition of bone resorption: beginning 24-48 hours after administration, the target cells are the osteoclasts. There are three different mechanisms of inhibition of bone resorption corresponding to the three generations of bisphosphonates. There are four distinct effects on osteoclasts:
 - reduction of osteoclastic activity;
 - inhibition of osteoclast adhesion;
 - decrease in number of osteoclasts;
 - induction of osteoclast apoptosis.

- Inhibition of crystallisation and mineralisation: clinically not relevant.
- Promotion of osteoblastic bone formation and production of osteoclast resorption inhibitor.
- Anti-angiogenic effect and effect on tumour cells.

3.4.3.2 *Effects and side-effects*

The main effects are:

- decrease of the risk of skeleton-related events, e.g. hormone-refractory prostate cancer with bone metastasis (1) (LE: 1b, GR: A);
- pain response in 60-85% of patients (1-3) (LE: 1b, GR: A).

The main side-effects are:

- flu-like symptoms (20-40%), bone pain, fever, fatigue, arthralgia and myalgia (all < 10%);
- hypocalcaemia (caution: rapid infusion – older patients with vitamin D deficiency);
- acute renal failure (rapid infusion); always check renal function (GFR);
- osteonecrosis of the jaw bones (only after iv therapy);
- gastrointestinal symptoms can occur after oral administration (2-10%).

Some remarks (all grade B recommendations):

- Recognise and treat dehydration before administration of bisphosphonates.
- Reduce the dose in the event of impaired renal function when using zoledronate (4) (LE: 2).
- Avoid simultaneous administration of aminoglycosides (5).
- Perform clinical examination of the patient's mouth and jaws; avoid oral/dental surgery during administration of iv bisphosphonates (6-10) (LE: 2).

3.4.3.3 *References*

1. Saad H, Higano C, Sartor O, et al. The role of bisphosphonates in the treatment of prostate cancer: recommendations from an expert panel. *Clin Genitourin Cancer* 2006 Mar;4(4):257-62.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16729908>
2. Heidenreich A, Hofmann R, Engelmann U. The use of bisphosphonates for the palliative treatment of painful bone metastasis due to hormone refractory prostate cancer. *J Urol* 2001 Jan;165(1):136-40.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11125382>
3. Weinfurt K, Anstrom K, Castel L, et al. Effect of zoledronic acid on pain associated with bone metastasis in patients with prostate cancer. *Ann Oncol* 2006 Jun;17(6):986-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16533874>
4. Chang J, Green L, Beitz J. Renal failure with the use of zoledronic acid. *N Engl J Med* 2003 Oct;349(17):1676-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14573746>
5. Rogers M, Gordon S, Benford H. Cellular and molecular mechanisms of action of bisphosphonates. *Cancer* 2000 Jun;88(12):2961-78.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10898340>
6. Picket F. Bisphosphonate-associated osteonecrosis of the jaw: a literature review and clinical practice guidelines. *J Dent Hyg* 2006 Summer;80(3):10.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16953991>
7. Ruggiero S, Mehrota B, Rosenberg T, et al. Osteonecrosis of the jaws associated with the use of bisphosphonates: a review of 63 cases. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg* 2004 May;62(5):527-34.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15122554>
8. Schwartz H. Osteonecrosis and bisphosphonates: correlation versus causation. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg* 2004 Jun;62(6):763-4.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15181903>
9. Tarassoff P, Csermak K. Avascular necrosis of the jaws: risk factors in metastatic cancer patients. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg* 2003 Oct;61(10):1238-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14586868>
10. Van den Wyngaert T, Huizing M, Vermorcken JB. Bisphosphonates and osteonecrosis of the jaw: cause and effect or a post hoc fallacy? *Ann Oncol* 2006 Aug;17(8):1197-204.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16873439>

3.4.4 ***Systemic analgesic pharmacotherapy - the analgesic ladder***

Analgesic pharmacotherapy is the mainstay of cancer pain management (1-3). Although concurrent use of other interventions is valuable in many patients, and essential in some, analgesic drugs are needed in almost every case. Based on clinical convention, analgesic drugs can be separated into three groups:

- non-opioid analgesics;
- opioid analgesics;
- adjuvant analgesics.

Emphasising that pain intensity should be the prime consideration (LE: 1a), the WHO has proposed a three-step approach to analgesic selection for cancer pain (1,3). Known as the analgesic ladder, when combined with appropriate dosing guidelines it can provide adequate relief in 70-90% of patients (4,5).

- **Step 1: non-opioid analgesic** Patients with mild to moderate cancer-related pain should be treated with a non-opioid analgesic.
- **Step 2: non-opioid analgesic + weak opioid** Patients who present with moderate to severe pain or who fail to achieve adequate relief after a trial of a non-opioid analgesia should be treated with a weak opioid (e.g. codeine or tramadol), typically by using a combination product containing a non-opioid (e.g. aspirin or paracetamol) and an opioid (e.g. codeine, tramadol or propoxyphene).
- **Step 3: non-opioid analgesic + strong opioid** Patients who present with severe pain or who fail to achieve adequate relief with step 2 drugs, should receive a strong opioid (e.g. morphine, fentanyl, oxycodone, methadon, buprenorphine, or hydromorphone).

3.4.4.1 Non-opioid analgesics

- Non-opioid analgesics are aspirin, paracetamol and non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs).
- Can be useful alone for mild to moderate pain (step 1 of the analgesic ladder).
- May be combined with opioids.
- Have a ceiling effect of analgesic efficacy.
- No tolerance or physical dependence.
- Inhibit the enzyme cyclo-oxygenase and block the synthesis of prostaglandins.
- Involvement of central mechanisms is also likely in paracetamol analgesia (6).
- Potential adverse effects (7): bleeding diathesis due to inhibition of platelet aggregation, gastroduodenopathy (including peptic ulcer disease) and renal impairment are the most common; less common adverse effects include confusion, precipitation of cardiac failure and exacerbation of hypertension. Particular caution must be used in elderly patients and those with blood-clotting disorders, predisposition to peptic ulceration, impaired renal function and concurrent corticosteroid therapy.
- Non-acetylated salicylates (choline magnesium trisalicylate and salsalate) are preferred in patients who have a predilection to bleeding; these drugs have less effect on platelet aggregation and no effect on bleeding time at the usual clinical doses.
- Rarely, paracetamol produces gastrointestinal toxicity, but with no adverse effect on platelet function. Hepatic toxicity is possible, however, and patients with chronic alcoholism and liver disease can develop severe hepatotoxicity at the usual therapeutic doses (8).

3.4.4.2 Opioid analgesics

Cancer pain of moderate or severe intensity should generally be treated with a systemically administered opioid analgesic (9). Classification is based on interaction with the various receptor subtypes:

- Agonist: most commonly used in clinical pain management, no ceiling effect.
- Agonist-antagonist (pentazocine, nalbuphine and butorphanol): ceiling effect for analgesia.

By convention, the relative potency of each of the commonly used opioids is based on a comparison with 10 mg of parenteral morphine. Equi-analgesic dose information provides guidelines for dose selection when the drug or route of administration is changed (10).

A trial of systemic opioid therapy should be administered to all cancer patients with moderate or severe pain (10-13). Patients who present with severe pain should be treated with a strong opioid from the outset. Patients with moderate pain are commonly treated with a combination drug containing paracetamol or aspirin plus codeine, tramadol, or propoxyphene, the dose of which can be increased until the maximum dose of the non-opioid co-analgesia is attained (e.g. 4000 mg paracetamol).

Factors to consider when selecting an opioid include:

- pain intensity;
- patient age;
- response to previous trials of opioid therapy;
- co-existing disease;
- influence of underlying illness, characteristics of the opioid and concurrent medications.

Routes of administration

Opioids should be administered by the least invasive and safest route that can provide adequate analgesia. In a survey of patients with advanced cancer, more than half required two or more routes of administration prior to death, and almost a quarter required three or more.

Non-invasive routes

- **Oral** routes are the preferred approach in routine practice. Alternative routes are necessary for patients who have impaired swallowing, gastrointestinal dysfunction, require a very rapid onset of analgesia, or cannot tolerate the oral route.
- **Rectal** suppositories containing oxycodone, hydromorphone, oxycodone and morphine in combination are available, and controlled-release morphine tablets can also be administered per rectum. The potency of rectally administered opioids is believed to approximate to oral dosing (14).
- **Transdermal** routes: fentanyl and buprenorphine have been demonstrated to be effective in post-operative and cancer pain (15). The fentanyl transdermal therapeutic system dosing interval is usually 72 h, but some patients require a 48 h schedule. There is some interindividual variability in fentanyl bioavailability by this route, which, combined with large differences in elimination pharmacokinetics, necessitates dose titration in most cases (16). The efficacy of transdermal fentanyl is equal to morphine. The incidence of side-effects such as sedation and constipation are lower than for morphine (17,18) (LE: 1b).
 - Transdermal patches able to deliver 12,25,50,75 and 100 mg/h are available. Multiple patches can be used simultaneously for patients who require higher doses. Current limitations of the transdermal delivery system include cost, and the need for an alternative short-acting opioid for breakthrough pain.
 - Recently, buprenorphine has become available for transdermal administration. A high affinity partial μ -opioid agonist, it is in clinical use for the treatment of acute and chronic pain (19). Its analgesic effect is comparable with that of other opioids, and it shows no relevant analgesic ceiling effect throughout the therapeutic dose range (20). Unlike full μ -opioid agonists, buprenorphine's physiological and subjective effects, including respiratory depression and euphoria, reach a plateau at higher doses. This ceiling may limit the abuse potential, and might result in a wider safety margin (21).
- **Sublingual** absorption of any opioid is potentially clinically beneficial, but bioavailability is very poor with drugs that are not highly lipophilic, so the chances of an adequate response are low (22). Sublingual buprenorphine, a relatively lipophilic partial agonist, can provide adequate relief for mild to moderate cancer pain. Overall, this route has limited value due to the lack of formulations, poor absorption of most drugs, and the inability to deliver high doses or prevent swallowing of the dose. An oral transmucosal formulation of fentanyl (incorporated into a sugar base) is useful for the rapid relief of breakthrough pain (23,24). Fentanyl delivered by this means is more effective than oral morphine at relieving pain (LE: 2).

Recommendation

	GR
Oral transmucosal administration of fentanyl should be used to provide rapid relief of breakthrough pain. The starting dose is 400 μ g, or 200 μ g in the elderly and those with a history of opioid sensitivity or underlying pulmonary disease.	B

Invasive routes

For patients undergoing a trial of systemic drug administration, a parenteral route must be considered when the oral route is not available. Repeated parenteral bolus injections, which can be administered iv, intramuscularly (im) or subcutaneously (sc), may be useful in some patients, but are often compromised by the occurrence of prominent bolus effects (toxicity at peak concentration and/or pain breakthrough at the trough). Repeated im injections are common, but are painful and offer no pharmacokinetic benefit; their use is not recommended (25).

- **Intravenous bolus** administration provides the most rapid onset and shortest duration of action. Time to peak effect correlates with the lipid solubility of the opioid, and ranges from 2-5 minutes for methadone, to 10-15 minutes for morphine (26). This approach is appropriate in two settings:
 - To provide parenteral opioids, usually transiently, to patients who already have venous access and are unable to tolerate oral opioids.
 - To treat very severe pain, for which iv doses can be repeated at an interval as brief as that determined by the time to peak effect until adequate relief is achieved.

- **Continuous parenteral infusions** is mainly used in patients who are unable to swallow, absorb opioids or otherwise tolerate the oral route, but is also employed in patients whose high opioid requirement renders oral treatment impractical (27). Long-term infusions can be administered iv or sc.
 - Ambulatory patients can easily receive a continuous sc infusion using a 27-gauge butterfly needle, which can be left in place for up to a week. A recent study demonstrated that the bioavailability of hydromorphone by this route is 78% (28), and clinical experience suggests that dosing can be identical to that for continuous iv infusion. A range of pumps is available to provide patient-controlled rescue doses (supplemental doses offered on an as-needed basis to treat pain that breaks through the regular schedule) as an adjunct to continuous basal infusion.
 - Opioids suitable for continuous sc infusion must be soluble, well absorbed and non-irritant. Extensive experience has been reported with hydromorphone, oxycodone and morphine (29). Methadone appears to be relatively irritating and is not preferred (30). To maintain the comfort of an infusion site, the sc infusion rate should not exceed 5 cc/h.
 - The infraclavicular and anterior chest sites provide the greatest freedom of movement for patients, but other sites can be used. A single infusion site can usually be maintained for 5-7 days.

Changing the route of administration

Switching between oral and parenteral routes should be guided by a knowledge of relative potency to avoid subsequent over- or underdosing. In calculating the equi-analgesic dose, the potencies of the iv, sc and im routes are considered equivalent. Perform changes slowly in steps, e.g. gradually reducing the parenteral dose and increasing the oral dose over a 2-3 day period (LE: 3).

Dosing

- **Around-the-clock dosing** Patients with continuous or frequent pain generally benefit from scheduled around-the-clock dosing, which provides continuous relief by preventing recurrence of the pain. This approach should be used only in patients with no previous opioid exposure. Patients should also be provided with a rescue dose. This combination offers gradual, safe and rational dose escalation that is applicable to all routes of opioid administration.
- **Controlled-release drug formulations** These preparations of oral opioids can lessen the inconvenience of around-the-clock administration of drugs with a short duration of action. Numerous studies have demonstrated the safety and efficacy of these preparations in cancer patients with pain (31,32).
- **As-needed (prn) dosing** This strategy is beneficial if rapid dose escalation is necessary or when beginning therapy with opioids with a long half-life (e.g. methadone or levorphanol). As-needed dosing may also be appropriate for patients who have rapidly decreasing analgesic requirements, or intermittent pains separated by pain-free intervals.
- **Patient-controlled analgesia (PCA)** This is a technique of parenteral drug administration in which the patient controls an infusion device that delivers a bolus of analgesic drug on demand according to parameters set by the physician. Long-term PCA in cancer patients is most commonly sc using an ambulatory infusion device. PCA is usually added to a basal infusion rate and acts, in effect, as a rescue dose.

Adverse effects and their management

- **Tolerance** There is great variation in the opioid dose required to manage pain (400-2000 mg of im morphine per 24 hours) (33). The induction of true analgesic tolerance that could compromise the utility of treatment can only be said to occur if a patient manifests the need for increasing opioid doses in the absence of other factors (e.g. progressive disease) that would be capable of explaining the increase in pain. Extensive clinical experience suggests that most patients who require dose escalation to manage increasing pain do have demonstrable disease progression (34). This suggests that true pharmacological tolerance to the analgesic effects of opioids is not a common clinical problem, and has two important implications:
 - Concern about tolerance should not impede the use of opioids early in the course of the disease.
 - Worsening pain in patients receiving a stable dose of opioids should not be attributed to tolerance, but be assessed as evidence of disease progression or, less commonly, increasing psychological distress.
- **Adverse drug interactions** There is potential for cumulative side-effects and serious toxicity to arise from combinations of drugs. The sedative effect of an opioid may add to that of other centrally acting

drugs, such as anxiolytics, neuroleptics and antidepressants. Likewise, constipation produced by opioids is probably worsened by anticholinergic drugs.

- **Respiratory depression** This is the most serious adverse effect of opioid therapy, which can impair all phases of respiratory activity (rate, minute volume and tidal exchange). Clinically significant respiratory depression is always accompanied by other signs of central nervous system depression, including sedation and mental clouding. Repeated administration of opioid drugs appears to produce a rapid tolerance to their respiratory depressant effects, however, so these drugs can be used in the management of chronic cancer pain without significant risk of respiratory depression. When this does occur in patients on chronic opioid therapy, administration of the specific opioid antagonist naloxone usually improves ventilation.
- **Sedation** Tolerance to this effect usually develops within a period of days to weeks. Patients should be warned about it, to reduce anxiety and discourage activities that could be dangerous if sedation occurs (e.g. driving). Some patients have a persistent problem with sedation, particularly if other sedating drugs are also being taken or if there is co-morbidity such as dementia, metabolic encephalopathy or brain metastases.
- **Confusion and delirium** Confusion is a greatly feared effect of opioid drugs, and mild cognitive impairment is common (35). However, similar to sedation, pure opioid-induced encephalopathy appears to be transient in most patients, persisting from days to 1-2 weeks. Although persistent confusion attributable to opioids alone does occur, it is usually related to the combined effect of the opioid and other factors, including electrolyte disorders, neoplastic involvement of the central nervous system, sepsis, vital organ failure and hypoxaemia (36). A stepwise approach to management often culminates in a trial of a neuroleptic drug. Haloperidol in low doses (0.5-1.0 mg orally or 0.25-0.5 mg iv or im) is most commonly recommended because of its efficacy and low incidence of cardiovascular and anticholinergic effects.
- **Constipation** This is the most common adverse effect of chronic opioid therapy (37-39), and laxative medication should be prescribed prophylactically. There are no controlled comparisons of the performance of the various laxatives in opioid-induced constipation. Combination therapy is frequently used, particularly co-administration of a softening agent (e.g. docusate) and a cathartic (e.g. senna, bisacodyl or phenolphthalein). The doses should be increased as necessary, and an osmotic laxative (e.g. magnesium sulphate) should be added if required. Chronic lactulose therapy is an alternative that some patients prefer, and the occasional patient is managed with intermittent colonic lavage using an oral bowel preparation.
- **Nausea and vomiting** Opioids may produce nausea and vomiting via both central and peripheral mechanisms. These drugs stimulate the medullary chemoreceptor trigger zone, increase vestibular sensitivity, and affect the gastrointestinal tract (increased gastric antral tone, diminished motility, delayed gastric emptying). The incidence of nausea and vomiting in ambulatory patients is estimated to be 10-40%, and 15-40%, respectively (40), with the effects greatest at the start of therapy. Metoclopramide is the most reasonable initial treatment. Tolerance typically develops within weeks. Routine prophylactic administration of an anti-emetic is not necessary. Serotonin antagonists (e.g. ondansetron) are not likely to be effective with opioid-induced symptoms as they do not eliminate apomorphine-induced vomiting and motion sickness, which appear to be appropriate models for opioid effects. Clinical trials are needed to confirm this.
- **Addiction and dependence** Confusion about physical dependence and addiction augments the fear of opioids and contributes substantially to the undertreatment of pain (41). Patients with chronic cancer pain have a so-called therapeutic dependence on their analgesic pharmacotherapy, which may or may not be associated with the development of physical dependence, but is seldom associated with addiction. The medical use of opioids is rarely associated with the development of addiction (42). There are no prospective studies in patients with chronic cancer pain, but extensive clinical experience affirms the low risk of addiction in this population (LE: 3). Healthcare providers, patients and families often require vigorous and repeated reassurance that the risk of addiction is small.

Adjuvant analgesics

Defined as a drug that has a primary indication other than pain but is analgesic in some conditions, these drugs may be combined with primary analgesics on any of the three steps of the analgesic ladder to improve the outcome for patients who cannot otherwise attain an acceptable balance between relief and side-effects.

In the management of cancer pain, adjuvant analgesics are conventionally categorised as follows.

- **Corticosteroids** Widely used as adjuvant analgesics (43,44), this group has been demonstrated to have analgesic effects, to improve QoL significantly (45), and to have beneficial effects on appetite, nausea, mood and malaise in patients with cancer (46). The mechanism of analgesia may involve

anti-oedemic and anti-inflammatory effects, plus a direct influence on the electrical activity in damaged nerves. (i.e. reduction of neuropathic pain). Patients with advanced cancer who experience pain and other symptoms may respond favourably to a relatively small dose of corticosteroids (e.g. dexamethasone 1-2 mg twice daily) (LE: 2a).

- **Benzodiazepines** These drugs have a small analgesic effect (47), and must be balanced by the potential for side-effects, including sedation and confusion. Benzodiazepines are generally used only if another indication exists, such as anxiety or insomnia (LE: 2b).

3.4.4.3 References

1. World Health Organization. Cancer pain relief and palliative Care. Report of a WHO expert committee. World Health Organization Technical Report Series, 804. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization, 1990.
<http://apps.who.int/bookorders/anglais/detart1.jsp?sesslan=1&codlan=1&codcol=10&codcch=804>
2. Foley KM. The treatment of cancer pain. *N Eng J Med* 1985 Jul;313(2):84-95.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2582259>
3. World Health Organization. Cancer pain relief. World Health Organization. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization, 1986.
4. Schug SA, Zech D, Dorr U. Cancer pain management according to WHO analgesic guidelines. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 1990 Feb;5(1):27-32.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2324558>
5. Grond S, Zech D, Schug SA, et al. Validation of the World Health Organization guidelines for cancer pain relief during the last days and hours of life. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 1991 Oct;6(7):411-22.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1940485>
6. Malmberg AB, Yaksh TL. Hyperalgesia mediated by spinal glutamate and substance P receptor blocked by spinal cyclooxygenase inhibition. *Science* 1992 Aug;92(5074):1276-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1381521>
7. Brooks PM, Day RO. Nonsteroidal antiinflammatory drugs - differences and similarities. *N Eng J Med* 1991 Jun;324(24):1716-25.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2034249>
8. Seeff LB, Cuccherini BA, Zimmerman HJ, et al. Acetaminophen hepatotoxicity in alcoholics. A therapeutic misadventure. *Ann Intern Med* 1986 March;104(3):399-404.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/3511825>
9. Hanks GW, Conno F, Cherny N, et al; Expert Working Group of the Research Network of the European Association for Palliative Care. Morphine and alternative opioids in cancer pain: the EAPC recommendations. *Br J Cancer* 2001 Mar;84(5):587-93.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11237376>
10. Cherny NI, Thaler HT, Friedlander-Klar H, et al. Opioid responsiveness of cancer pain syndromes caused by neuropathic or nociceptive mechanisms: a combined analysis of controlled, single-dose studies. *Neurology* 1994 May;44(5):857-61.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7514771>
11. Jadad AR, Carroll D, Glynn CJ, et al. Morphine responsiveness of chronic pain: double blind randomised crossover study with patient controlled analgesia. *Lancet* 1992 Jun;339(8806):1367-71.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1350803>
12. McQuay HJ, Jadad AR, Carroll D, et al. Opioid sensitivity of chronic pain: a patient-controlled analgesia method. *Anaesthesia* 1992 Sep;47(9):757-67.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1415972>
13. Eisenberg E, McNicol ED, Carr DB. Efficacy and safety of opioid agonists in the treatment of neuropathic pain of nonmalignant origin: systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *JAMA* 2005 Jun;293(24):3043-52.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15972567>
14. Hanning CD. The rectal absorption of opioids. In: Benedetti C, Chapman C R, Giron G, eds. Opioid analgesia. *Advances in pain research and therapy*, vol 14. NY: Raven Press, 1990, pp. 259-269.
15. Calis KA, Kohler DR, Corso DM. Transdermally administered fentanyl for pain management. *Clinical Pharm* 1992 Jan;11(1):22-36.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1730176>
16. Portenoy RK, Southam MA, Gupta SK, et al. Transdermal fentanyl for cancer pain. Repeated dose pharmacokinetics. *Anesthesiology* 1993 Jan;78(1):36-43.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8424569>

17. Clark AJ, Ahmedzai SH, Allan LG, et al. Efficacy and safety of transdermal fentanyl and sustained-release oral morphine in patients with cancer and chronic noncancer pain. *Curr Med Res Opin* 2004 Sep;20(9):1419-28.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15383190>
18. Ahmedzai S, Brooks D. Transdermal fentanyl versus sustained-release oral morphine in cancer pain: preference, efficacy, and quality of life. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 1997 May;13(5):254-61.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9185430>
19. Koppert W, Ihmsen H, Körber N, et al. Different profiles of buprenorphine-induced analgesia and antihyperalgesia in a human pain model. *Pain* 2005 Nov;118 (1-2):15-22.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16154698>
20. Sittl R. Transdermal buprenorphine in the treatment of chronic pain. *Expert Rev Neurother* 2005 May;5(3):315-23.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15938664>
21. Johnson RE, Fudala PJ, Payne R. Buprenorphine: considerations for pain management. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 2005 Mar;29(3):297-326.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15781180>
22. Weinberg DS, Inturrisi CE, Reidenberg B, et al. Sublingual absorption of selected opioid analgesics. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* 1988 Sep;44(3):335-42.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2458208>
23. Coluzzi PH, Schwartzberg L, Conroy JD, et al. Breakthrough cancer pain: a randomized trial comparing oral transmucosal fentanyl citrate (OTFC) and morphine sulfate immediate release (MSIR). *Pain* 2001 Mar; 91(1-2):123-30.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11240084>
24. Fine PG, Marcus M, DeBoer AJ, et al. An open label study of oral transmucosal fentanyl citrate (OTFC) for the treatment of breakthrough cancer pain. *Pain* 1991 May;45(2):149-53.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1876422>
25. American Pain Society. Principles of analgesic use in the treatment of acute pain and chronic cancer pain. A concise guide to medical practice, 3rd edn. Skokie, IL: American Pain Society, 1992.
26. Chapman CR, Hill HF, Saeger L, et al. Profiles of opioid analgesia in humans after intravenous bolus administration: alfentanil, fentanyl and morphine compared on experimental pain. *Pain* 1990 Oct;43(1):47-55.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1980537>
27. Storey P, Hill HH Jr, St Louis RH, et al. Subcutaneous infusions for control of cancer symptoms. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 1990 Feb;5(1):33-41.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1969887>
28. Moulin DE, Krefft JH, Murray-Parsons N, et al. Comparison of continuous subcutaneous and intravenous hydromorphone infusions for management of cancer pain. *Lancet* 1991 Feb;337(8739):465-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1704089>
29. Moulin DE, Johnson NG, Murray-Parsons N, et al. Subcutaneous narcotic infusions for cancer pain: treatment outcome and guidelines for use. *CMAJ* 1992 Mar;146(6):891-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1371946>
30. Bruera E, Fainsinger R, Moore M, et al. Local toxicity with subcutaneous methadone. Experience of two centers. *Pain* 1991 May;45(2):141-3.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1876420>
31. Kaiko RF. Clinical protocol and role of controlled release morphine the surgical patient. In: Stanley TH, Ashburn MA, Fine PG, eds. *Anesthesiology in pain management*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic, 1991, pp. 193-212.
32. Walsh TD, MacDonald N, Bruera E, et al. A controlled study of sustained-release morphine sulfate tablets in chronic pain from advanced cancer. *Am J Clin Oncol* 1992 Jun;15(3):268-72.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1590284>
33. Coyle N, Adelhardt J, Foley KM, et al. Character of terminal illness in the advanced cancer patient: pain and other symptoms during last four weeks of life. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 1990 Apr;5(2):83-93.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2348092>
34. Foley KM. Clinical tolerance to opioids. In: Basbaum AI, Bessom JM, eds. *Towards a new pharmacotherapy of pain*. Chichester, UK: Dahlem Konferenzen, John Wiley, 1991, pp. 181-204.
35. Bruera E, Macmillan K, Hanson J, et al. The cognitive effects of the administration of narcotic analgesics in patients with cancer pain. *Pain* 1989 Oct;39(1):13-6.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2812850>

36. Breitbart W, Holland JC. Psychiatric complications of cancer. *Curr Ther in Hematol Oncol* 1988;3:268-75.
37. Inturrisi CE. Management of cancer pain. *Pharmacology and principles of management. Cancer* 1989 Jun;63(11 Suppl):2308-20.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2566371>
38. Walsh TD. Prevention of opioid side effects. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 1990 Dec;5(6):362-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1980127>
39. Sykes NP. Oral naloxone in opioid- associated constipation. *Lancet* 1991 Jun;337(8755):1475.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1675336>
40. Campora E, Merlini L, Pace M, et al. The incidence of narcotic induced emesis. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 1991 Oct;6(7):428-30.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1940487>
41. Schuster CR. Does treatment of cancer pain with narcotics produce junkies?. In: Hill CS, Fields WS, eds. *Drug treatment of cancer pain in a drug oriented society. Advances in pain research and therapy*, vol 11. NY: Raven Press, 1989; pp. 1-3.
42. Chapman CR, Hill HF. Prolonged morphine self-administration and addiction liability. Evaluation of two theories in a bone marrow transplant unit. *Cancer* 1989 Apr;63(8):1636-44.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2466551>
43. Walsh TD. Adjuvant analgesic therapy in cancer pain. In: Foley KM, Bonica JJ, Ventafridda V (eds). *The Second International Conference on Cancer Pain. Advances in pain research and therapy*, vol 16. New York, NY: Raven Press, 1990, pp. 155-168.
44. Della Cuna GR, Pellegrini A, Piazzini M. Effect of methylprednisolone sodium succinate on quality of life in preterminal cancer patients. A placebo controlled multicenter study. The Methylprednisolone Preterminal Cancer Study Group. *Eur J Cancer Clin Oncol* 1989 Dec;25(12):1817-21.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2698804>
45. Tannock I, Gospodarowicz M, Meakin W, et al. Treatment of metastatic prostatic cancer with low-dose prednisone: evaluation of pain and quality of life as pragmatic indices of response. *J Clin Oncol* 1989 May;7(5):590-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2709088>
46. Wilcox JC, Corr J, Shaw J, et al. Prednisolone as appetite stimulant in patients with cancer. *Br Med J (Clin Res Ed)* 1984 Jan;288(6410):27.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/6418303>
47. Fernandez F, Adams F, Holmes VF. Analgesic effect of alprazolam in patients with chronic, organic pain of malignant origin. *J Clin Psychopharmacol* 1987 Jun;7(3):167-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/3597802>

3.4.5 **Treatment of neuropathic pain**

Numerous options are available for relieving neuropathic pain, including opioids, which give patients significant pain reduction with greater satisfaction than antidepressants (1,2). However, the potential complications of opioids mean that they are not always a satisfactory option (3). Beside opioids, effective therapies for managing neuropathic pain include antidepressants, anticonvulsants, topical treatments (lidocaine patch, capsaicin), N-methyl-D-aspartate (NMDA) receptor antagonists, baclofen, local anaesthetics, and clonidine (4,5).

3.4.5.1 *Antidepressants*

There is clear evidence for the effectiveness of antidepressants in the treatment of neuropathic pain (5), which work primarily via interaction with pathways running through the spinal cord from serotonergic and noradrenergic structures in the brain stem and mid-brain.

Tricyclic antidepressants (TCAs) such as amitriptyline, nortriptyline (metabolite of amitriptyline), imipramine, and desipramine (metabolite of imipramine) are often the first drugs selected to alleviate neuropathic pain (6,7) (LE: 1a). The mechanism of action is predominantly by blocking the reuptake of norepinephrine and serotonin (dual acting), together with a blockade of neuronal membrane ion channels (reducing neuronal influx of Ca²⁺ or Na⁺), and interaction with adenosine and NMDA receptors. However, treatment with these analgesics may be compromised (and outweighed) by their side-effects. TCAs must be used cautiously in patients with a history of cardiovascular disorders, glaucoma, and urine retention. In addition, combination therapy with monoamine-oxidase inhibitors could result in the development of serotonin syndrome.

Duloxetine enhances both serotonin and norepinephrine function in descending modulatory pathways. It has weak affinity for the dopamine transporter and insignificant affinity for several neurotransmitters, including muscarinic, histamine, glutamate, and gamma-aminobutyric acid (GABA) receptors. Duloxetine has demonstrated a significant pain-relieving effect with a generally favourable side-effect profile in painful diabetic

neuropathy (7) (LE: 1b).

Selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs) – sertraline, paroxetine, fluoxetine and citalopram – selectively inhibit the reuptake of serotonin. These antidepressants have a more favourable side-effect profile than TCAs, but their effectiveness in neuropathic pain is disputed in the literature (second-line pharmacological treatment).

Recommendations

	GR
Amitriptyline and nortriptyline are the first line treatment for neuropathic pain; nortriptyline has fewer side-effects.	A
TCAs must be used cautiously in patients with a history of cardiovascular disorders, glaucoma, and urine retention.	
Duloxetine is the first-line treatment for neuropathic pain due to diabetic polyneuropathy.	A
Duloxetine may be tried as an analgesic in other neuropathic pain syndromes.	GCP

GCP = good clinical practice.

3.4.5.2 Anticonvulsant medication

The rationale for the use of anti-epileptic drugs in treating neuropathic pain is the reduction of neuronal hyperexcitability, one of the key processes in the development and maintenance of neuropathic pain (8). Different anticonvulsants have demonstrated pain relief by a blockade of neuronal membrane ion channels (reducing neuronal influx of Ca²⁺ or Na⁺), and effects on neurotransmitters (enhancement of GABA, inhibition of glutamate release) and/or neuromodulation systems (blocking the NMDA receptor) (9,10). Carbamazepine and phenytoin were initially used for the treatment of trigeminal neuralgia. Although both drugs reduce neuropathic pain, their attendant side-effects and complicated pharmacokinetic profile limit their use for this.

Despite the introduction of newer anticonvulsants with better side-effect profiles, carbamazepine remains the drug of choice for treating trigeminal neuralgia (11) (LE: 1a). However, oxcarbazepine (10-keto analogue of carbamazepine), a new anticonvulsant with a similar mechanism of action to that of carbamazepine but with a better side-effect profile, may replace carbamazepine for this (12).

Gabapentin and pregabalin are first-line treatments for neuropathic pain (reducing elements of central sensitisation), especially in post-zoster neuralgia and diabetic polyneuropathy (13-15) (LE: 1a). The combination of gabapentin with opioids seems to display synergistic effects in relieving neuropathic pain (16,17). Gabapentin has a favourable safety profile with minimal concern for drug interactions and no interference with hepatic enzymes. However, renal failure results in higher gabapentin concentrations and a longer elimination half-life, making dose adjustments necessary. Pregabalin (3-isobutyl GABA) is a structural analogue of gabapentin, but shows greater analgesic activity in rodent models of neuropathic pain than did gabapentin (18). Recent studies confirm the effectiveness of pregabalin in peripheral (including post-herpetic neuralgia and diabetic polyneuropathy) and central neuropathic pain (19).

Recommendation

	GR
Gabapentin and pregabalin are first line treatments for neuropathic pain, especially if TCAs are contraindicated.	A

3.4.5.3 Topical analgesics

Neuropathic pain syndromes are typically associated with touch-evoked allodynia and hyperalgesia that impair patients' QoL. As well as treatment with anticonvulsants and antidepressants, a topical drug can be effective in treating ongoing pain and allodynia, supporting the idea that peripheral actions are of key importance in the initiation and maintenance of neuropathic pain.

Topical treatments for neuropathic pain include the 5% lidocaine patch, and capsaicin. The 5% lidocaine patch, a targeted peripheral analgesic, is effective in the treatment of post-herpetic neuralgia and a variety of other focal peripheral neuropathies (20,21) (first-line pharmacological treatment; LE: 1b). Once a day, up to three patches are applied to the painful skin, covering as much of the affected area as possible.

Capsaicin causes pain due to release of substance P from the nociceptive terminals, initiating nociceptive firing. An analgesic response follows because prolonged exposure to capsaicin desensitises the nociceptive terminals and elevates the pain threshold. Capsaicin (third-line pharmacological treatment) reduces

pain in a variety of neuropathic pain conditions (including post-herpetic neuralgia, diabetic neuropathy and painful polyneuropathy). It is applied in a 0.075% concentration (22) (LE: 3).

Recommendations

	GR
Topical lidocaine 5% should be used as an adjuvant in patients suffering from post-herpetic neuralgia.	A
Transdermal capsaicin may be used as an adjuvant in patients with neuropathic pain.	C

3.4.5.4 NMDA receptor antagonists

Within the dorsal horn, ionotropic glutamate receptors (NMDA, α -amino-3-hydroxyl-5-methyl-4-isoxazole-propionate [AMPA], kainate) and metabotropic glutamate receptors are all involved in neuropathic pain (23). However, the actions of excitatory amino acids (glutamate) on the NMDA receptor is considered a pivotal event in the phenomenon of wind-up and neuronal hyperexcitability (enhancement and prolongation of sensory transmission) that eventually leads to allodynia, and primary and secondary hyperalgesia.

Subanaesthetic doses of ketamine, and its active enantiomer S(+)-ketamine, given parenterally, neuraxially, nasally, transdermally or orally, alleviate pain post-operatively and in a variety of neuropathic pain syndromes, including central pain (24) (LE: 2b). However, ketamine may result in unwanted changes in mood, conscious perception, and intellectual performance, as well as psychomimetic side-effects (including visual and auditory hallucinations, dissociation and nightmares), limiting its use for neuropathic pain (25). It must therefore be reserved as a third-line option for when other standard analgesic treatments are exhausted (26,27).

Recommendation

	GR
Ketamine is effective as an analgesic in neuropathic pain, but may be responsible for severe life-threatening side-effects and should be reserved for specialised pain clinics and as a last resort (third-line treatment).	B

3.4.5.5 Other drug treatments

Baclofen, a muscle relaxant, is analgesic due to its agonistic effect on the inhibitory GABAB receptors. Baclofen is efficacious in patients with trigeminal neuralgia, but not in those with other neuropathic pain conditions (28). However, this analgesic also has antispasticity properties and may induce analgesia by relieving muscle spasms, a frequent accompaniment of acute neuropathic pain. Baclofen can be considered a second-line agent for trigeminal neuralgia, or a third-line agent in neuropathic pain syndromes (LE: 3).

Clonidine, an α 2-adrenoreceptor agonist, is available as a patch for transdermal administration and has been used in neuropathic pain states. When used topically, it seems to enhance the release of endogenous enkephalin-like substances, but its use in the treatment of neuropathic pain is focused on intrathecal or epidural administration in combination with opioids and/or local anaesthetics. This delivery improves pain control because of a possible supra-additive effect during neuropathic pain treatment (30) (LE: 2b).

Summary: treatment of neuropathic pain

- **First-line agent:**
 - nortirpylinepregabalin, gabapentin;
 - duloxetine (first-line treatment in diabetic polyneuropathy only);
 - lidocaine 5% patch (first-line treatment in post-herpetic neuralgia only).
- **Second-line agent:**
 - opioids/tramadol (first-line treatment in patients with neuropathic cancer pain only).
- **Third-line agent:**
 - baclofen;
 - transdermal capsaicin 0.075%;
 - ketamine (an anaesthetic).

3.4.5.6 Invasive analgesic techniques

Studies suggest that 10-30% of patients with cancer pain do not achieve a satisfactory balance between relief and side-effects using systemic pharmacotherapy alone without unacceptable drug toxicity (31,32).

Anaesthetic and neurosurgical techniques may reduce the need for systemically administered opioids, while achieving relief.

Peripheral nerve catheterisation in the management of cancer pain

Tumour infiltration or compression of a peripheral nerve or plexus can result in severe neuropathic pain resistant to pharmacological treatment. In these patients invasive analgesic techniques may be emphasised (33,34).

Recommendation

	GR
Reversible regional anaesthetic techniques must be considered for the management of neuropathic pain.	GCP

GCP = good clinical practice.

Neurolytic blocks to control visceral cancer pain

Visceral cancer pain is mainly treated with NSAIDs and opioids, but neurolytic blockade can be used to optimise palliative treatment for cancer in the viscera.

Different neurolytic blockades have been described (35,36). A coeliac plexus block is indicated to treat pain secondary to malignancies of the retroperitoneum or upper abdomen (distal part of the stomach, pancreas, liver, gall bladder) (37) (LE: 1b). A superior hypogastric plexus block has proven utility for pelvic pain (rectum, vaginal fundus, bladder, prostate, testes, seminal vesicles, uterus and ovaries) due to a neoplasm that is refractory to pharmacological treatment (LE: 3) (38-40).

Neuraxial administration of opioids

The delivery of low-dose opioids near the sites of action in the spinal cord may decrease supraspinally mediated adverse effects. Compared with neuroablative therapies, spinal opioids have the advantage of preserving sensation, strength and sympathetic function (41,42). Contraindications include bleeding diathesis, profound leucopenia and sepsis. A temporary trial of spinal opioid therapy should be performed to assess the potential benefits of this approach before implantation of a permanent catheter.

The addition of a low concentration of a local anaesthetic, such as 0.125-0.25% (levo)bupivacaine, to an epidural/ intrathecal opioid increases the analgesic effect without increasing toxicity (43,44). The potential morbidity of these procedures requires well-trained clinicians and long-term monitoring (LE: 2).

Recommendation

	GR
Continuous intrathecal or epidural administration of morphine may be considered in patients with inadequate pain relief despite escalating doses with sequential strong opioids, or the development of side-effects (nausea, vomiting, constipation, drowsiness, sedation) limiting further dose increase.	B

Chemical rhizotomy

Chemical rhizotomy, produced by the instillation of a neurolytic solution into the epidural or intrathecal space, can be an effective method of pain control for patients with otherwise refractory localised pain syndromes (45, 46). The technique is most commonly used in chest-wall pain due to tumour invasion of somatic and neural structures. Other indications include refractory upper limb, lower limb, pelvic or perineal pain (lower end block).

Because of the significant risk of increased disability through weakness, sphincter incompetence and loss of positional sense, chemical rhizotomy of lumbosacral nerve roots is best reserved for patients with limited function and pre-existing urinary diversion. Adverse effects can be related to the injection technique (spinal headache, mechanical neural damage, infection and arachnoiditis) or to the destruction of non-nociceptive nerve fibres (47) (LE: 4).

Recommendation

	GR
Lower end block may be considered in patients with intractable perineal pain (bladder, rectum) that has responded insufficiently to more conservative therapy. This technique may only be performed in patients with loss of sphincter function (rectum and/or bladder).	C

Cordotomy

During cordotomy, the anterolateral spinothalamic tract is sectioned to produce contralateral loss of pain and temperature sensitivity. The patient with severe unilateral pain arising in the torso or lower extremity is most likely to benefit from this procedure. The percutaneous technique is generally preferred. Significant pain relief is achieved in more than 90% of patients during the period immediately following cordotomy (48). Of surviving patients, 50% have recurrent pain after 1 year. Repeated cordotomy can sometimes be effective. The neurological complications of cordotomy include paresis, ataxia and bladder dysfunction (49) (LE: 3).

3.4.5.7 References

1. Namaka M, Gramlich CR, Ruhlen D, et al. A treatment algorithm for neuropathic pain. *Clin Ther* 2004 Jul;26(7):951-79.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15336464>
2. Ballantine JC, Mao J. Opioid therapy for chronic pain. *N Engl J Med* 2003 Nov;349(20):1943-53.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14614170>
3. Rowbotham MC, Twilling L, Davies PS, et al. Oral opioid therapy for chronic peripheral and central neuropathic pain. *N Engl J Med* 2003 Mar;348(13):1223-32.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12660386>
4. Dworkin RH, O'Connor AB, Backonja M, et al. Pharmacologic management of neuropathic pain: evidence-based recommendations. *Pain* 2007 Dec;132(3):237-51.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17920770>
5. Dworkin RH, Backonja M, Rowbotham MC, et al. Advances in neuropathic pain: diagnosis, mechanisms, and treatment recommendations. *Arch Neurol* 2003 Nov;60(11):1524-34.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14623723>
6. Kakuyama M, Fukuda K. The role of antidepressants in the treatment of chronic pain. *Pain Rev* 2000;7:119-128.
7. Sindrup SH, Otto M, Finnerup NB, et al. Antidepressants in the treatment of neuropathic pain. *Basic Clin Pharmacol Toxicol* 2005 Jun;96(6):399-409.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15910402>
8. Jensen TS. Anticonvulsants in neuropathic pain: rationale and clinical evidence. *Eur J Pain* 2002;6(Suppl.A):61-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11888243>
9. Rogawski MA, Loscher W. The neurobiology of antiepileptic drugs for the treatment of nonepileptic conditions. *Nat Med* 2004 Jul;10(7):685-92.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15229516>
10. Vinik A. Clinical review: use of antiepileptic drugs in the treatment of chronic painful diabetic neuropathy. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2005 Aug;90(8):4936-45.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15899953>
11. Collins SL, Moore RA, McQuay HJ, et al. Antidepressants and Anticonvulsants for Diabetic Neuropathy and Postherpetic Neuralgia: A Quantitative Systematic Review. *J. Pain Symptom Manage* 2000 Dec;20(6):449-58.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11131263>
12. Guay DR. Oxcarbazepine, topiramate, levetiracetam, and zonisamide: potential use in neuropathic pain. *Am J Geriatr Pharmacother* 2003 Sep;1(1):18-37.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15555463>
13. Spina E, Perugi G. Antiepileptic drugs: indications other than epilepsy. *Epileptic Disord* 2004 Jun;6(2):57-75.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15246950>
14. Nicholson B. Gabapentin use in neuropathic pain syndromes. *Acta Neurol Scand* 2000 Jun;101(6):359-71.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10877151>
15. Vranken JH, Dijkgraaf MG, Kruis MR, et al. Pregabalin in patients with central neuropathic pain: A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial of a flexible-dose regimen. *Pain* 2008 May;136(1-2):150-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17703885>
16. Gilron I, Bailey JM, Tu D, et al. Morphine, gabapentin, or their combination for neuropathic pain. *N Engl J Med* 2005 Mar;352(13):1324-34.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15800228>
17. Bennett MI, Simpson KH. Gabapentin in the treatment of neuropathic pain. *Palliat Med* 2004 Jan;18(1):5-11.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14982201>

18. Frampton JE, Foster RH. Pregabalin in the treatment of postherpetic neuralgia. *Drugs* 2005;65(1); 111-8; discussion 119-20.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15610058>
19. Ryvlin P. Defining success in clinical trials – profiling pregabalin, the newest AED. *Eur J Neurol* 2005 Nov;12 Suppl 4;12-21.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16144536>
20. Meier T, Wasner G, Faust M, et al. Efficacy of lidocaine patch 5% in the treatment of focal peripheral neuropathic pain syndromes: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study. *Pain* 2003 Nov;106(1-2);151-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14581122>
21. Gaier BS, Jensen MP, Ma T, et al. The lidocaine patch 5% effectively treats all neuropathic pain qualities: results of a randomized, double-blind, vehicle-controlled, 3-week efficacy study with use of the neuropathic pain scale. *Clin J Pain* 2002 Sep-Oct;18(5):297-301.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12218500>
22. Sindrup SH, Jensen TS. Pharmacologic treatment of pain in polyneuropathy. *Neurology* 2000 Oct;55(7):915-20.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11061244>
23. Fisher K, Coderre TJ, Hagen NA. Targeting the NMDA receptor for chronic pain management: preclinical animal studies, recent clinical experience and future research directions. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 2000 Nov;20(5);358-73.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11068158>
24. Vranken JH, Dijkgraaf MG, Kruis MR, et al. Iontophoretic administration of S(+)-ketamine in patients with intractable central pain: a placebo-controlled trial. *Pain* 2005 Nov;118(1-2);224-31.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16202531>
25. Fisher K, Hagen NA. Analgesic effect of oral ketamine in chronic neuropathic pain of spinal origin: a case report. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 1999 Jul;18(1);61-6.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10439575>
26. Enarson MC, Hayes H, Woodroffe MA. Clinical experiences with oral ketamine. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 1999 May;17(5);384-6.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10355218>
27. Hocking G, Cousins MJ. Ketamine in chronic pain: an evidence-based review. *Anesth Analg* 2003 Dec;97(6):1730-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14633551>
28. Fromm GH, Terrence CF, Chatta AS. Baclofen in the treatment of trigeminal neuralgia: double blind study and long term follow up. *Ann Neurol* 1984 Mar;15(3);240-4.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/6372646>
29. Chabal C, Jacobson L, Mariano A, et al. The use of oral mexiletine for the treatment of peripheral nerve injury. *Anesthesiology* 1992 Apr;76(4);513-17.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1312797>
30. Eisenach JC, De Kock M, Klimscha W. Alpha 2 adrenergic agonists for regional anesthesia: a clinical review of clonidine (1984-1995). *Anesthesiology* 1996 Sep;85(3);655-74.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8853097>
31. Schug SA, Zech D, Dorr U. Cancer pain management according to WHO analgesic guidelines. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 1990 Feb;5(1):27-32.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2324558>
32. Grond S, Zech D, Schug SA, et al. Validation of the World Health Organization guidelines for cancer pain relief during the last days and hours of life. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 1991 Oct;6(7):411-22.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1940485>
33. Vranken JH, Zuurmond WW, de Lange JJ. Continuous brachial plexus lock as treatment for the Pancoast's syndrome. *Clin J Pain* 2000 Dec;16(4);327-33.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11153789>
34. Bride (eds). *Neural Blockade in Clinical Anesthesia and Management of Pain*, 3rd ed. 1998, Philadelphia: Lippincott-Raven, pp. 373-394.
35. Eisenberg E, Carr DB, Chalmers TC. Neurolytic celiac plexus block for treatment of cancer pain: a meta-analysis. *Anesth Analg* 1995 Feb;80(2):290-5.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7818115>
36. Plancarte R, de Leon-Casasola O, El-Helaly M, et al. Neurolytic superior hypogastric plexus block for chronic pelvic pain associated with cancer. *Reg Anesth* 1997 Nov-Dec;22(6):562-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9425974>

37. Kawamata M, Ishitani K, Ishikawa K, et al. Comparison between celiac plexus block and morphine treatment on quality of life in patients with pancreatic cancer pain. *Pain* 1996 Mar;64(3):597-602. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8783327>
38. de Leon Casasola OA, Kent E, Lema MJ. Neurolytic superior hypogastric plexus block for chronic pelvic pain associated with cancer. *Pain* 1993 Aug;54(2):145-51. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8233527>
39. Lillemo K, Cameron JL, Kaufman HS, et al. Chemical splanchnicectomy in patients with unresectable pancreatic cancer. A prospective randomized trial. *Ann Surg* 1993 May;217(5):447-55; discussion 456-7. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7683868>
40. Suleyman Ozyalcin N, Talu GK, Camlica H, et al. Efficacy of coeliac plexus and splanchnic nerve blockades in body and tail located pancreatic cancer pain. *Eur J Pain* 2004 Dec;8(6):539-45. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15531222>
41. Smith TJ, Staats PS, Deer T, et al; Implantable Drug Delivery Systems Study Group. Randomized clinical trial of an implantable drug delivery system compared with comprehensive medical management for refractory cancer pain: impact on pain, drug-related toxicity, and survival. *J Clin Oncol* 2002 Oct;20(19):4040-9. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12351602>
42. Ballantyne JC, Carwood CM. Comparative efficacy of epidural, subarachnoid, and intracerebroventricular opioids in patients with pain due to cancer. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2005 Jan;(1):CD005178. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15654707>
43. Deer TR, Caraway DL, Kim CK, et al. Clinical experience with intrathecal bupivacaine in combination with opioid for the treatment of chronic pain related to failed back surgery syndrome and metastatic cancer pain of the spine. *Spine J* 2002 Jul-Aug;2(4):274-8. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14589479>
44. van Dongen RTM, Crul BJP, von Egmond J. Intrathecal coadministration of bupivacaine diminishes morphine dose progression during longterm intrathecal infusion in cancer patients. *Clin J Pain* 1999 Sep;15(3):166-72. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10524468>
45. Candido K, Stevens RA. Intrathecal neurolytic blocks for the relief of cancer pain. *Best Pract Res Clin Anaesthesiol* 2003 Sep;17(3):407-28. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14529011>
46. Slatkin NE, Rhiner M. Phenol saddle blocks for intractable pain at end of life: report of 19 four cases and literature review. *Am J Hosp Palliat Care* 2003 Jan-Feb;20(1):62-6. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12568439>
47. Rodriguez-Bigas M, Petrelli NJ, Herrera L, et al. Intrathecal phenol rhizotomy for management of pain in recurrent unresectable carcinoma of the rectum. *Surg Gynecol Obstet* 1991 Jul;173(1):41-4. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1866669>
48. Crul BJ, Blok LM, van Egmond J, et al. The present role of percutaneous cervical cordotomy for the treatment of cancer pain. *J Headache Pain* 2005 Feb;6(1):24-9. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16362188>
49. Sanders M, Zuurmond W. Safety of unilateral and bilateral percutaneous cervical cordotomy in 80 terminally ill cancer patients. *J Clin Oncol* 1995 Jun;13(6):1509-12. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7751899>

3.5 Quality of life

- **Anxiety** is a common symptom in patients near the end of life. There is currently insufficient evidence on the role of drugs in the treatment of anxiety associated with terminal illness, and it is therefore not possible to draw any conclusions about the effectiveness of pharmacotherapy for it (1).
- **Cancer-related fatigue** is a significant problem. It can occur because of the side-effects of treatment or because of the disease itself, and can have a significant impact on a person's ability to function. The causes of fatigue are not fully understood and so it is very difficult to treat it appropriately. Trials of erythropoietin and darbopoeitin (for anaemic patients on chemotherapy) and psychostimulants (amphetamines) provide evidence for improvement in cancer-related fatigue at a clinically meaningful level. There are no data to support the use of paroxetine or progestational steroids for the treatment of cancer-related fatigue. Methylphenidate is an obvious candidate for a large-scale cancer-related fatigue study (2).
- **Sexual dysfunction** The proportion of people surviving and living with cancer is growing, which has led to an increased awareness of the importance of QoL, including sexual function, to people with

cancer. Sexual dysfunction is a potential long-term complication of cancer treatment. Following treatment for prostate cancer, there is evidence that transurethral alprostadil and vacuum constriction devices reduce sexual dysfunction, although negative effects were fairly common. Vaginal lubricating creams are also effective, as are PDE5 inhibitors for sexual dysfunction secondary to prostate cancer treatment (3).

- **Selenium** is necessary for human health. It acts against cell damage in the body and might help to alleviate treatment side-effects such as nausea, diarrhoea or lymphoedema in cancer patients, although there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate this (4).

3.5.1 **References**

1. Jackson KC, Lipman AG. Drug therapy for anxiety in palliative care. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2004;(1):CD004596.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14974072>
2. Minton O, Stone P, Richardson A, et al. Drug therapy for the management of cancer related fatigue. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2008 Jan 23;(1):CD006704
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18254112>
3. Iles CL, Candy B, Jones L, et al. Interventions for sexual dysfunction following treatments for cancer. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2007 Oct 17;(4):CD005540
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17943864>
4. Ennert G, Horneber M. Selenium for alleviating the side effects of chemotherapy, radiotherapy and surgery in cancer patients. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2006 Jul 19;3:CD005037
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16856073>

3.6 **Conclusions**

The goal of analgesic therapy in cancer patients is to optimise analgesia with the minimum of side-effects. Current techniques can provide adequate relief for the large majority of patients. Most will need ongoing analgesic therapy, and requirements often change as the disease progresses. Patients with refractory pain should have access to specialists in pain management or palliative medicine who can provide an integrated multidisciplinary approach.

4. **PAIN MANAGEMENT IN UROLOGICAL CANCERS**

4.1 **Pain management in prostate cancer patients**

4.1.1 **Clinical presentation**

Pain in both early and advanced prostate cancer (PCa) can be caused directly by the cancer (77%), be related to the treatment (19%), or be unrelated to either (3%) (1). Management must focus on symptomatic patients with locally advanced disease or metastases.

The overall incidence of chronic pain in PCa patients is about 30-50%, but as patients enter the terminal phase this rises to 90% (2). Pain may be directly attributable to tumour infiltration of and growth in three main areas: bone, nerve or a hollow viscus.

4.1.2 **Pain due to local impairment**

4.1.2.1 *Invasion of soft tissue or a hollow viscus*

Pain caused by invasion of a hollow viscus is treated with surgery or minimally invasive procedures (e.g. catheter, stent or nephrostomy tube).

4.1.2.2 *Bladder outlet obstruction*

Continuous growth of the prostate can lead to an outlet obstruction. Lower urinary tract symptoms (LUTS) can occur, especially stranguria and an inability to void. Acute pain requires prompt relief. The best method is to insert a suprapubic catheter and treat the tumour according to the stage (3). If the outlet obstruction persists transurethral palliative resection (TURP) is an option if no curative therapy can be offered.

4.1.2.3 *Ureteric obstruction*

Ureteric obstruction is most frequently caused by tumour compression or infiltration within the true pelvis

(4-7). Less commonly, obstruction can be more proximal, associated with retroperitoneal metastases. In most cases, obstruction is primarily asymmetrical. Untreated progressive ureteric obstruction results in bilateral hydronephrosis and subsequent renal failure. It is good practice to drain symptomatic hydronephrosis at once, and to drain only one kidney (the less dilated and better appearing kidney or the one with the better function if known) in asymptomatic patients. A nephrostomy tube is superior to a double-J stent for drainage because the subsequent routine endoscopic replacement of the stent could be increasingly difficult in a continuously growing prostate gland, and a nephrostomy tube can be changed without anaesthesia.

4.1.2.4 *Lymphoedema*

Patients with a huge prostate mass and/or lymph node metastases in the pelvis frequently get lymphoedema of the legs. Physiatric techniques such as wraps, pressure stockings and pneumatic pumps can improve function and relieve pain and heaviness.

4.1.2.5 *Ileus*

Local obstruction of the rectum is a common occurrence in advanced PCa, and can lead to abdominal pain caused by obstructive ileus. Rarely, peritoneal involvement can also result in ileus. Surgery and/or rectal stenting must be performed for mechanical obstruction. Paralytic ileus due to tumour infiltration of a nerve plexus or secondary to analgesics may require laxatives for opioid-induced constipation to improve motility and reduce pain.

4.1.3 **Pain due to metastases**

4.1.3.1 *Bone metastases*

- Bone metastases are the most common cause of chronic pain in patients with PCa (8,9) as a result of:
 - endosteal or periosteal nociceptor activation (mechanical distortion or release of chemical mediators)
 - tumour growth into adjacent soft tissues or nerves and
 - other complex mechanisms (9).
- Widespread bony metastases frequently cause multifocal pain. Patients with multiple bony metastases typically report pain in only a few sites.
- More than 25% of patients with bony metastases are pain-free (10).
- The factors that convert a painless lesion into a painful one are unknown.

The choice of treatment will depend on the site, histology and stage of the tumour, and on the patient's physical and emotional condition. Although tumour-cell specific therapies are being developed, most commonly used techniques damage normal tissues, with consequent side-effects. The pros and cons of the therapeutic options should be considered in each case, those with fewest side-effects being administered first. The options are:

- hormone therapy;
- radiotherapy;
- orthopaedic surgery;
- radioisotopes;
- bisphosphonates;
- calcitonin;
- chemotherapy;
- systemic analgesic pharmacotherapy (the analgesic ladder).

Other pain management tools such as nerve blocks are rarely used.

Hormone therapy

Huggins and Hodges (11) first noted the effect of exogenous oestrogen administration on prostatic carcinoma. Hormone changes may cause complex endocrine effects, such as pituitary inhibition of luteinising hormone (LH), follicle-stimulating hormone (FSH) and prolactin, as well as changes in endogenous corticosteroid hormone production (12). A variety of additive or ablative hormone manipulations have been employed, including oestrogen, anti-androgen (cyproterone, flutamide), oestrogen-mustine complex (estramustine), progestogens, aminoglutethimide, gonadotrophin-releasing hormone (GnRH) analogues, orchidectomy, adrenalectomy and hypophysectomy. Corticosteroids are also used for the palliation of pain, particularly that due to bone deposits.

Side-effects

Hormone therapy is generally much better tolerated than chemotherapy. It can cause a temporary exacerbation of pain (pain flare), which is generally predictive of a subsequent response (13). The side-effects are:

- GnRH analogues and orchidectomy:
 - loss of body hair;
 - testicular atrophy;
 - gynaecomastia;
 - loss of libido;
 - impotence;
 - increased cardiovascular mortality rate in long term administration;
 - psychological morbidity.
- anti-androgens:
 - gynaecomastia (more often if used alone than when used in combination with GnRH analogues);
 - hepatic impairment;
 - less sexual dysfunction than with GnRH analogues.
- cyproterone acetate:
 - fewer side-effects than oestrogens;
 - lower incidence of cardiovascular complications than with oestrogens.
- oestrogens:
 - loss of body hair;
 - testicular atrophy;
 - gynaecomastia;
 - loss of libido;
 - impotence.
- Long-term administration results in higher mortality from cardiac and cerebrovascular disease as compared to GnRH analogues.
- adrenalectomy:
 - major operative procedure.
- hypophysectomy:
 - small but significant mortality rate;
 - hormone replacement is subsequently required for life.

Efficacy

In a collected series of protocols, pain relief has been estimated at between 35% (14) and 70% (15). The differences may be due to the selection of patients and problems in pain measurement. Well-differentiated prostatic carcinoma is more likely to respond to hormones than are poorly differentiated tumours. Manipulations that include replacement corticosteroid therapy or have additional corticoid effects seem to give higher response rates. Corticosteroids are also used for the palliation of pain, particularly in bone metastases.

Problems

To date, most patients with adenocarcinoma of the prostate present in early tumour stages and undergo radical surgery or radiotherapy. In cases of disease progression and symptoms, hormone therapy can be indicated with patients remaining asymptomatic for years. Pain is associated with a hormone-resistant tumour in progression, which necessitates alternative therapeutical options.

Radiotherapy

- The role of radiotherapy in the management of pain due to bone metastases is unquestionable.
- Radiotherapy techniques vary widely, from a large dose given as a single treatment to as many as 20 smaller treatments given over 4 weeks.
- Dose-time factors: the biological effect of the radiation depends not only on the total dose delivered, but also on the number of separate treatments and the total time over which the irradiation therapy is administered.
- Palliative doses are smaller than maximum tolerance doses.
- Bear in mind that radiological evidence of a deposit may considerably underestimate the extent of disease.

In metastatic adenocarcinoma of the prostate, radiotherapy is associated with palliation of pain from bony metastases and improved quality of life. Radiation therapy is effective at treating painful sites, and might also be effective at reducing the propensity for adjuvantly treated disease to become symptomatic in most patients (16). This effect does not appear to be significantly influenced by dose-time relationships or histology. The

proportion of patients achieving complete pain relief approaches 80% (17) (see also Section 3.3.3).

Orthopaedic surgery

If more than 50% of the thickness of the cortex of a long bone is eroded by metastasis, prophylactic fixation rather than radiotherapy alone should be considered. Internal fixation should be followed by postoperative radiotherapy because there is a real danger of continued tumour growth and further structural weakness (18,19). Radiotherapy should not be withheld for fear of inhibiting bone healing and regrowth. There is good evidence that palliative doses of radiotherapy are associated with recalcification (20).

Radioisotopes

Widespread axial skeletal involvement in PCa has been successfully treated with systemically administered bone-seeking radioisotopes (see also Section 3.3.2). Commonly used radionuclides are strontium-89 chloride (⁸⁹Sr) and samarium-153-ethylenediaminetetramethylene phosphonic acid (¹⁵³Sm-EDTMP). The addition of ⁸⁹Sr as a single injection of 10.8 mCi (399.6 MBq) is an effective adjuvant therapy to local field radiotherapy, reducing disease progression, the requirement for further radiotherapy and analgesic support (16), and improving quality of life. Some evidence suggests that radioisotopes could give complete relief from pain over 1–6 months, with no increase in analgesia, although adverse effects, specifically leucocytopenia and thrombocytopenia, have been experienced (21).

Bisphosphonates

Bisphosphonates are routine supportive care for patients with bone metastases, and in a meta-analysis of 8 randomised studies some improvement in pain control due to bone metastases could be demonstrated (22). Bisphosphonates act by inhibiting osteoclast activities. Recent studies showed no statistically significant difference between the bisphosphonate and control groups in terms of PCa death, disease progression, and radiological and PSA response, but they should be considered for treating refractory bone pain and preventing skeletal events in those with metastatic PCa (22).

Zoledronic acid is effective for treating the complications of bone metastasis. Its efficacy and safety have been established in three pivotal trials involving more than 3000 patients (23). Although they appear osteoblastic on radiographic imaging, most bone metastases are characterised by excess osteoclast volume and activity. Pathological osteoclast activation is associated with increased risk of skeletal complications. Zoledronic acid, a potent inhibitor of osteoclast activity, differentiation and survival, decreases the risk of skeletal complications in men with androgen-independent PCa and bone metastases. Other bisphosphonates, including pamidronate and clodronate, seem to be less effective (24).

Zoledronic acid administration for one year to patients with hormone-sensitive PCa and bone metastases who were on androgen-deprivation therapy was safe and prevented bone loss, as shown by significant increases in bone mineral density and sustained suppression of biochemical markers of bone turnover (25). Zoledronic acid (4 mg intravenously over 15 minutes every 3-4 weeks) decreased the frequency of skeleton-related events, delayed the time to the first occurrence, and reduced pain (23). Visual analogue scale improvement is positively correlated with a decrease of C-telopeptide and bone phosphatase alkaline ($p < 0.05$) serum levels (26). Studies are needed to determine the optimal timing, schedule and duration of treatment in men with bone metastases, as well as other potential roles for bisphosphonates, e.g. prevention of bone metastases (see Section 3.4.3).

Calcitonin

Current evidence does not support the use of calcitonin to control pain arising from bone metastases (27).

Chemotherapy

In about 80% of men with metastatic PCa, primary androgen ablation leads to symptomatic improvement and a reduction in the serum levels of PSA. The disease eventually becomes refractory to hormone treatment, and systemic chemotherapy should be reserved for this patient group. Recent data have shown encouraging signs in overall survival, palliation of symptoms and improvements in quality of life (28), particularly with docetaxel.

Trials using single-agent chemotherapy in advanced disease have shown poor results, but newer studies suggest multiagent chemotherapies may be more effective. A randomised trial showed that mitoxantrone plus low-dose prednisone relieved pain and improved quality of life more frequently than did prednisolone alone. Other studies have confirmed the symptomatic effect of this regimen, but none found improved survival.

A PSA-response rate and a reduction of pain were also reported with other combined chemotherapies (Table

4). Individualised therapy was necessary as side-effects were common and no regimen showed a survival benefit.

Table 4: PSA-response rates to selected combined chemotherapy regimens

Chemotherapy agent	Plus	Response rate (%)
Ketoconazole	+ doxorubicin	55
Vinblastine	+ estramustine	54-61
Estramustine	+ etoposide	39-58
Mitoxantrone	+ prednisone	33
Paclitaxel	+ estramustine	53

In 2005, two studies demonstrated that docetaxel-based regimens have a very good symptomatic effect that is significantly better than that of the mitoxantrone-based approach (Table 5) (25,26). Additionally, for the first time, a significant survival benefit was shown for the docetaxel group (18.9 versus 16.5 months).

Table 5: Docetaxel-based chemotherapy versus mitoxantrone-based regimens

Chemotherapy agent	Plus	Frequency	Response rate (29)	
			Pain (%)	Quality of life (%)
Docetaxel	+ prednisone	Every 3 weeks	35	22
Docetaxel	+ prednisone	Weekly	31	23
Mitoxantrone	+ prednisone	Every 3 weeks	22	13

Although most of these regimens are associated with side-effects such as fatigue, mild myelosuppression and gastrointestinal irritation, they are generally well tolerated by most patients (30). The docetaxel-based regimens are now the standard of care for patients with advanced hormone-refractory PCa. Soft-tissue lesions could be influenced to a greater extent than bony metastases. Pain management by chemotherapy could be effective, although it is much more cost-intensive than the administration of opioids, and the survival advantage is limited.

4.1.4 Systemic analgesic pharmacotherapy (the analgesic ladder)

If the treatments described above provide insufficient pain relief, systemic analgesic pharmacotherapy should be administered (see Section 3.4.4). In most cases, the drug selection scheme proposed by the World Health Organization (WHO), the analgesic ladder, is to be recommended.

Short-term studies have shown that NSAIDs alone are effective in managing cancer pain, with side-effects similar to those with placebo. In about 50% of studies, increasing the dose of NSAIDs increased efficacy but not the incidence of side-effects. No large clinical difference has been demonstrated between combining an NSAID with an opioid versus either medication alone (31).

Tramadol extended-release tablets and dihydrocodeine extended-release tablets were effective for the management of chronic tumour pain associated with PCa with bone metastasis on step 2 of the WHO ladder, with the tramadol giving slightly better pain management and fewer side-effects, particularly constipation (32). The treatment of constipation in palliative care is based on experimental evidence, and uncertainty persists about its optimum management in this group of patients (33).

Oral morphine is an effective analgesic for cancer pain, with qualitative evidence showing that it compares well with other opioids. Morphine is the gold standard for moderate to severe cancer-related pain. Alternatives such as hydromorphone are now available, but no clinically significant difference has been shown between it and other strong opioids such as morphine (34). Patients with inadequate pain control and intolerable opioid-related toxicity/adverse effects may have to switch to an alternative opioid for symptomatic relief, although the evidence to support opioid switching is largely anecdotal, observational or from uncontrolled studies (35).

Breakthrough pain is a common and debilitating problem for patients with cancer. Evidence suggests that oral transmucosal fentanyl citrate is effective for breakthrough pain (36), giving more rapid relief than morphine (37).

4.1.5 **Spinal cord compression**

Spinal cord compression can occur due to the collapse of a vertebral body or to pressure from an extradural tumour within the spinal canal. Prodromal pain is a feature in 96% of these patients. The overall incidence in PCa patients is less than 10% (38). Thoracic cord compression is the most common area (70%), and the incidence of multiple extradural sites can be as high as 18% (39). Definitive treatment with surgery (anterior decompression with spinal stabilisation) or radiotherapy should be considered. The symptom of local back pain sometimes disappears, despite an increase in motor deficits, because of the evolving sensory component of the paraplegia.

Corticosteroids (typically dexamethasone 16 mg daily) are of only temporary use in cord oedema. There is evidence that decompressive surgery benefits ambulant patients with poor prognostic factors for radiotherapy, and non-ambulant patients with a single area of compression, paraplegia of < 48 hours' duration, non-radiosensitive tumours and predicted survival of > 3 months. There is a significant risk of serious adverse effects from high-dose corticosteroids (40).

4.1.6 **Hepatic invasion**

Hepatic invasion by secondary tumour is a common cause of severe hypochondrial pain, often radiating to the back and shoulder blade. The mechanism may be the stretching of nerve endings in the liver capsule, diaphragmatic irritation, or haemorrhage into a necrotic area of tumour. Liver pain can often be controlled by conventional titration of appropriate analgesics or with corticosteroids.

Whole-liver palliative radiotherapy can also be useful in carefully selected patients with refractory pain, giving far fewer side-effects than the alternatives of intra-arterial chemotherapy or hepatic artery embolisation. Hepatic irradiation can improve abdominal pain with little toxicity in more than half of patients (41). Doses should not exceed 30 Gy in 15 daily fractions or its equivalent if radiation hepatitis is to be avoided.

4.1.7 **Pain due to cancer treatment**

4.1.7.1 *Acute pain associated with hormonal therapy*

Luteinising hormone-releasing hormone (LHRH) tumour flare in PCa

Initiation of LHRH therapy for PCa produces a transient symptom flare in 5-25% of patients (42,43), presumably caused by an initial stimulation of LH release before suppression is achieved (43,44). The syndrome typically presents as an exacerbation of bone pain or urinary retention. Spinal cord compression and sudden death have also been reported (42). Symptom flare is usually observed within the first week of therapy, and lasts 1-3 weeks. Co-administration of an androgen antagonist at the start of LHRH agonist therapy can prevent this (45).

4.1.7.2 *Chronic pain associated with hormonal therapy*

Gynaecomastia

Chronic gynaecomastia and breast tenderness are common complications of anti-androgen therapies for PCa, the incidence varying between drugs. Frequently associated with diethylstilboestrol (46), it is less common with flutamide and cyproterone (47-49), and uncommon in patients receiving LHRH agonist therapy (49). In elderly patients, it must be distinguished from primary breast cancer or secondary cancer in the breast (50).

4.1.8 **Conclusions**

Radio-, chemo- and hormone therapy are all valuable options for relieving cancer pain. The side-effects of inappropriate anticancer treatments can be very distressing, and so the disadvantages of treatments must be balanced against the palliative benefits. In many patients, the best approach to pain relief is through interdisciplinary co-operation.

Surgery, radio-, chemo- and hormone therapy are mainly used as antitumour treatment in the relief of pain. The rational use of any of these treatments demands knowledge not only of tumour biology, but also of the mechanisms of action of these specific oncological techniques. The therapeutic aim should be clearly understood prior to starting treatment.

Radical treatment should be given if the disease is potentially curable, but the intent should be symptomatic or palliative if the tumour is advanced or widely disseminated (29). The importance of early intervention needs to be emphasised, and education is crucial: patients must be aware of the early signs and symptoms of metastatic disease, which does not necessarily involve pain.

4.1.9 Recommendations at a glance (stage M1) (51-56)

ANTICANCER TREATMENT		
Recommendation	LE	GR
Hormonal therapy (orchiectomy, LHRH analogues, diethylstilboestrol equivalent)	1a	A
Total androgen blockade: flare prevention, second-line	2b	B
Intermittent androgen suppression experimental	3	B
monotherapy with anti-androgen is an option	2	B
First-line treatment controls disease for 12-18 months, second-line individualised	1b	A
Supportive care		
Low-dose glucocorticoids	1b	A
Chemotherapy		
Mitoxantrone plus prednisolone	1b	B
Estramustine + vinblastine or etoposide or paclitaxel	2b	B
Docetaxel	1b	A
PAIN MANAGEMENT		
Recommendation	LE	GR
Pain assessment (localisation, type, severity, overall distress)		B
Pain due to painful or unstable bony metastases (single lesions)		
External beam irradiation	1b	A
Pain due to painful bony metastases (widespread)		
Radioisotopes (⁸⁹ Sr or ¹⁵³ Sm-EDTMP)	2	B
Pain due to painful metastases (many spots)		
Bisphosphonates	1b	A
Systemic pain management		
WHO analgesic ladder step 1: NSAID or paracetamol	1a	A
Opioid administration		
Dose titration	2	B
Access to breakthrough analgesia	1b	A
Tricyclic antidepressant and/or anticonvulsant in case of neuropathic pain	1a	A

4.1.10 References

- Foley KM. Pain syndromes in patients with cancer. In: Bonica JJ, Ventafridda V (eds). *Advances in Pain Research and Therapy 2*. New York, Raven Press, 1979, pp. 59-75.
- Twycross RG, Lack SA. Symptom control in far advanced cancer: Pain relief. London: Pitman, 1983, p. 6.
- Heidenreich A, Bolla M, Joniau S, et al; members of the European Association of Urology (EAU) Guidelines Office. Guidelines on Prostate Cancer. In: EAU Guidelines, edition presented at the 25th EAU Annual Congress 2010. ISBN 978-90-79754-70-0.
<http://www.uroweb.org/gls/pdf/Prostate%20Cancer%202010%20June%2017th.pdf>
- Fair WR. Urologic emergencies. In: DeVita VT, Hellman S, Rosengerg SA (eds). *Cancer Principles and Practice of Oncology*, 3rd ed. PA: Lippincott, 1989, pp. 2016-2028.
- Greenfield A, Resnick MI. Genitourinary emergencies. *Semin Oncol* 1989 Dec;16(6):516-20.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2688111>
- Talner LB. Specific causes of obstruction. In: Pollack HM (ed.). *Clinical Urography*, vol. 2. PA: Saunders, 1990, pp. 1629-1751.
- Cherny NI, Portenoy RK. Cancer Pain: Principles of Assessment and Syndromes. In: Wall PD, Melzack R(eds). *Textbook of Pain*, 3rd ed. Edinburgh: Churchill Livingstone, 1994.

8. Banning A, Sjøgren P, Henriksen H. Pain causes in 200 patients referred to a multidisciplinary cancer pain clinic. *Pain* 1991 Apr;45(1):45-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1861877>
9. Nielsen OS, Munro AJ, Tannock IF. Bone metastases: pathophysiology and management policy. *J Clin Oncol* 1991 Mar;9(3):509-24.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1705581>
10. Wagner G. Frequency of pain in patients with cancer. *Recent Results Cancer Res* 1984;89:64-71.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/6364273>
11. Huggins C, Hodges VC. Studies on prostatic cancer. *Cancer Research* 1941;1:293-7.
12. Powles TJ, Smith IE, Coombes RC. Endocrine therapy. In: Halnan KE (ed.). *Treatment of Cancer*, London: Chapman & Hall, 1983, pp. 103-117.
13. Stoll BA. Hormonal therapy-pain relief and recalcification. In: Stoll BA, Parbhoo S (eds). *Bone Metastasis: Monitoring and Treatment*. NY: Raven Press, 1983, pp. 321-342.
14. Stoll BA. Breast and prostatic cancer: Methods and results of endocrine therapy. In: Stoll BA (ed.). *Hormonal management of endocrine-related cancer*. London: Lloyd-Luke, 1981, pp. 77-91, 148-57.
15. Pannuti F, Martoni A, Rossi AP, et al. The role of endocrine therapy for relief of pain due to advanced cancer. In: Bonica JJ, Ventafridda V (eds). *Advances in Pain Research and Therapy 2*. NY: Raven Press, 1979, pp. 145-165.
16. Porter AT, McEwan AJ, Powe JE, et al. Results of a randomized phase-III trial to evaluate the efficacy of strontium-89 adjuvant to local field external beam irradiation in the management of endocrine resistant metastatic prostate cancer. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 1993 Apr;25(5):805-13.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8478230>
17. Bates TD. Radiotherapy, chemotherapy and hormone therapy in the relief of cancer pain. In: Swerdlow M, Charlton JE (eds). *Relief of Intractable Pain*, 1989, Elsevier, Amsterdam, pp. 329-47.
18. [No authors listed] Pathological fractures due to bone metastases. *Br Med J (Clin Res Ed)*. 1981 Sep;283(6294):748.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/6791732>
19. Galasko CS. The management of skeletal metastases. *J R Coll Surg Edinb* 1980 May;25(3):144-61.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/6452521>
20. Ford HT, Yarnold JR. Radiation therapy – pain relief and recalcification. In: Stoll BA, Parbhoo S, eds. *Bone Metastasis: Monitoring and Treatment*. NY: Raven Press, 1983, pp. 343-54.
21. Roqué i Figuls M, Martínez-Zapata MJ, Alonso-Coello P, et al. Radioisotopes for metastatic bone pain. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2003, issue 4, art. no.: CD003347. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD003347.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14583970>
22. Wong RKS, Wiffen PJ. Bisphosphonates for the relief of pain secondary to bone metastases. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2002, issue 2, art. no.: CD002068. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD002068.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12076438>
23. Smith MR. Zoledronic acid to prevent skeletal complications in cancer: corroborating the evidence. *Cancer Treat Rev*. 2005;31(Suppl.3):19-25.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16229955>
25. Michaelson MD, Smith MR. Bisphosphonates for treatment and prevention of bone metastases. *J Clin Oncol* 2005 Nov;23(32):8219-24.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16278476>
26. Polascik TJ, Given RW, Metzger C, et al. Open-label trial evaluating the safety and efficacy of zoledronic acid in preventing bone loss in patients with hormone-sensitive prostate cancer and bone metastases. *Urology* 2005 Nov;66(5):1054-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16286123>
26. Fulfaro F, Leto G, Badalamenti G, et al. The use of zoledronic acid in patients with bone metastases from prostate carcinoma: effect on analgesic response and bone metabolism biomarkers. *J Chemother* 2005 Oct;17(5):555-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16323446>
27. Martínez-Zapata MJ, Roqué M, Alonso-Coello P, et al. Calcitonin for metastatic bone pain. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2006 Jul, issue 3: CD003223.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16856000>
28. Shelley M, Harrison C, Coles B, et al. Chemotherapy for hormone-refractory prostate cancer. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, 2, 2008.
29. Cherny NI, Portenoy RK. Cancer pain: principles of assessment and syndromes. In: Wall PD, Melzack R(eds). *Textbook of Pain*, 3rd ed. Edinburgh: Churchill Livingstone, 1994.

30. Olson KB, Pienta KJ. Pain management in patients with advanced prostate cancer. *Oncology (Williston Park)* 1999 Nov;13(11):1537-49; discussion 1549-50 passim.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10581602>
31. McNicol ED, Strassels S, Goudas L, et al. NSAIDs or paracetamol, alone or combined with opioids, for cancer pain. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2005 Jan, issue 2, art. no.: CD005180.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15654708>
32. Oliva P, Carbonell R, Giron JA, et al. Extended-release oral opiates: tramadol versus dihydrocodeine in chronic tumor pain associated to prostate cancer. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews: EBM Reviews – Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials* (2008).
33. Miles CL, Fellowes D, Goodman ML, et al. Laxatives for the management of constipation in palliative care patients. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2006 Oct, issue 4, art. no.: CD003448.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17054172>
34. Quigley C. Hydromorphone for acute and chronic pain. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2002, issue 1, art. no.: CD003447.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11869661>
35. Quigley C. Opioid switching to improve pain relief and drug tolerability. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2004, issue 3, art. no.: CD004847.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15266542>
36. Zeppetella G, Ribeiro MDC. Opioids for the management of breakthrough (episodic) pain in cancer patients. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2006 Jan, issue 1, art. no.: CD004311.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16437482>
37. Wiffen PJ, McQuay HJ. Oral morphine for cancer pain. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2007 Oct, issue 4, art. no.: CD003868.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17943804>
38. Hoy AM, Lucas CF. Radiotherapy, chemotherapy and hormone therapy: treatment for pain. In: Wall PD, Melzack R (eds). *Textbook of Pain*, 3rd ed. Edinburgh: Churchill Livingstone, 1994.
39. Kramer JA. Spinal cord compression in malignancy. *Palliat Med* 1992;6:202-11.
40. George R, Jeba J, Ramkumar G, et al. Interventions for the treatment of metastatic extradural spinal cord compression in adults. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2008 Oct, issue 4, art. no.: CD006716.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18843728>
41. Borgelt BB, Gelber R, Brady LW, et al. The palliation of hepatic metastases: results of the Radiation Therapy Oncology Group pilot study. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 1981 May;7(5):587-91.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/6168623>
42. Thompson IM, Zeidman EJ, Rodriguez FR. Sudden death due to disease flare with luteinizing hormone-releasing hormone agonist therapy for carcinoma of the prostate. *J Urol* 1990 Dec;144(6):1479-80.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2122011>
43. Chrisp P, Sorkin EM, Leuprorelin. A review of its pharmacology and therapeutic use in prostatic disorders. *Drugs and Aging* 1991 Nov-Dec;1(6):487-509.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1794035>
44. Goldspiel BR, Kohler DR. Goserelin acetate implant: a depot luteinizing hormone-releasing hormone analog for advanced prostate cancer. *DICP* 1991 Jul-Aug;25(7-8):796-804.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1835221>
45. Crawford ED, Nabors W. Hormone therapy of advanced prostate cancer: where we stand today. *Oncology (Williston Park)* 1991 Jan;5(1):21-30.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1828686>
46. Eberlein TJ. Gynecomastia. In: Harris J R, Hellman S, Henderson I C, Kinne D, eds. *Breast diseases*, 2nd ed. PA: Lippincott, 1991, pp. 46-50.
47. Delaere KP, Van Thillo EL. Flutamide monotherapy as primary treatment in advanced prostatic carcinoma. *Semin Oncol* 1991 Oct;18(5Suppl.6):13-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1948117>
48. Goldenberg SL, Bruchofsky N. Use of cyproterone acetate in prostate cancer. *Urol Clin North Am* 1991 Feb;18(1):111-22.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1825143>
49. Neumann F, Kalmus J. Cyproterone acetate in the treatment of sexual disorders: pharmacological base and clinical experience. *Exp Clin Endocrinol* 1991;98(2):71-80.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1838080>

50. Ramamurthy L, Cooper RA. Metastatic carcinoma to the male breast. *Br J Radiol* 1991 Mar;64(759): 277-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2021802>
51. National Committee on Cancer Care Workgroup on Prostate Cancer. Treatment of metastatic prostate cancer (M1). In: Ministry of Health (Singapore): Prostate Cancer 2000, National Guideline Clearinghouse (withdrawn).
52. Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelines Network (SIGN). Control of pain in patients with cancer. A national clinical guideline 2000.
<http://www.sign.ac.uk/guidelines/fulltext/44/index.html>
53. American College of Radiology. ACR Appropriateness Criteria (tm) for bone metastases. In: *American College of Radiology: ACR Appropriateness Criteria (tm) for metastatic bone disease*, 1996 (revised 2003), National Guideline Clearinghouse.
http://www.guideline.gov/summary/summary.aspx?doc_id=5911&nbr=003897&string=ACR+AND+apropriateness+AND+criteria
54. Cancer Care Ontario (CCO). Use of strontium-89 in patients with endocrine-refractory carcinoma of the prostate metastatic to bone, 1997 (updated online 2001), National Guideline Clearinghouse.
<http://www.cancercare.on.ca/pdf/pebc3-6f.pdf>
55. Schröder FH. Hormonal therapy of prostate cancer. In: Walsh P, Retik AB, Darracott Vaughan E, Wein AJ, eds. *Campbell's Urology*, 8th ed. 2002, Elsevier Science, vol. 4, pp. 3182-3208.
56. Eisenberger MA. Chemotherapy for hormone-resistant prostate cancer In: Walsh P, Retik AB, Darracott Vaughan E, Wein AJ (eds). *Campbell's Urology*, 8th ed. 2002, Elsevier Science, vol. 4, pp. 3209-26.

4.2 Pain management in transitional cell carcinoma patients

4.2.1 Clinical presentation

Globally, urothelial cancer is the fourth most common cancer in men and the ninth in women (1). Transitional cell carcinoma (TCC) is the most frequent cancer of the bladder and upper urinary tract. It arises much more frequently in the bladder than in the collecting system (calices, renal pelvis and ureter).

From the perspective of pain, there are no differences between TCC and other histotypes of urothelial malignant tumour. In bladder carcinoma, pain can be present early on as a burning pain together with irritative symptoms, or late in advanced disease due to local invasion of neighbouring tissues or metastatic organ invasion.

TCC of the renal collecting system represents 5-10% of all kidney tumours and 5% of all TCC of the urinary tract (2). TCC of the ureter accounts for only 3% of all TCC (3). In upper urinary tract TCC, pain is an initial symptom in around 30% of cases.

4.2.2 Origin of tumour-related pain

4.2.2.1 Bladder TCC

The main causes of tumour-related pain in bladder TCC are:

- obstruction of the upper urinary tract due to growth of bladder tumour close to the ureteral orifices.
- invasion of the surrounding areas by a locally advanced tumour (pelvic wall, nerve roots, other organs such as bowel, rectum)
- bone metastases
- soft tissue metastases (seldom painful)

4.2.2.2 Upper urinary tract TCC

The main causes of tumour-related pain in upper urinary tract TCC are:

- obstruction of the upper urinary tract (presenting symptom in around 30% of cases)
- acute obstruction due to blood clots
- invasion of the surrounding areas by a locally advanced tumour (posterior abdominal wall, nerve roots, paraspinous muscles, other organs such as bowel, spleen, liver)
- bone metastases
- soft tissue metastases (seldom painful)

4.2.3 Pain due to local impairment

4.2.3.1 Bladder TCC

Obstruction of the ureteral orifices by tumour infiltration may lead to hydronephrosis and consecutive flank pain due to ureteral distension (visceral pain). Transurethral resection of the tumour is often effective in eliminating

ureteral obstruction. Hydronephrosis is treated by temporary or permanent ureteral stenting or percutaneous/open nephrostomy.

In locally advanced disease, infiltration of the contiguous soft tissue and neighbouring organs can cause acute burning pain by infiltration of the pelvic nerves (neuropathic pain), sometimes associated with paraesthesia irradiating to the lower limb, or motor deficit. If the tumour invades adjacent organs (small bowel, rectum) there can be obstruction, plus visceral pain due to distension of hollow organs. Growing bladder tumour can cause complete bladder outlet obstruction with hypogastric abdominal pain from bladder distension. Obstruction of the lymphatic vessels by lymphadenopathy can cause lymphoedema of the lower limbs with pain due to distension of muscle fascia (somatic pain).

In infiltrating and advanced bladder cancer, radical or debulking cystectomy and urinary diversion have a positive impact on pain, removing the neoplastic mass invading the surrounding tissues. Extended operations including excision of involved bowel are sometimes indicated. Palliative surgery may be necessary in occlusive intestinal syndromes (4).

Chemotherapy has some effect in 40-75% of patients with advanced disease (see guidelines on bladder cancer). It relieves pain by decreasing the neoplastic mass in respondent patients (5-9) (LE: 1a).

Radiotherapy can be effective in controlling pelvic pain due to local disease progression. Using 40-45 Gy on target volume, radiotherapy can reduce the local painful symptoms, but it can also worsen the irritative bladder symptoms and induce proctitis (10) (LE: 2b).

4.2.3.2 Upper urinary tract TCC

Locally advanced primary tumours are usually managed by surgery. Extended operations including excision of involved bowel, spleen or abdominal wall muscle are sometimes indicated. With regard to chemotherapy, the same considerations are valid for upper urinary tract TCC as for that of the bladder.

4.2.4 Pain due to metastases

Haematogenous metastases to the bone are often found in advanced bladder or upper urinary tract TCC. No data are available in the literature concerning the specific effect of chemotherapy on bone metastases alone. Radiotherapy has a palliative analgesic role in bone metastases: ten fractionated doses of 30-35 Gy, rapidly reduces, if not eliminates, pain in 80-90% of cases (10) (LE: 2b). Hemibody irradiation can also be used in diffuse bone metastases (10). There are no studies of radioisotope therapy for bone metastasis in TCC.

Orthopaedic surgery can stabilise pathological fractures (4). Neurosurgery may have a place in the palliation of pain derived from compression of the spinal cord.

4.2.5 References

1. Wingo PA, Tong T, Bolden S. Cancer Statistics, 1995. *CA Cancer J Clin* 1995 Jan-Feb;45(1):8-30. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7528632>
2. Fraley EE. Cancer of the renal pelvis. In: Skinner DG, De Kernion JB, eds. *Genitourinary Cancer*. PA: W.B. Saunders, 1978, p. 134.
3. Huben RP, Mounzer AM, Murphy GP. Tumor grade and stage as prognostic variables in upper tract urothelial tumors. *Cancer* 1988 Nov;62(9):2016-20. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/3167813>
4. Mount BM, Scott JF. Palliative care of the patients with terminal cancer. In: Skinner DG, Lieskovsky G (eds). *Diagnosis and Management of Genitourinary Cancer*, 1988, W.B. Saunders, Philadelphia, pp. 842-863.
5. Ricci S, Galli L, Chioni A, et al. Gemcitabine plus epirubicin in patients with advanced urothelial carcinoma who are not eligible for platinum-based regimens. *Cancer* 2002 Oct;95(7):1444-50. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12237912>
6. Sternberg CN, Yagoda A, Scher HI, et al. Methotrexate, vinblastine, doxorubicin and cisplatin for advanced transitional cell carcinoma of the urothelium. Efficacy and patterns of response and relapse. *Cancer* 1989 Dec;64(12): 2448-58. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2819654>
7. Loehrer PJ, Einhorn LH, Elson PJ, et al. A randomized comparison of cisplatin alone or in combination with methotrexate, vinblastine, and doxorubicin in patients with metastatic urothelial carcinoma: a cooperative group study. *J Clin Oncol* 1992 Jul;10(7):1066-73. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1607913>

8. Logothetis C, Dexeus FH, Finn L, et al. A prospective randomized trial comparing MVAC and CISCA chemotherapy for patients with metastatic urothelial tumors. *J Clin Oncol* 1990 Jun;8(6):1050-5. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2189954>
9. Von der Maase H, Hansen SW, Roberts JT, et al. Gemcitabine and cisplatin versus methotrexate, vinblastine, doxorubicin, and cisplatin in advanced or metastatic bladder cancer: results of a large, randomised, multinational, multicenter, Phase III study. *J Clin Oncol* 2000 Sep;18(17):3068-77. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11001674>
10. Friedland J. Local and systemic radiation for palliation of metastatic disease. *Urol Clin North Am* 1999 May;26(2):391-402. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10361561>

4.3. Pain management in renal cell carcinoma patients

4.3.1 Clinical presentation

Renal cell carcinoma (RCC) is mainly diagnosed incidentally. There is no pain unless tumour invades adjacent areas or obstructs urine outflow due to haemorrhage and blood clot formation. Some 20-30% of patients present with metastases, and 30% of patients primarily presenting with a localised kidney tumour develop them during follow-up. RCC metastasises mainly to lung, bone, brain, liver and ipsilateral or contralateral adrenergic glands. Such patients have a maximal 2-year survival rate of 20%. Overall 50-60% of patients may need treatment for the symptoms of metastatic disease, mainly pain.

The main origins of tumour-related pain are:

- invasion of the surrounding areas by a locally advanced tumour (posterior abdominal wall, nerve roots, paraspinous muscles, other organs such as bowel, spleen, liver)
- obstruction of the upper urinary tract due to haemorrhage and subsequent formation of blood clots
- bone metastases
- soft tissue metastases (seldom painful).

4.3.2 Pain due to local impairment

Patients with invasion of surrounding areas (e.g. the posterior abdominal wall, nerve roots, paraspinous muscles, other organs such as bowel, spleen, liver) by a locally advanced primary tumour without metastases usually present with pain. Surgical management is the only effective option for this type of tumour. Extended operations that include excision of involved bowel, spleen or abdominal wall muscle are sometimes indicated.

Adjuvant immunotherapy or radiotherapy is without proven benefit with regard to recurrence. Even in cases of metastatic disease, palliative nephrectomy is indicated for the control of severe symptoms such as haemorrhage, pain or paraneoplastic syndromes (GCP). The frequency with which each of these symptoms is controlled, however, is unclear and there are no data in the literature comparing efficacy of nephrectomy in palliative situations with other therapies such as angioinfarction of the tumour.

Standard pre-operative (30 Gy) or post-operative radiotherapy offers no survival benefit, and its role in delaying local progression is questionable (1). Radiotherapy of soft tissue has no proven benefit for pain and tumour control.

In metastatic disease, the European Organisation for Research and Treatment of Cancer (EORTC) Genitourinary Group study 30947 demonstrated a significant increase in survival with palliative nephrectomy plus immunotherapy compared with immunotherapy (interferon-alpha) alone (median survival of 17 compared with 7 months) (2) (LE: 2b). There is no special effect on pain relief from immunotherapy.

Obstruction of the upper urinary tract due to haemorrhage and subsequent formation of blood clots is effectively treated by radical nephrectomy in non-metastatic tumour (GCP). If the patient is physically fit for surgery, this should be done to increase the quality of life, e.g. palliative nephrectomy in cases of metastatic tumour (GCP).

There are no data in the literature about the efficacy of other therapies such as angioinfarction of the tumour with regard to haemorrhage and pain relief in palliative situations. WHO guidelines recommend analgesic therapy and/or palliative drainage of the urinary tract if patients are not fit for major surgery.

4.3.3 Pain due to metastases

Patients with bone metastases have a significantly better life expectancy (30 months) than those with visceral metastases (11.6 months) (3).

Surgery is indicated for solitary bone metastases that can be resected completely, intractable bone pain, and impending or demonstrable pathological fracture. In bone metastases with extensive soft tissue involvement and severe pain, amputation of a limb is sometimes required to maintain quality of life. Surgery for bone metastases achieves a significant decrease in pain in 89-91% of patients (4-6) (LE: 2b/3). Additionally, surgery prevents pathological fractures and spinal compression, and there is a significant impact on survival.

Pre-operative embolisation of bone metastases or embolisation alone achieves good pain relief in hypervascular bone metastases (7,8) (LE: 3).

High dose radiation therapy for palliation of painful bony metastases has been shown to be effective in 50-75% of all renal cancer patients (9-11) (LE: 3), and in 67% with general bone metastases (12) (LE: 2b). There is no impact on survival. Small studies of radionuclide therapy (e.g. with ⁸⁹Sr) have shown good pain relief in bony metastases from RCC (13) (LE: 3).

Bone metastases show poor response to immunotherapy, and there is no proven benefit in pain relief. Hormonal therapy and chemotherapy are even less effective, and have no room in pain control.

Standard pre-operative (30 Gy) or post-operative radiotherapy offers no survival benefit; its role in delaying local progression is questionable (1); there is no proven benefit for pain and tumour control for soft tissue metastases.

Immunotherapy alone achieved an overall response in 15-27% of patients (14). Immunotherapy in combination with chemotherapy (interleukin-2 + interferon-alpha + 5-fluorouracil) is the most effective therapy, achieving partial tumour response in up to 46% of patients and complete response in a maximal 15%, although these rates are mainly for lung/lymph node metastases (15).

Pain due to soft tissue metastases probably behaves analogous to tumour response, but there are no data on immunotherapy for pain control. Hormonal therapy has no proven benefit for survival or pain relief.

4.3.4 **References**

1. Van de Werf-Messing B. Proceedings: carcinoma of the kidney. *Cancer* 1973 Nov;32(5):1056-61.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/4757899>
2. Mickisch GH, Garin A, van Poppel H, et al; European Organisation for Research and Treatment of Cancer (EORTC) Genitourinary Group. Radical nephrectomy plus interferon-alfabased immunotherapy compared with interferon alfa alone in metastatic renal-cell carcinoma: a randomised trial. *Lancet* 2001 Sep;358(9286):966-70.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11583750>
3. Bohnenkamp B, Romberg W, Sonnentag W, et al. (Prognosis of metastatic renal cell carcinoma related to the pattern of metastasis [author's transl.]). *J Cancer Res Clin Oncol* 1980 Jan;96(1):105-14. [Article in German.]
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7358767>
4. Smith EM, Kursh ED, Makley J, et al. Treatment of osseous metastases secondary to renal cell carcinoma. *J Urol* 1992 Sep;148(3):784-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1512825>
5. Kollender Y, Bickels J, Price WM, et al. Metastatic renal cell carcinoma of bone: indications and technique of surgical intervention. *J Urol* 2000 Nov;164(5):1505-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11025692>
6. Jackson RJ, Loh SC, Gokaslan ZL. Metastatic renal cell carcinoma of the spine: surgical treatment and results. *J Neurosurg* 2001 Jan;94(suppl.1):18-24.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11147860>
7. Gorich J, Solymosi L, Hasan I, et al. [Embolization of bone metastases]. *Radiologe* 1995 Jan;35(1):55-9. [article in German.]
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7534427>
8. Layalle I, Flandroy P, Trotteur G, et al. Arterial embolization of bone metastases: is it worthwhile?. *J Belge Radiol* 1998 Oct;81(5):223-5.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9880954>
9. Halperin EC, Harisiadis L. The role of radiation therapy in the management of metastatic renal cell carcinoma. *Cancer* 1983 Feb;51(4):614-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/6185207>

10. Onufrey V, Mohiuddin M. Radiation therapy in the treatment of metastatic renal cell carcinoma. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 1985 Nov;11(11):2007-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2414257>
11. Forman JD. The role of radiation therapy in the management of carcinoma of the kidney. *Sem Urol* 1989 Aug;7(3):195-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2481333>
12. Chow E, Wong R, Hruby G, et al. Prospective patient-based assessment of effectiveness of palliative radiotherapy for bone metastases. *Radiother Oncol* 2001 Oct; 61(1):77-82.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11578732>
13. Kloiber R, Molnar CP, Barnes M. Sr-89 therapy for metastatic bone disease: scintigraphic and radiographic follow-up. *Radiology* 1987 Jun;163(3):719-23.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/3575721>
14. Figlin RA. Renal cell carcinoma: management of advanced disease. *J Urol* 1999 Feb;161(2):381-6.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9915408>
15. Kankuri M, Pelliniemi TT, Pyrhonen S, et al. Feasibility of prolonged use of interferon-alpha in metastatic kidney carcinoma: a phase II study. *Cancer* 2001 Aug;92(4): 761-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11550145>

4.4 Pain management in patients with adrenal carcinoma

Adrenal carcinoma is a rare disease and has a poor prognosis. Non-functional adrenal lesions of more than 5 cm in diameter should be removed because there is a high probability of malignancy (1).

4.4.1 *Malignant pheochromocytoma*

Pheochromocytomas result from pheochromocytocytes, which are the predominant cells of the adrenal medulla and are also found in the paraganglia near the aorta and in lesser numbers in the ganglia of the sympathetic nervous system (2). When correctly diagnosed and treated, the disease is curable, unless there are metastases.

Computed tomography (CT) and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) have the highest sensitivity in detecting the tumour, achieving 94-100%. A ¹³¹J-metaiodobenzylguanidine (¹³¹J-MIBG) scan is positive in approximately 87% of cases (3).

Chemotherapy with cyclophosphamide, vincristine and dacarbazine has little effect on metastases (4) (LE: 2b), but therapeutic doses of ¹³¹J-MIBG (33 GBq = 900 mCi) may produce some results (5, 6) (LE: 2b). The hormone response rate is 50%. There are no data on pain relief with ¹³¹J-MIBG in metastatic pheochromocytoma, but a response rate that is at least the same as for hormone levels should be expected.

Malignant pheochromocytomas are considered radioresistant, although there are some cases in which radiation therapy induced partial remission (7) (LE: 3). There is no information about the efficacy of radiation concerning pain relief in cases of bone or soft tissue metastases.

4.4.2 *Treatment of pain*

- Soft tissue and/or bone pain due to metastases are best treated by therapeutic doses of ¹³¹J-MIBG, if the pheochromocytoma takes up this radionuclide (8) (LE: 2b). There is no literature concerning chemotherapy or radiotherapy and pain relief in metastatic pheochromocytoma.
- Treat the pain symptomatically following the recommendations made in Section 3.4.

4.4.2.1 *Adrenocortical carcinomas*

Carcinoma of the adrenal cortex is highly malignant, with local and haematogenous metastasis, and 5-year survival rates of 25-43% for all treatments. Patients with distant metastases have a mean survival of only 4 months (9). An autopsy study showed metastasis to lung (60%), liver (50%), lymph nodes (48%), bone (24%) and pleura/heart (10%) (10). These tumours often extend directly into adjacent structures, especially the kidney.

Chemotherapy is of low efficacy. The most effective drug is mitotane, an adrenolytic. The tumour-response rate is 25-35% (9, 11) (LE: 2a). It remains to be proven whether chemotherapy prolongs survival. Radiation therapy has not been useful except for palliation and pain management (12) (LE: 2b).

4.4.2.2 *Treatment of the pain depending on its origin*

- Abdominal symptoms are typical on first presentation of the tumour. The treatment is surgical removal of the primary tumour, with attempts to remove the entire lesion even if resection of adjacent structures is necessary, as well as resection of local lymph nodes.

- Soft tissue and/or bone metastases causing local symptoms can be treated by radiotherapy (8,12). There are no data on chemotherapy or radiotherapy for pain relief in metastatic adrenocortical carcinomas.
- Treat the pain symptomatically following the recommendations given in Section 3.4.

4.4.3 **References**

1. Cerfolio RJ, Vaughan ED Jr, Brennan TG Jr, et al. Accuracy of computed tomography in predicting adrenal tumor size. *Surg Gynecol Obstet* 1993 Apr;176(4):307-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8460403>
2. Goldfien A. Pheochromocytoma – diagnosis and management. *Clin Endocr Metab* 1991;10:606.
3. Lucon AM, Pereira MA, Mendonça BB, et al. Pheochromocytoma: Study of 50 cases. *J Urol* 1997 Apr;157(4):1208-12.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9120903>
4. Schlumberger M, Gicquel C, Lumbroso J, et al. Malignant pheochromocytoma: clinical, biological, histologic and therapeutic data in a series of 20 patients with distant metastases. *J Endocrinol Invest* 1992 Oct;15(9):631-42.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1479146>
5. Mornex R, Badet C, Peyrin L. Malignant pheochromocytoma: a series of 14 cases observed between 1966 and 1990. *J Endocrinol Invest* 1992 Oct;15(9):643-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1479147>
6. Proye C, Vix M, Goropoulos A, et al. High incidence of malignant pheochromocytoma in a surgical unit: 26 cases out of 100 patients operated from 1971 to 1991. *J Endocrinol Invest* 1992 Oct;15(9):651-63.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1479148>
7. Yu L, Fleckman AM, Chadha M, et al. Radiation therapy of metastatic pheochromocytoma: case report and review of the literature. *Am J Clin Oncol* 1996 Aug;19(4):389-93.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8677912>
8. Kopf D, Goretzki PE, Lehnert H. Clinical management of malignant adrenal tumors. *J Cancer Res Clin Oncol* 2001;127(3):143-55.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11260859>
9. Wooten MD, King DK. Adrenal cortical carcinoma. Epidemiology and treatment with mitotane and a review of the literature. *Cancer* 1993 Dec;72(11):3145-55.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8242539>
10. Didolkar MS, Berscher RA, Elias EG, et al. Natural history of adrenal cortical carcinoma: a clinicopathologic study of 42 patients. *Cancer* 1981 May;47(9):2153-61.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7226109>
11. Bukowski RM, Wolfe M, Levine HS, et al. Phase II trial of mitotane and cisplatin in patients with adrenal carcinoma: a Southwest Oncology Group study. *J Clin Oncol* 1993 Jan;11(1):161-5.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8418229>
12. Percarpio B, Knowlton AH. Radiation therapy of adrenal cortical carcinoma. *Acta Radiol Ther Phys Biol* 1976 Aug;15(4):288-92.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/62490>

4.5 **Pain management in penile cancer patients**

4.5.1 **Clinical presentation**

In Europe, penile cancer is a relatively rare disease, with an incidence of < 2/100,000 per year, accounting for < 1% of all cancers in men. It is a disease of older men, increasing in incidence around the age of 60 years, peaking at around 80 years. The penile lesion itself usually alerts the patient to the presence of a penile cancer, which in most cases occurs on the glans (48%) and prepuce (21%). Patients with cancer of the penis tend to delay seeking medical attention (embarrassment, guilt, fear, ignorance and neglect). Pain does not develop in proportion to the extent of the local tumour, and is not usually a presenting complaint (1).

To date there is no consensus on the therapeutic management of metastatic disease, and few controlled studies of statistical significance have looked at both penile carcinoma and cancer-related pain. Most of the principles for pain management in prostatic carcinoma are valid here, but the following should also be borne in mind. Pain can occur in both early and advanced penile cancer. In the early stages, acute pain could indicate a voiding dysfunction (infravesical obstruction) (see Section 4.1.2.2). In advanced disease, pain is usually caused by metastases or lymph node involvement, especially inguinal lymph nodes. Positive lymph nodes are relatively common in penile cancer, inguinal or pelvic lymph nodes being most frequently affected. Positive nodes may be present in > 50% of cases. Systematic lymphadenectomy is curative in about 50% of these patients, but

permanent and disabling lymphoedema of the scrotum and lower limbs is a frequent complication.

Pain can result from:

- local pressure from the tumour mass or infiltration of hollow viscus organs;
- lymphoedema of the scrotum and lower limbs.

4.5.2 Pain due to local impairment

4.5.2.1 Soft-tissue and hollow-viscus invasion

Bladder outlet and ureteric obstruction is managed in the same manner as that described in Section 4.1.2.2.

4.5.3 Lymphoedema

Patients with a huge inguinal tumour mass, or scarred inguinal tissue after lymph node dissection, very often show lymphoedema of the lower limbs. This is more frequent in cases involving both inguinal and iliac nodes. Lymphoedema is treated with physiatric techniques (wraps, pressure stockings or pneumatic pumps), which can both improve function, and relieve pain and heaviness. Orthotics can immobilise and support painful or weakened structures, and assistive devices can benefit patients with pain on weight-bearing or ambulation.

4.5.4 Pain due to metastases

4.5.4.1 Anticancer management for pain relief

Pain management begins with antitumour treatment, usually surgery (partial/total penectomy or emasculation and lymphadenectomy), radiotherapy (not as effective; for palliation), and chemotherapy. If this is unsuccessful or not feasible, the next step is systemic analgesic pharmacotherapy (WHO ladder). Experience of combining chemotherapy with surgery or radiotherapy is very limited because of the relative rarity of penile carcinomas (1).

4.5.5 Conclusions

No conclusive or universally applicable recommendations can be given for managing pain related to metastatic penile carcinoma treatment, other cancer treatment regimes must be adapted. Attention should be paid to the guidelines appropriate for treating the metastases and organs involved (see also guidelines on penile cancer).

4.5.6 References

1. Lynch DF Jr, Pettaway CA. Tumours of the penis. In: Walsh P, Retik AB, Darracott Vaughan E, Wein AJ (eds). *Campbell's Urology*, 8th ed. 2002, Elsevier Science, vol. 4, pp. 2945-2982.

4.6 Pain management in testicular cancer patients

4.6.1 Clinical presentation

Testicular cancer generally affects men in the third or fourth decade of life. It is mainly diagnosed causally as an intrascrotal mass. Approximately 20% of patients present with scrotal or inguinal pain, which disappears after orchiectomy. Only 11% of patients complain of back or flank pain at first presentation (1). Primary advanced tumour with pain due to bone metastases is very rare, maximally 3% at first presentation. It should be treated causally by primary chemotherapy and adjuvant analgesics.

4.6.2 Pain due to local impairment

Orchiectomy is an effective treatment for local pain due to the scrotal mass.

4.6.3 Pain due to metastases

- Back or flank pain due to retroperitoneal lymphadenopathy slowly disappears as chemotherapy causes the mass to decrease (LE: 2b) (see guidelines on testicular cancer). Temporary analgesia is advisable (see Section 3.4.4).
- Retroperitoneal lymph node metastases can also cause obstruction of the ureter, leading to a symptomatic hydronephrosis with back or flank pain and perhaps additional fever. The therapy of choice is the immediate treatment of the hydronephrosis by ureteral stenting or the insertion of a percutaneous nephrostomy.
- Bone pain due to bony metastases is very rare and occurs mainly in patients with primary advanced disease and relapse after chemotherapy (2,3). Treatment with chemotherapy or second-line chemotherapy may be possible (see guidelines on testicular cancer). There is no literature on radiotherapy in cases of relapse and limitation of further chemotherapy.
- Back pain and neurological symptoms due to spinal cord compression by vertebral metastases may require urgent surgery (4) (LE: 3).

4.6.4 References

1. Hernes EH, Harstad K, Fosså SD. Changing incidence and delay of testicular cancer in southern Norway (1981-1992). *Eur Urol* 1996;30(3):349-57.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8931969>
2. Hitchins RN, Philip PA, Wignall B, et al. Bone disease in testicular and extragonadal germ cell tumours. *Br J Cancer* 1988 Dec;58(6):793-6.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/3224081>
3. Merrick MV. Bone scintigraphy in testicular tumours. *Br J Urol* 1987 Aug;60(2):167-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/3664206>
4. Arnold PM, Morgan CJ, Morantz RA, et al. Metastatic testicular cancer presenting as spinal cord compression: report of two cases. *Surg Neurol* 2000 Jul;54(1):27-33.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11024504>

4.7 Recommendations at a glance

Table 6: Efficacy of the therapeutic options in pain relief (expert opinion)

Origin of pain/therapeutic options	RCC	TCC	PCa	Penile cancer	Adrenergic cancer	Testicular cancer
Bone metastases						
Surgery	+++	?	+	?	?	+
Radiation	++	++	+++	?	+	?
Radionuclide	+	?	+++	?	++	-
Chemotherapy	-	?	+	?	-	+++
Immunotherapy	-	-	-	?	?	?
Hormone therapy	-	-	++	-	-	-
Analgesics	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++
Soft tissue infiltration						
Surgery	+++	+++	-	?	?	+
Radiation	-	+	++	?	+	?
Chemotherapy	+	++	+	?	++	+++
Immunotherapy	+	-	-	?	?	?
Hormone therapy	-	-	++	-	-	-
Analgesics	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++
Nerve compression/nerve infiltration						
Surgery	+++	+++	++	?	?	++
Radiation	+	+	++	?	+	?
Chemotherapy	+	++	+	?	?	+++
Immunotherapy	+	-	-	?	?	?
Hormone therapy	-	-	++	-	-	-
Analgesics	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++	+++

RCC = renal cell carcinoma; TCC = transitional cell carcinoma; PCa = prostate cancer;
 ? = no conclusive data on pain control; - = no pain control; + = low pain control;
 ++ = moderate pain control; +++ = good pain control.

5. POST-OPERATIVE PAIN MANAGEMENT

5.1 Background

Post-operative pain is an expected, inevitable symptom in a surgical patient associated with surgical tissue damage, the presence of drains and tubes, post-operative complications or a combination of the above mentioned (1,2).

Approximately 70% of surgical patients experience a certain degree (moderate, severe or extreme) of post-operative pain (3,4) (LE: 1a). That is usually underestimated and undertreated (1,3), leading to increased morbidity and mortality, mostly due to respiratory and thromboembolic complications, increased hospital stay, impaired QoL, and development of chronic pain (1,3,5-7) (LE: 1a).

5.2 The importance of effective post-operative pain management

The physiological consequences of post-operative pain are shown in Table 7. All could delay or impair post-operative recovery and increase economic cost of surgery (longer hospitalisation) (13,14) (LE: 3). Inadequate post-operative pain control may also lead to development of chronic pain after surgery (15,16) (LE: 2b).

Table 7: Physiological consequences of post-operative pain

Condition	Consequences	Ref.	LE
Stress response to surgery	Tissue trauma results in release of mediators of inflammation and stress hormones Activation of this 'stress response' leads to: - retention of water and sodium - increase in metabolic rate	8	2a
Respiratory complications	Shallow breathing Cough suppression Lobular collapse Retention of pulmonary secretions Infections	9	2b
Cardiovascular complications	Hypertension Tachycardia Increased myocardial work, - myocardial ischaemia - angina - infarction	10	2b
Thromboembolic complications	Reduced mobility due to inadequate pain management can lead to thromboembolic episodes	11	2a
Gastrointestinal complications	Gastric stasis Paralytic ileus mostly after open urological operations	12	2b
Musculoskeletal complications	Prolonged confinement to bed: - reduced mobility - muscle atrophy	13	3
Psychological complications	Peri-operative pain may provoke fear and anxiety, which can lead to: - anger - resentment - hostility to medical and nursing personnel - insomnia	13, 14	3

5.2.1 *Aims of effective post-operative pain management:*

- to improve the comfort and satisfaction of the patient;
- to facilitate recovery and functional ability;
- to reduce morbidity;
- to promote rapid discharge from hospital (1-3) (LE: 1a).

Recommendation

	GR
Post-operative pain should be treated adequately, to avoid post-operative complications and the development of chronic pain.	B

5.3 Pre- and post-operative pain management methods

5.3.1 *Pre-operative patient preparation:*

- patient evaluation;
- adjustment or continuation of medication in order to avoid abstinence syndrome;
- pre-medication as part of multi-modal analgesia;
- behavioural-cognitive interventions for the patient and family to alleviate anxiety and fear of post-operative pain reduce the post-operative analgesic requirement and result in better pain management (1) (LE: 1a).

Recommendation

	GR
Pre-operative assessment and preparation of the patient allow more effective pain management.	A

5.3.2 *Pain assessment*

Careful pain assessment by the surgeon or the acute pain team before and after treatment can lead to more efficient pain control, and diminished morbidity and mortality (1,4) (LE: 2a). In the post-anaesthesia care unit pain should be evaluated, treated and re-evaluated initially every 15 minutes and then every 1-2 hours. After discharge to the surgical ward, pain should be assessed every 4-8 hours before and after treatment (17,18). Various rating scales have been described to measure post-operative pain, but their major disadvantage is that they are all subjective, making their results difficult to evaluate, especially in patients with communication difficulties (18).

Recommendation

	GR
Adequate post-operative pain assessment can lead to more effective pain control and fewer post-operative complications.	B

5.3.3 *Pre-emptive analgesia*

Pre-emptive or preventive analgesia is defined as the administration of analgesia before surgical incision to prevent establishment of central sensitisation from incision or inflammatory injury in order to achieve optimal post-operative pain control (19). The results of clinical trials on its efficacy are controversial (19,20) (LE: 2b).

5.3.4 *Systemic analgesic techniques*

5.3.4.1 *Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs)*

These drugs act by inhibiting cyclo-oxygenase (COX) and the subsequent production of prostaglandins (Table 8). The main advantages of NSAIDs are that they do not produce respiratory depression or sedation, and seem to decrease the need for opioids (21). However, their analgesic effect is not strong enough for the management of severe post-operative pain (22).

Table 8: NSAIDs: drugs, dosage and administration

Drug	Dosage per day	Route of administration
Conventional NSAIDs (non-selective COX inhibitors)		
Ketorolac	10-30 mg four times daily	Orally or iv
Ibuprofen	400 mg three times daily	Orally
Ketoprofen	50 mg four times daily	Orally or iv
Diclofenac	75 mg twice daily	Orally or iv
	50 mg three times daily	Orally or iv
	100 mg twice daily	Rectally
COX-2 selective inhibitors		
Meloxicam	15 mg once per day	Orally
Lornoxicam	4-8 mg twice daily	Orally or iv
Celecoxib	200 mg once per day	Orally
Parecoxib	40 mg once or twice daily	iv form only

iv = intravenous.

Intravenous administration of NSAIDs should start 30-60 min before the estimated end of surgery, and oral administration should start as soon as possible. Intramuscular administration of analgesic drugs for post-operative pain control is generally avoided because of variability of serum drug concentrations. (23).

Their main adverse effects are (22):

- gastric irritation, ulcer formation, bleeding;
- renal impairment;
- bronchospasm, deterioration of asthma;
- platelet dysfunction, inhibition of thromboxane A2;
- peri-operative bleeding;
- inhibition of bone healing and osteogenesis.

COX-2 selective inhibitors are associated with fewer gastrointestinal complications and better bone healing. In addition they cause minimal platelet inhibition compared with non-selective COX inhibitors (24). However, COX-2 inhibitors are contraindicated for long-term use in patients with cardiovascular problems. The use of COX-2 inhibitors is approved only for short-term post-operative pain therapy.

Recommendations

	GR
NSAIDs are not sufficient as the sole analgesic agent after major surgery.	B
NSAIDs are often effective after minor or moderate surgery.	B
NSAIDs often decrease the need for opioids.	B
Avoid long-term use of COX inhibitors in patients with atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease.	B

5.3.4.2 Paracetamol

Paracetamol (acetaminophen) is a relatively safe and effective antipyretic and analgesic for mild to moderate post-operative pain. In cases of severe post-operative pain, the co-administration of paracetamol with strong opioids seems to reduce the consumption of opioids (26) (LE: 2). Its exact mode of action is unclear, although it may act by centrally inhibiting COX production (27).

Dosage and routes of administration

- 1 g four times daily (orally, iv or rectally). Dose should be reduced to 1 g three times daily in patients with hepatic impairment.
- Intravenous administration of paracetamol should start 30 min before the end of surgery, and oral administration as soon as possible.

Adverse effects

No significant adverse effects have been observed in patients receiving paracetamol for acute post-operative pain. Caution should be taken when administered to patients with chronic alcoholism or hepatic failure. A dose > 6 g/24 h can cause acute renal failure.

Combinations of paracetamol with opioids

Paracetamol in combination with an opioid (Table 9) provides adequate post-operative analgesia for mild to moderate pain without the adverse effects of strong opioids.

Table 9: Dosage and administration of paracetamol/opioid combinations

Paracetamol	Opioid	Times per day	Route of administration
Paracetamol 1 g	Codeine 60 mg	x 4	Orally or rectally
Paracetamol 600-650 mg	Codeine 60 mg	x 4	Orally or rectally
Paracetamol 500 mg	Codeine 30 mg	x 4	Orally or rectally
Paracetamol 300 mg	Codeine 30 mg	x 4	Orally or rectally
Paracetamol 650 mg	Dextropropoxyphene 65 mg	x 4	Orally
Paracetamol 600-650 mg	Tramadol 75-100 mg	x 4	Orally
Paracetamol 325 mg	Oxycodone 5 mg	x 4	Orally

Recommendations

	GR
Paracetamol can be very useful for post-operative pain management as it reduces the consumption of opioids.	B
Paracetamol can alleviate mild post-operative pain as a single therapy without major adverse effects.	B

5.3.4.3 Metamizole (dipyrone)

Metamizole is an effective antipyretic and analgesic drug used for mild to moderate post-operative pain and renal colic. Its use is prohibited in the USA and some European countries because of single reported cases of neutropenia and agranulocytosis. Elsewhere, it is considered to be a useful analgesic and antipyretic drug for moderate pain. Long-term use of metamizole is best avoided (28,29) (LE: 2b).

Dosage and route of administration

The dose is 500-1000 mg qds (orally, iv or rectally).

Adverse effects

Apart from single sporadic cases of neutropenia and agranulocytosis, metamizole can cause minor side-effects such as nausea, light hypotension and allergic reactions. Allergic reactions and the rare complication of agranulocytosis have been described only after direct iv administration, and so iv metamizole should therefore be administered as a drip (1 g in 100 mL normal saline).

5.3.4.4 Opioids

Opioids are the first-line treatment for severe acute post-operative pain (Table 10), Correct dose titration can minimise their unwanted effects (30).

Table 10: Opioids: drugs, dosage and administration

Drug	Dosage per day	Route of administration
<i>Strong opioids</i>		
Morphine* 5-10 mg	six to eight times	Orally
Morphine* 10-15 mg	six to 12 times	sc or im
Pethidine (meperidine) 50-100 mg	six to eight times	iv, sc or im
Oxycodone 5-10 mg	four to six times	orally, iv or sc
<i>Weak opioids</i>		
Tramadol 50-100 mg	four to six times	orally, iv or im
Codeine 30-60 mg (combined with paracetamol)	four times	orally or rectally

*A simple way of calculating the daily dosage of morphine for adults (20-75 years) is: $100 - \text{patient's age} = \text{morphine per day in mg}$; sc = subcutaneous; im = intramuscularly; iv = intravenously.

5.3.4.5 Patient-controlled analgesia (PCA)

Systemic administration of opioids may follow the 'as needed' schedule or 'around-the-clock' dosing. The most effective mode is patient-controlled analgesia (PCA) (31,32) (LE: 1a) (Table 11).

Table 11: Typical PCA dosing schedule

Drug (concentration)	Bolus size	Lockout interval (min)	Continuous infusion
Morphine (1 mg/mL)	0.5-2.5 mg	5-10	0.01-0.03 mg/kg/h
Fentanyl (0.01 mg/mL)	10-20 µg	5-10	0.5-0.1 µg/kg/h
Pethidine (10 mg/mL)	5-25 mg	5-10	-

Recommendation

	GR
Intravenous PCA provides superior post-operative analgesia, improving patient satisfaction and decreasing the risk of respiratory complications.	A

Opioids adverse effects are:

- respiratory depression, apnoea;
- sedation;
- nausea, vomiting;
- pruritus;
- constipation;
- hypotension.

5.3.4.6 Opioid equi-analgesic doses

The commonest parenteral and oral equi-analgesic doses of opioids are shown in Table 12.

Table 12: Common equi-analgesic dosages for parenteral and oral administration of opioids*

Drug	Parenteral (mg)	Oral (mg)
Morphine	10	30
Fentanyl	0.1	-
Pethidine	75	300
Oxycodone	15	20-30
Dextropropoxyphene	-	50
Tramadol	37.5	150
Codeine	130	200

*All listed opioid doses are equivalent to parenteral morphine 10 mg. The intrathecal opioid dose is 1/100th, and the epidural dose 1/10th, of the dose required systemically.

5.3.5 Regional analgesic techniques

5.3.5.1 Local anaesthetic agents

The most commonly used local anaesthetics are:

- bupivacaine;
- L-bupivacaine;
- ropivacaine.

Bupivacaine is considered to be cardiotoxic in high doses. L-bupivacaine and ropivacaine appear to be safer, but the degree of motor blockage they provide is not as good as that of bupivacaine. Ropivacaine has the longest duration of action.

5.3.5.2 Epidural analgesia

Epidural analgesia provides excellent post-operative pain relief for extended periods after major surgical operations, reducing post-operative complications and the consumption of opioids (1,2) (LE: 1a) (Table 13).

Table 13: Typical epidural dosing schemes*

Drug	Single dose	Continuous infusion
Morphine	1-5 mg	0.1-1 mg/h
Fentanyl	50-100 µg	25-100 µg/h
Sufentanil	10-50 µg	10-20 µg/h
Pethidine	10-30 mg	10-60 mg/h
Bupivacaine 0.125% or ropivacaine 0.2% + fentanyl 2 µg/mL	10-15 mL	2-6 mL/h

* L-bupivacaine doses are equivalent to those of bupivacaine.

5.3.5.3 Patient-controlled epidural analgesia (PCEA)

PCEA has become very common because it allows individualisation of dosage, decrease in the use of drugs and greater patient satisfaction. It also seems to provide better analgesia than intravenous PCA (35,36) (LE: 1a) (Table 14).

Table 14: Typical PCEA dosing schemes

Drug	Demand dose	Lockout interval (min)	Continuous rate
Morphine	100-200 µg	10-15	300-600 µg/h
Fentanyl	10-15 µg	6	80-120 µg/h
Pethidine	30 mg	30	-
Bupivacaine 0.125% + fentanyl 4 µg/mL	2 mL	10	4 mL/h
Ropivacaine 0.2% + fentanyl 5 µg/mL	2 mL	20	5 mL/h

Recommendation

	GR
Epidural analgesia, especially PCEA, provides superior post-operative analgesia, reducing complications and improving patient satisfaction, and is therefore preferable to systemic techniques (2).	A

5.3.5.4 Neural blocks

Local anaesthetic blocks (intermittent and continuous) can be used after urological surgical operations to supplement post-operative analgesia (37) (LE: 2a) (Table 15).

Table 15: Examples of neural blocks

Procedure	Drug/dosage
Iliohypogastric or ilioinguinal nerve infiltration after hernia repair	10-20 mL bupivacaine or ropivacaine 0.25-0.5%
Intercostal nerve infiltration	5-10 mL bupivacaine or ropivacaine 0.25-0.5%
Continuous intrapleural infusion	10 mL/h bupivacaine or ropivacaine 0.1-0.2%

5.3.5.5 Wound infiltration

Intra-operative wound infiltration with local anaesthetic (usually 10-20 mL of ropivacaine or bupivacaine 0.25-0.5%) can provide some post-operative analgesia and may reduce the requirement for systemic analgesia (38) (LE: 2b).

5.3.5.6 Continuous wound instillation

Continuous post-operative wound instillation of a local anaesthetic via a multi-hole catheter placed intraoperatively by the surgeon has been proven to provide satisfactory analgesia for moderate to severe post-operative pain, reducing consumption of systemic analgesics (39-41) (LE: 2b).

5.3.6 Multi-modal analgesia

The concept of multi-modal ('balanced') analgesia is that combining different doses and routes of administration of analgesics improves the effectiveness of pain relief after surgery and reduces the maximal dosage and adverse effects (42) (LE: 2b). It seems to be more effective when different drugs are administered via different routes than when different drugs are administered via a single route (1) (LE: 2b).

Recommendation

	GR
Multi-modal pain management should be employed whenever possible since it helps to increase efficacy while minimising adverse effects.	B

5.3.7 Special populations**5.3.7.1 Ambulatory surgical patients**

A multi-modal analgesic plan uses a combination of NSAIDs or paracetamol plus local anaesthetics used as

peripheral nerve blocks, tissue infiltration, or wound instillation so as to avoid the use of opioids, which can prolong hospital stay (43,44) (LE: 2a), (45) (LE: 2b).

Recommendations

	GR
For post-operative pain control in outpatients, multi-modal analgesia with a combination of NSAIDs or paracetamol plus local anaesthetics should be used.	B
If possible, avoid opioids.	B

5.3.7.2 Geriatric patients

Pain perception appears to be reduced in geriatric patients, and requirement for analgesia generally decreases with increasing age (46,47). Geriatric patients can also suffer from emotional and cognitive impairment such as depression and dementia, which could affect adequate pain management (48). Post-operative delirium in the elderly is a fairly common complication and is often multi-factorial. It may be associated with the administration of pethidine (49). Multi-modal post-operative analgesia may be the pain management technique of choice in elderly patients, as the dosages of medication required are lower. However, it is important to be vigilant for adverse reactions, as they tend to increase in number in the geriatric population (50) (LE: 2b). Epidural analgesia might diminish the risk of post-operative delirium and respiratory complications in elderly patients (51) (LE: 2b).

Recommendation

	GR
Multi-modal and epidural analgesia are preferable for post-operative pain management in elderly patients because these techniques are associated with fewer complications.	B

5.3.7.3 Obese patients

Obese patients appear to be at higher risk for certain post-operative complications, including respiratory, cardiovascular, thromboembolic episodes, and wound infections (52,53). Because the administration of opioids to obese patients is associated with sudden respiratory arrest, a combination of NSAIDs or paracetamol with an epidural local anaesthetic might be the safest analgesic solution (54,55) (LE: 2b).

If absolutely necessary, opioids should be used with caution under careful titration to avoid depression of the respiratory drive (55). Oxygen therapy should also be applied post-operatively to increase oxygen saturation (56).

Recommendations

	GR
The post-operative use of opioids should be avoided in obese patients unless absolutely necessary.	B
An epidural local anaesthetic in combination with NSAIDs or paracetamol is preferable.	B

5.3.7.4 Other groups

Critically ill or cognitively impaired patients present special difficulties. Regional or multi-modal analgesia might be more effective in such patients because drug dosages are reduced and behavioural interventions and patient-controlled methods are unsuitable (1) (LE: 3).

Recommendation

	GR
There are no sufficient data to support a specific post-operative pain management plan for critically ill or cognitively impaired patients.	C

5.3.8 Post-operative pain management teams

The importance of efficient post-operative pain management has led to the development of acute post-operative pain management teams, which generally consist of nursing and pharmacy personnel led by an

anaesthesiologist. They have been shown to improve pain relief, decrease analgesic medication-related side-effects, improve patient satisfaction, and decrease overall costs and morbidity rates (57-59) (LE: 2b). Improved pain control can lead to a shorter period of hospitalisation and fewer unscheduled re-admissions after day-case surgery (60) (LE: 3).

5.4 Specific pain treatment after different urological operations

5.4.1 Extracorporeal shock wave lithotripsy (ESWL)

This is a minimally invasive treatment, during and after which 33-59% of patients do not need any analgesia (61-63) (LE: 2b). Post-treatment pain is unlikely to be severe and oral analgesics are usually sufficient.

Analgesic plan

- Pre-operative assessment: see section 5.3.2.
- Intra-operatively: experience exists for alfentanil (0.5-1.0 mg/70 kg iv), given on demand during ESWL. NSAIDs or midazolam given 30-45 min before treatment reduces the need for opioids during the procedure (LE: 2b). With pre-medication of diclofenac (100 mg rectally), only 18% of patients needed pethidine during lithotripsy (64). After pre-medication with midazolam (5 mg orally), 70% of patients were completely free of pain during the treatment, and if buprenorphine was added this proportion rose to 87% (65). After pre-medication with midazolam (2 mg iv, 5 min before the treatment), diclofenac or tramadol proved to be safe and effective analgesics with fewer side-effects than fentanyl (66) (LE: 1b). Other effective regimes for intra-operative pain treatment are fentanyl (1 µg/kg iv [67]), sufentanil or remifentanyl. These drugs are usually given by the anaesthesiologist because of the risk of respiratory depression, which was significantly lower (20% vs 53%) after the procedure if remifentanyl was used instead of sufentanil (68,69) (LE: 1b).
- Post-operative: NSAIDs, metamizole, paracetamol, codeine and paracetamol combination preparations or tramadol could all be used on an 'as needed' or time-contingent basis (Table 16). If pain is more severe or persistent, examination is generally necessary to exclude hydronephrosis or renal haematoma.

Table 16: Analgesic drug options after ESWL

Drug	Dosage (mg)	Method of administration	Frequency (max.)
Diclofenac	50	Orally	Three times daily
Diclofenac	100	Rectally	Every 16 h
Metamizole	500-1000	Orally	Four times daily
Paracetamol	500-1000	Orally	Four times daily
Tramadol	50-100	Orally	Four times daily

Recommendations

	GR
Analgesics should be given on demand during and after ESWL because not all patients need pain-relief.	B
Pre-medication with NSAIDs or midazolam often decreases the need for opioids during the procedure.	B
iv opioids and sedation can be used in combination during ESWL; dosage is limited by respiratory depression.	C

Post-ESWL, analgesics with a spasmolytic effect are preferable (C).

5.4.2 Endoscopic procedures

5.4.2.1 Transurethral procedures

These operations are usually performed under spinal anaesthesia (epidural or subarachnoid block) with the patient awake or mildly sedated, and will usually provide analgesia for 4-6 h following surgery. Pain is generally caused by the indwelling catheter or the double-J (ureteral stent following ureterorenoscopy), which mimics overactive bladder syndrome. Drugs with an antimuscarinic effect have been proven to be useful in addition to the opioids (70) (LE: 1b).

Analgesic plan

- Pre-operative assessment: see section 5.3.2.
- Intra-operative: spinal (intrathecal or epidural) anaesthesia will provide intra-operative analgesia and last for 4-6 h post-operatively.
- Post-operative: after 4-6 h, mild oral analgesics such as NSAIDs or paracetamol +/- codeine, or stronger opioids, also orally. In the case of bladder discomfort from the indwelling catheter, metamizole (orally or iv), pethidine (iv) or piritramid (iv) would also be effective. Antimuscarinic drugs such as oxybutynin (5 mg orally three times daily) are useful and reduce the need for opioids (70) (LE: 1b) (Table 17).

Table 17: Analgesic drug options after transurethral procedures

Drug	Dosage (mg)	Method of administration	Frequency (max.)
Diclofenac	50	Orally	Three times daily
Diclofenac	100	Rectally	Every 16 h
Metamizole	500-1000	Orally or iv	Four times daily
Paracetamol	500-1000	Orally or iv	Four times daily
Tramadol	50-100	Orally, im, sc or iv	Four times daily
Piritramid	15	iv or sc	Four times daily
Pethidine	25-100	Orally, im, sc or iv	Four to six times daily
Morphine	10	im	Eight times daily

Recommendations

	GR
Post-operative analgesics with spasmolytic effect or mild opioids are preferable.	C
Antimuscarinic drugs could be helpful in reducing discomfort resulting from the indwelling catheter.	B
Antimuscarinic drugs may reduce the need for opioids.	B

5.4.2.2 Percutaneous endoscopic procedures

The analgesic plan is nearly the same as that for transurethral procedures. Local anaesthetic (such as 10 mL of 0.5% bupivacaine) could be infiltrated locally into the skin incision. General anaesthesia is required for the procedure because of the uncomfortable decubitus (prone position) and the prolonged duration of the operation.

5.4.2.3 Laparoscopic procedures

These procedures are performed under general anaesthesia. therefore patients cannot take oral medication for at least 4-6 h post-operatively, so parenteral analgesia should be used. Then, oral or systemic analgesia can be given, depending on bowel motility.

A particular problem after laparoscopic cholecystectomy is the development of shoulder pain as a result of diaphragmatic irritation following pneumoperitoneum. This seems to be dependent on the intra-abdominal pressure used during the procedure, as reduced carbon dioxide insufflation reduces post-operative shoulder pain (71-73) (LE: 1b). The same could apply for some transabdominal urologic laparoscopic interventions.

Analgesic plan

Pre-operative assessment: see section 5.3.2.

Intra-operative: iv opioids +/- NSAIDs, paracetamol or metamizole administered by the anaesthesiologist. The infiltration of local anaesthetic into the port incisions reduces pain after laparoscopy (74).

Post-operative: the administration of systemic opioids iv (im or sc), is very effective in the immediate post-operative period. NSAIDs (e.g. paracetamol and/or metamizole) and incisional local anaesthetics (multi-modal concept) can be given to reduce the need for opioids (74,75) (Table 18).

Table 18: Analgesic drug options after laparoscopic surgery

Drug	Dosage (mg)	Method of administration	Frequency (max.)
Metamizole	500-1000	Orally or iv	Four times daily
Paracetamol	500-1000	Orally or iv	Four times daily
Tramadol	50-100	Orally, im, sc or iv	Four times daily
Piritramid	15	iv or sc	Four times daily
Morphine	10	Intermittent im	Eight times daily
Morphine	1 mg bolus	iv	PCA, 5 min lockout
Diclofenac	50	Orally	Three times daily
Diclofenac	100	Rectally	Every 16 h

PCA = patient-controlled analgesia

Recommendations

	GR
Low intra-abdominal pressure and good desufflation at the end of the procedure reduces post-operative pain.	A
NSAIDs are often sufficient for post-operative pain control.	B
NSAIDs decrease the need for opioids.	B

5.4.3 Open surgery

5.4.3.1 Minor operations of the scrotum/penis and the inguinal approach

These two types of surgical operations are relatively minor and nearly all patients will be able to take oral analgesia afterwards (Table 19). The operation is often performed as an ambulatory procedure under local anaesthesia or with the aid of an ilioinguinal or iliohypogastric nerve block.

Table 19: Analgesic drug options after minor surgery of the scrotum, penis, and inguinal region

Drug	Dosage (mg)	Method of administration	Frequency (max.)
Diclofenac	50	Orally	Three times daily
Diclofenac	100	Rectally	Every 16 h
Paracetamol	1000	Orally	Four times daily
Metamizole	500-1000	Orally	Four times daily
Tramadol	50-100	Orally	Four times daily

Recommendations

	GR
For post-operative pain control, multi-modal analgesia with a combination of NSAIDs or paracetamol plus local anaesthetics should be used.	B
If possible, avoid opioids for outpatients.	C

5.4.3.2 Transvaginal surgery

General, local or regional anaesthesia can be used for these operations. The post-surgical analgesic options are listed in Table 20.

Table 20: Analgesic drug options after transvaginal urological surgery

Drug	Dosage (mg)	Method of administration	Frequency (max.)
Diclofenac	50	Orally	Three times daily
Diclofenac	100	Rectally	Every 16 h
Paracetamol	1000	Orally	Four times daily
Metamizole	500-1000	Orally or iv	Four times daily
Tramadol	50-100	Orally	Four times daily
Piritramid	15	iv or sc	Four times daily
Pethidine	25-100	Orally, im, sc or iv	Four to six times daily
Morphine	10	im	Eight times daily

Recommendations

	GR
NSAIDs are often sufficiently effective after minor or moderate surgery.	B
NSAIDs decrease the need for opioids.	B

5.4.3.3 Perineal open surgery*Analgesic plan*

- Pre-operative assessment: see section 5.3.2.
- Intra-operative: general anaesthesia is usually used, particularly for perineal radical prostatectomy, because of the uncomfortable exaggerated lithotomy position. Sometimes an intrathecal catheter (epidural) can be sited for intra-operative and post-operative pain control.
- Post-operative: continuous epidural infusion of a combination of opioids and local anaesthetic or PCA is usually used (Table 21). When systemic opioids are required, it is advisable to use them in combination with NSAIDs so as to reduce their dose and side-effects. When the patient is able to take oral analgesics oral metamizole or paracetamol +/- codeine can be used.

Table 21: Analgesic options after major perineal open surgery

Drug	Dosage	Method of administration	Frequency (max.)
Bupivacaine 0.25% + fentanyl 2 µg/mL	5-15 mL/h	Continuous epidural infusion	n.a.
Morphine	1 mg bolus	iv	PCA, 5 min lockout
Metamizole	500-1000 mg	Orally or iv	Four times daily
Paracetamol	500-1000 mg	Orally or iv	Four times daily
Tramadol	50-100 mg	Orally, im, sc or iv	Four times daily
Piritramid	15 mg	iv or sc	Four times daily
Diclofenac	50 mg	Orally	Three times daily
Diclofenac	100 mg	Rectally	Every 16 h

PCA = patient-controlled analgesia.

n.a.: not applicable

5.4.3.4 Transperitoneal laparotomy*Analgesic plan*

- Pre-operative assessment: see section 5.3.2.
- Intra-operative: general anaesthetic and regional technique; sometimes an intrapleural catheter can be sited.
- Post-operative: continuous epidural infusion of a combination of opioids and local anaesthetic

(Table 22). Once the patient is able to take oral analgesics (depending on bowel motility) metamizole, paracetamol +/- codeine or tramadol can be used. Multi-modal concepts (combining NSAIDs with opioids, fast-track strategies, keeping abdominal and urinary drainage as short as possible) are useful in reducing the need for analgesia (76).

Table 22: Analgesic options after transperitoneal laparotomy

Drug	Dosage	Method of administration	Frequency (max.)
Bupivacaine 0.25% + fentanyl 2 µg/mL	5-15 mL/h	Continuous epidural infusion	n.a.
Morphine	1 mg bolus	iv	PCA, 5 min lockout
Metamizole	500-1000 mg	Orally or iv	Four times daily
Paracetamol	500-1000 mg	Orally or iv	Four times daily
Tramadol	50-100 mg	Orally, im, sc or iv	Four times daily
Piritramid	15 mg	iv or sc	Four times daily
Diclofenac	50 mg	Orally	Three times daily
Diclofenac	100 mg	Rectally	Every 16 h

PCA = patient-controlled analgesia.

n.a.: not applicable

Recommendations

	GR
The most effective method for systemic administration of opioids is PCA (see section 5.3.4.5), which improves patient satisfaction and decreases the risk of respiratory complications.	A
Epidural analgesia, especially PCEA, provides superior post-operative analgesia, reducing complications and improving patient satisfaction and is preferable to systemic techniques (see sections 5.3.5.2 and 5.3.5.3).	A

5.4.3.5 Suprapubic/retroperitoneal laparotomy

Post-operatively, it is possible to use the oral route for analgesia earlier than after a transperitoneal procedure. Oral opioids, metamizole and/or paracetamol +/- NSAIDs can be used.

Analgesic plan

- Pre-operative assessment: see section 5.3.2.
- Intra-operative: general anaesthetic and regional technique.
- Post-operative: continuous epidural infusion of a combination of opioids and local anaesthetic (Table 23). Once the patient is able to take oral analgesics metamizole, paracetamol +/- codeine, +/- NSAIDs can be used.

Table 23: Analgesic options after suprapubic/retroperitoneal laparotomy

Drug	Dosage	Method of administration	Frequency (max.)
Bupivacaine 0.25% + fentanyl 2 µg/mL	5-15 mL/h	Continuous epidural infusion	n.a.
Morphine	1 mg bolus	iv	PCA, 5 min lockout
Metamizole	500-1000 mg	Orally or iv	Four times daily
Paracetamol	500-1000 mg	Orally or iv	Four times daily
Tramadol	50-100 mg	Orally, im, sc or iv	Four times daily
Piritramid	15 mg	iv or sc	Four times daily
Diclofenac	50 mg	Orally	Three times daily
Diclofenac	100 mg	Rectally	Every 16 h

PCA = patient-controlled analgesia.

n.a.: not applicable

5.4.3.6 Retroperitoneal approach - flank incision - thoracoabdominal approach

Analgesic plan

- Pre-operative assessment: see section 5.3.2.
- Intra-operative: general anaesthetic and regional technique; sometimes an intrapleural catheter can be inserted.
- Post-operative: continuous epidural infusion of a combination of opioids and local anaesthetic gives significantly better pain control compared with iv analgesics (77,78) (Table 24). If epidural analgesia is not possible or refused, PCA should be provided. Once the patient is able to take oral analgesics (depending on bowel motility) paracetamol +/- codeine or metamizole can be associated (to reduce the need for opioids) or used alone.

Table 24: Analgesic options after retroperitoneal approach - flank incision

Drug	Dosage	Method of administration	Frequency (max.)
Bupivacaine 0.25% + fentanyl 2 µg/mL	5-15 mL/h	Continuous epidural infusion	n.a.
Morphine	1 mg bolus	iv	PCA, 5 min lockout
Metamizole	500-1000 mg	Orally or iv	Four times daily
Paracetamol	500-1000 mg	Orally or iv	Four times daily
Tramadol	50-100 mg	Orally, im, sc or iv	Four times daily
Piritramid	15 mg	iv or sc	Four times daily
Diclofenac	50 mg	Orally	Three times daily
Diclofenac	100 mg	Rectally	Every 16 h

PCA, patient-controlled analgesia.

n.a.: not applicable

Recommendation

	GR
Epidural analgesia, especially PCEA, provides superior post-operative analgesia, reducing complications and improving patient satisfaction and is therefore preferable to systemic techniques (see sections 5.3.5.2 and 5.3.5.3).	A

5.5 Dosage and method of delivery of some important analgesics

5.5.1 NSAIDs

Table 25: Dosage and delivery of NSAIDs

Drug	Method of administration	Single dosage (mg)	Maximal dosage (mg) per 24 h
Diclofenac	Orally	50-75	150
Diclofenac	Rectally	100	150
Ibuprofen	Orally	200-800	2400

5.5.2 Drugs with antipyretic effect

Table 26: Dosage and delivery of antipyretics

Drug	Method of administration	Single dosage (mg)	Maximal dosage (mg/24 h)
Paracetamol	Orally	500-1000	4000 (50 mg/kg)
Paracetamol	Iv	1000 4000	(50 mg/kg)
Metamizole	Orally	500-1000	4000
Metamizole	Iv	1000-2500	5000

5.5.3 Selective COX-2 inhibitor

Table 27: Dosage and delivery of selective COX-2 inhibitors

Drug	Method of administration	Single dosage (mg)	Maximal dosage (mg/24 h)
Celecoxib	Orally	100-200	400

5.5.4 Opioids

Table 28: Dosage and delivery of opioids

Drug	Method of administration	Common single dosage (mg)	Maximal dosage (mg)
Tramadol	Orally	50	400-600
Tramadol	Iv	50-100	400-600
Dihydrocodeine	Orally	60-120	240
Piritramid	Iv	7.5-22.5	90
Piritramid	Iv	1-2	300
Piritramid	sc/im	15-30	120
Pethidine	Orally	25-150	500
Pethidine	Rectally	100	500
Pethidine	sc/im	25-150	500
Pethidine	Iv	25-100	500
Morphine*	Orally	Starting with 10	No maximal dose
Morphine*	Rectally	Starting with 10	No maximal dose
Morphine*	sc/im	Starting with 5	No maximal dose
Morphine*	Iv	Starting with 2	No maximal dose
Morphine*	iv (PCA)	0.5-2.5 mg bolus 10-15 min lockout	No maximal dose

*Strong opioids have no real upper limit in dosage (except buprenorphine). The dose must be titrated in correlation with pain relief and depending on the individual strength of unwanted effects such as respiratory depression (see section 5.3.4.4).

5.6 Peri-operative pain management in children

5.6.1 Peri-operative problems

The main pre-operative problems in children are fear of surgery, anxiety about separation from their parents, and the pain of procedures such as venepuncture. Contrary to the popular belief, the presence of parents during anaesthesia induction does not alleviate children's anxiety (79) (LE: 1a). The pre-operative use of oral morphine sulfate, 0.1 mg/kg, can help to prevent crying in children and thereby reduce oxygen consumption

and pulmonary vasoconstriction (Table 29). The prior application of EMLA (lidocaine 2.5%, prilocaine 2.5%) cream helps to reduce the pain of venepuncture (80) (LE: 1a). Atropine, 0.01-0.02 mg/kg iv, im, orally or rectally, prevents bradycardia during anaesthesia induction.

Table 29: Pre-medication drugs in children

Drug	Dosing	Route of administration	Category
Ketamine	6 mg/kg	Oral, intranasal, intramuscular	NMDA antagonist
Midazolam	0.5 mg/kg	Oral, intranasal, rectally	Benzodiazepine
Dexmedetomidine	4 µg/kg	Oral, intranasal	α ₂ - receptor agonist
Clonidine	4 µg/kg	Oral	α ₂ - receptor agonist
Pentobarbital	4-6 mg/kg	Intramuscular	Barbiturate
Chloral hydrate	50-100 mg/kg	Oral	Barbiturate
Methohexital	25-30 mg/kg	Rectally	Barbiturate

Recommendation

	GR
EMLA local application alleviates significantly venepuncture pain in children.	A

5.6.2 Post-operative analgesia

Post-operatively, paracetamol, NSAIDs, opioids and their combinations are used according to the severity of the surgical procedure (Table 30).

Table 30: Dosage of analgesics in children for post-operative analgesia

Drug	Dose	Route of administration	Severity of surgical procedure
Paracetamol	10-15 mg/kg every 4 hours 20-30 mg/kg every 6 hours	Oral Rectally	Minor Minor
Ibuprofen	10-15 mg/kg every 6 hours	Oral, iv, rectally	Minor, medium
Naproxen	6-8 mg/kg every 8-12 hours	Oral, iv, rectally	Minor, medium
Codeine	0.5-1 mg/kg every 3-4 hours	Oral	Minor, medium
Morphine	0.1 mg/kg every 2-4 hours Infusion: 0.03mg/ mg/kg/hour 0.3 mg/kg every 3-4 hours	iv, sc Oral	Medium, major
Oxycodone	0.1-0.2 mg/kg every 3-4 hours	Oral	Medium
Hydromorphone	0.04-0.08 mg/kg every 3-4 hours	Oral	Medium
Tramadol	1 mg/kg every 4-6 hours	iv	Medium, major
Pethidine	2-3 mg/kg every 3-4 hours	iv	Medium, major

The post-operative use of COX-2 inhibitors in children is still controversial. PCA can be used safely in children older than 6 years. Nurse-controlled analgesia is effective in infants and children unable to use PCA (81). Locoregional techniques such as wound infiltration, nerve blocks, caudal and epidural analgesia are also successful (82,83). Most common drugs used are bupivacaine and ropivacaine (Table 31). Higher volumes of lower drug concentrations appear to be more effective than lower volumes of higher concentrations (84) (LE: 1a). The addition of opioids, ketamine or clonidine increases the duration of pain relief and reduces the need for rescue analgesia, so providing more effective pain relief than local anaesthesia alone in caudal analgesia (85-87) (LE: 1a).

Table 31: Epidural dosage of local anaesthesia

Drug	Bolus 0-12 months	Bolus > 1 year	Infusion for 0-12 months	Infusion > 1year
Bupivacaine	2 mg/kg	2.5 mg/kg	0.2 mg/kg/hour	0.4 mg/kg/hour
Ropivacaine	2.5 mg/kg	3.5 mg/kg	0.3 mg/kg/hour	0.6 mg/kg/hour

5.7 References

- American Society of Anesthesiologists Task Force on Acute Pain Management. Practice guidelines for acute pain management in the perioperative setting: an update report by the American Society of Anesthesiologists Task Force on Acute Pain Management. *Anesthesiology* 2004 Jun;100(6):1573-81. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15166580>
- Rosenquist RW, Rosenberg J; United States Veterans Administration. Postoperative pain guidelines. *Reg Anesth Pain Med* 2003 Jul-Aug;28(4):279-88. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12945020>
- Neugebauer EA, Wilkinson RC, Kehlet H, et al; PROSPECT Working Group. PROSPECT: a practical method for formulating evidence-based expert recommendations for the management of postoperative pain. *Surg Endosc* 2007 Jul;21(7):1047-53. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17294309>
- Apfelbaum JL, Chen C, Mehta SS, et al. Postoperative pain experience: results from a national survey suggest postoperative pain continues to be undermanaged. *Anesth Analg* 2003 Aug;97(2):534-40. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12873949>
- Pavlin DJ, Chen C, Penalosa DA, et al. Pain as a factor complicating recovery and discharge after ambulatory surgery. *Anesth Analg* 2002 Sep;95(3):627-34. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12198050>
- Wu CL, Naqibuddin M, Rowlingson AJ, et al. The effect of pain on health-related quality of life in the immediate postoperative period. *Anesth Analg* 2003 Oct;97(4):1078-85. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14500161>
- Perkins FM, Kehlet H. Chronic pain as an outcome of surgery. A review of predictive factors. *Anesthesiology* 2000 Oct;93(4):1123-33. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11020770>
- Desborough JP. The stress response to trauma and surgery. *Br J Anaesth* 2000 Jul;85(1):109-17. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10927999>
- Sydow FW. The influence of anesthesia and postoperative analgesic management of lung function. *Acta Chir Scand Suppl* 1989;550:159-65. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2652967>
- Wartler DC, Pagel PS, Kersten JR. Approaches to the prevention of perioperative myocardial ischemia. *Anesthesiology* 2000 Jan;92(1):253-9. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10638923>
- Rosenfeld BA. Benefits of regional anesthesia on thromboembolic complications following surgery. *Reg Anesth* 1996 Nov-Dec;21(6 Suppl):9-12. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8956414>
- Livingston EH, Passaro EP Jr. Postoperative ileus. *Dig Dis Sci* 1990 Jan;35(1):121-32. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2403907>
- Wilmore DW, Kehlet H. Management of patients in fast track surgery. *BMJ* 2001 Feb;332:473-6. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11222424>
- Kehlet H, Holte K. Effect of postoperative analgesia on surgical outcome. *Br J Anaesth* 2001 Jul;87(1):62-72. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11460814>
- Perkins FM, Kehlet H. Chronic pain as an outcome of surgery. A review of predictive factors. *Anesthesiology* 2000 Oct;93(4):1123-33. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11020770>
- Macrae WA. Chronic pain after surgery. *Br J Anaesth* 2001 Jul;87(1):88-98. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11460816>
- Jensen MP, Karoly P. Self-report scales and procedures for assessing pain in adults. In *Handbook of Pain Assessment*. Turk DC and Melzack R, eds. NY: Guilford Press, 1992, pp. 135-151.
- Herr K. Pain assessment in cognitively impaired older adults. *Am J Nurs* 2002 Dec;102(12):65-7. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12473932>
- Kissin I. Preemptive analgesia. *Anesthesiology* 2000 Oct;93(4):1138-43. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11020772>

20. Kissin I. Preemptive analgesia. Why its effect is not always obvious. *Anesthesiology* 1996 May;84(5): 1015-19.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8623993>
21. White PF. The role of non-opioid analgesic techniques in the management of pain after ambulatory surgery. *Anesth Analg* 2002 Mar;94(3):577-85.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11867379>
22. Souter AJ, Fredman B, White PF. Controversies in the perioperative use of nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs. *Anesth analg* 1994 Dec;79(6):1178-90.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7978444>
23. Brose WG, Cohen SE. Oxyhemoglobin saturation following cesarean section in patients receiving epidural morphine, PCA, or IM meperidine analgesia. *Anesthesiology* 1989 Jun;70(6):948-53.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2729636>
24. Fitzgerald GA. Cardiovascular pharmacology of nonselective nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and coxibs: clinical considerations. *Am J Cardiol* 2002 Mar;89(6A):26D-32D.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11909558>
25. Bresalier RS, Sandler RS, Quan H, et al. Adenomatous Polyp Prevention on Vioxx (APPROVE) Trial Investigators. Cardiovascular events associated with rofecoxib in a colorectal adenoma chemoprevention trial. *N Engl J Med* 2005 Mar;352(11):1092-102.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15713943>
26. Schug SA, Sidebotham DA, Mc Guinety M, et al. Acetaminophen as an adjunct to morphine by patient-controlled analgesia in the management of acute postoperative pain. *Anesth Analg* 1998 Aug;87(2):368-72.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9706932>
27. Bannwarth B, Demotes-Mainard F, Schaeferbeke T, et al. Central analgesic effects of aspirin-like drugs. *Fundam Clin Pharmacol* 1995;9(1):1-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7768482>
28. Maj S, Centkowski P. A prospective study of the incidence of agranulocytosis and aplastic anemia associated with the oral use of metamizole sodium in Poland. *Med Sci Monit* 2004 Sep;10(9):PI93-5.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15328493>
29. Hedenmalm K, Spigset O. Agranulocytosis and other blood dyscrasias associated with dipyron (metamizole). *Eur J Clin Pharmacol* 2002 Jul;58(4):265-74.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12136373>
30. McQuay H, Moore A, Justins D. Treating acute pain in hospital. *BMJ* 1997 May;314(7093):1531-5.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9183203>
31. Walder B, Schafer M, Henzi I, et al. Efficacy and safety of patient-controlled opioid analgesia for acute postoperative pain. A quantitative systematic review. *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand* 2001 Aug;45(7): 795-804.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11472277>
32. Ballantyne JC, Carr DB, Chalmers TC, et al. Postoperative patientcontrolled analgesia: meta-analyses of initial randomized control trials. *J Clin Anesth* 1993 May-Jun;5(3):182-93.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8318237>
33. Lehmann LJ, DeSio JM, Radvany T, et al. Transdermal fentanyl in postoperative pain. *Reg Anesth* 1997 Jan-Feb;22(1):24-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9010943>
34. Rawal N, Langford RM. Current practices for postoperative pain management in Europe and the potential role of the fentanyl HCl iontophoretic transdermal system. *Eur J Anaesth* 2007 Apr;24(4): 299-308.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17156510>
35. Yardeni IZ, Shavit Y, Bessler H, et al. Comparison of postoperative pain management techniques on endocrine response to surgery: a randomised controlled trial. *Int J Surg* 2007 Aug;5(4):239-43.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17660130>
36. Mann C, Pouzeratte Y, Boccara G, et al. Comparison of intravenous or epidural patient-controlled analgesia in the elderly after major abdominal surgery. *Anesthesiology* 2000 Feb;92(2):433-41.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10691230>
37. Liu SS, Salinas FV. Continuous plexus and peripheral nerve blocks for postoperative analgesia. *Anesth Analg* 2003 Jan;96(1):263-72.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12505964>
38. Mulroy MF, Burgess FW, Emanuelsson BM. Ropivacaine 0.25% and 0.5%, but not 0.125% provide effective wound infiltration analgesia after outpatient hernia repair, but with sustained plasma drug levels. *Reg Anesth Pain Med* 1999 Mar-Apr;24(2):136-41.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10204899>

39. Bianconi M, Ferraro L, Ricci R, et al. The pharmacokinetics and efficacy of ropivacaine continuous wound instillation after spine fusion surgery. *Anesth Analg* 2004 Jan;98(1):166-72.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14693613>
40. Gupta S, Maheshwari R, Dulara SC. Wound instillation with 0.25% bupivacaine as continuous infusion following hysterectomy. *Middle East J Anesthesiol* 2005 Oct;18(3):595-610.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16381265>
41. Bianconi M, Ferraro L, Traina GC, et al. Pharmacokinetics and efficacy of ropivacaine continuous wound instillation after joint replacement surgery. *Br J Anaesth* 2003 Dec;91(6):830-5.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14633754>
42. Kehlet H, Wilmore DW. Multimodal strategies to improve surgical outcome. *Am J Surg* 2002 Jun;183(6):630-41.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12095591>
43. Beauregard L, Pomp A, Choinière M. Severity and impact of pain after day-surgery. *Can J Anesth* 1998 Apr;45(4):304-11.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9597202>
44. Rawal N, Hylander J, Nydahl PA, et al. Survey of postoperative analgesia following ambulatory surgery. *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand* 1997 Sep;41(8):1017-22.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9311400>
45. Crews JC. Multimodal pain management strategies for office-based and ambulatory procedures. *JAMA* 2002 Aug;288(5):629-32.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12150675>
46. Gibson SJ, Helme RD. Age-related differences in pain perception and report. *Clin Geriatr Med* 2001 Aug;17(3):433-56.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11459714>
47. Gloth FM 3rd. Geriatric pain. Factors that limit pain relief and increase complications. *Geriatrics* 2000 Oct;55(10):46-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11054950>
48. Pickering G, Jourdan D, Eschalièr A, et al. Impact of age, gender and cognitive functioning on pain perception. *Gerontology* 2002 Mar-Apr;48(2):112-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11867935>
49. Marcantonio ER, Juarez G, Goldman L, et al. The relationship of postoperative delirium with psychoactive medications. *JAMA* 1994 Nov;272(19):1518-22.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7966844>
50. Gloth FM 3rd. Principles of perioperative pain management in older adults. *Clin Geriatr Med* 2001 Aug;17(3):553-73.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11459721>
51. Lynch EP, Lazor MA, Gellis JE, et al. The impact of postoperative pain on the development of postoperative delirium. *Anesth Analg* 1998 Apr;86(4):781-5.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9539601>
52. Adams JP, Murphy PG. Obesity in anaesthesia and intensive care. *Br J Anaesth* 2000 Jul;85(1):91-108.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10927998>
53. Choban PS, Flancbaum L. The impact of obesity on surgical outcomes: a review. *J Am Coll Surg* 1997 Dec;185(6):593-603.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9404886>
54. Choi YK, Brolin RE, Wagner BK, et al. Efficacy and safety of patient-controlled analgesia for morbidly obese patients following gastric bypass surgery. *Obes Surg* 2000 Apr;10(2):154-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10782177>
55. Cullen DJ. Obstructive sleep apnea and postoperative analgesia: a potentially dangerous combination. *J Clin Anesth* 2001 Mar;13(2):83-5.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11331164>
56. Rosenberg J, Pedersen MH, Gebuhr P, et al. Effect of oxygen therapy on late postoperative episodic and constant hypoxemia. *Br J Anaesth* 1992 Jan;68(1):18-22.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1739560>
57. Rawal N. 10 years of acute pain services: achievements and challenges. *Reg Anesth Pain Med* 1999 Jan-Feb;24(1):68-73.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9952098>
58. Stamer UM, Mpasios N, Stuber F, et al. A survey of acute pain services in Germany and a discussion of international survey data. *Reg Anesth Pain Med* 2002 Mar-Apr;27(2):125-31.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11915057>

59. Miaskowski C, Crews J, Ready LB, et al. Anesthesia-based pain services improve the quality of postoperative pain management. *Pain* 1999 Mar;80(1-2):23-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10204714>
60. Fancourt-Smith PF, Hornstein J, Jenkins LC. Hospital admissions from the Surgical Day Case Centre of Vancouver General Hospital 1977-1987. *Can J Anesth* 1990 Sep;37(6):699-704.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2208546>
61. Kraebber DM, SA Torres. Extracorporeal shock wave lithotripsy: review of the first 100 cases at the Kidney Stone Center of Southeast Georgia. *South Med J* 1988 Jan;81(1):48-51.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/3336800>
62. Liston TG, Montgomery BS, Bultitude MI, et al. Extracorporeal shock wave lithotripsy with the Storz Modulith SL20: the first 500 patients. *Br J Urol* 1992 May;69(5):465-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1623372>
63. Voce S, Dal Pozzo C, Arnone S, et al. 'In situ' echo-guided extracorporeal shock wave lithotripsy of ureteral stones. Methods and results with Dornier MPL 9000. *Scand J Urol Nephrol* 1993;27(4):469-73.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8159919>
64. Tauzin-Fin P, Saumtally S, Houdek MC, et al. [Analgesia by sublingual buprenorphine in extracorporeal kidney lithotripsy]. *Ann Fr Anesth Reanim* 1993;12(3):260-4. [article in French]
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8250363>
65. Dawson C, Vale JA, Corry DA, et al. Choosing the correct pain relief for extracorporeal lithotripsy. *Br J Urol* 1994 Sep;74(3):302-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7953259>
66. Ozcan S, Yilmaz E, Buyukkocak U, et al. Comparison of three analgesics for extracorporeal shock wave lithotripsy. *Scand J Urol Nephrol* 2002;36(4):281-5.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12201921>
67. Irwin MG, Campbell RC, Lun TS, et al. Patient maintained alfentanil target-controlled infusion for analgesia during extracorporeal shock wave lithotripsy. *Can J Anesth* 1996 Sep;43(9):919-24.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8874909>
68. Beloeil H, Corsia G, Coriat P, et al. Remifentanil compared with sufentanil during extra-corporeal shock wave lithotripsy with spontaneous ventilation: a double-blind, randomized study. *Br J Anaesth* 2002 Oct;89(4):567-70.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12393357>
69. Medina HJ, Galvin EM, Dirx M, et al. Remifentanil as a single drug for extracorporeal shock wave lithotripsy: a comparison of infusion doses in terms of analgesic potency and side effects. *Anesth Analg* 2005 Aug;101(2):365-70, table of contents.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16037145>
70. Tauzin-Fin P, Sesay M, Svartz L, et al. Sublingual oxybutynin reduces postoperative pain related to indwelling bladder catheter after radical retropubic prostatectomy. *Br J Anaesth* 2007 Oct;99(4):572-5.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17681969>
71. Lindgren L, Koivusalo AM, Kellokumpu I. Conventional pneumoperitoneum compared with abdominal wall lift for laparoscopic cholecystectomy. *Br J Anaesth* 1995 Nov;75(5):567-72.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7577282>
72. Sarli L, Costi R, Sansebastiano G, et al. Prospective randomized trial of low-pressure pneumoperitoneum for reduction of shoulder-tip pain following laparoscopy. *Br J Surg* 2000 Sep;87(9):1161-5.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10971421>
73. Barczynski M, Herman RM. A prospective randomized trial on comparison of low-pressure (LP) and standard-pressure (SP) pneumoperitoneum for laparoscopic cholecystectomy. *Surg Endosc* 2003 Apr;17(4):533-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12582754>
74. Bisgaard T. Analgesic treatment after laparoscopic cholecystectomy: a critical assessment of the evidence. *Anesthesiology* 2006 Apr;104(4):835-46.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16571981>
75. Neudecker J, Sauerland S, Neugebauer E, et al. The European Association for Endoscopic Surgery clinical practice guideline on the pneumoperitoneum for laparoscopic surgery. *Surg Endosc* 2002 Jul;16(7):1121-43.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12015619>
76. Kehlet H, Wilmore DW. Multimodal strategies to improve surgical outcome. *Am J Surg* 2002 Jun;183(6):630-41.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12095591>

77. Block BM, Liu SS, Rowlingson AJ, et al. Efficacy of postoperative epidural analgesia: a meta-analysis. *JAMA* 2003 Nov;290(18):2455-63.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14612482>
78. Wu CL, Cohen SR, Richman JM, et al. Efficacy of postoperative patient-controlled and continuous infusion epidural analgesia versus intravenous patient-controlled analgesia with opioids: a meta-analysis. *Anesthesiology* 2005 Nov;103(5):1079-88; quiz 1109-10.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16249683>
79. Chundamala J, Wright JG, Kemp SM. An evidence-based review of parental presence during anesthesia induction and parent/child anxiety. *Can J Anaesth* 2009 Jan;56(1):57-70.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19247779>
80. Möller C, A lignocaine-prilocaine cream reduces venipuncture pain. *Ups J Med Sci* 1985;90(3):293-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/3913095>
81. Monitto CL, Greenberg RS, Kost-Byerly S, et al. The safety and efficacy of parent-/nurse-controlled analgesia in patients less than six years of age. *Anesth Analg* 2000 Sep;91(3):573-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10960379>
82. Matsota P, Papageorgiou-Brousta M, Kostopanagioutou G. Wound infiltration with levobupivacaine: an alternative method of postoperative pain relief after inguinal hernia repair in children. *Eur J Pediatr Surg* 2007 Aug;17(4):270-4.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17806025>
83. Merguerian PA, Sutters KA, Tang E, et al. Efficacy of continuous epidural analgesia versus single dose caudal analgesia in children after intravesical ureteroneocystostomy. *J Urol* 2004 Oct;172(4 Pt 2):1621-5; discussion 1625.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15371775>
84. Hong JY, Han SW, Kim WO, et al. A comparison of high volume/low concentration and low volume/high concentration ropivacaine in caudal analgesia for pediatric orchiopexy. *Anesth Analg* 2009 Oct;109(4):1073-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19762734>
85. Akbas M, Titiz TA, Ertugrul F, et al. Comparison of the effect of ketamine added to bupivacaine and ropivacaine, on stress hormone levels and the duration of caudal analgesia. *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand* 2005 Nov;49(10):1520-6.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16223400>
86. Tripi PA, Palmer JS, Thomas S, et al. Clonidine increases duration of bupivacaine caudal analgesia for ureteroneocystostomy: a double-blind prospective trial. *J Urol* 2005 Sep;174(3):1081-3.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16094063>
87. Castillo-Zamora C, Castillo-Peralta LA, Nava-Ocampo AA. Dose minimization study of single-dose epidural morphine in patients undergoing hip surgery under regional anesthesia with bupivacaine. *Paediatr Anaesth* 2005 Jan;15(1):29-36.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15649160>

6. NON-TRAUMATIC ACUTE FLANK PAIN

6.1 Background

Acute flank pain is a frequently occurring and complex medical problem. Ureterolithiasis is the most common non-traumatic cause. However, half of all renal colics are not caused by urolithiasis (1-3) (Table 32).

Table 32: Main urological and non-urological causes of flank pain

Urological causes	Non-urological causes
Renal or ureteral stones	Aortic aneurysm
Urinary tract infection (pyelonephritis, pyonephrosis, renal abscess)	Gallbladder disorder
Uretero-pelvic junction obstruction	Gastrointestinal disorders
Renal vascular disorders (renal infarction, renal vein thrombosis)	Pancreatic disease
Papillary necrosis	Gynaecological disorders
Intra- or peri-renal bleeding	Musculoskeletal disease
Testicular cord torsion.	

6.2 Initial diagnostic approach

6.2.1 Symptomatology

History and physical examination, including body temperature, can be very helpful in the differential diagnosis of acute flank pain (4).

- **Acute renal colic** is indicated by pain of short duration (≤ 12 hours), nausea, vomiting, loin tenderness and haematuria (erythrocytes $> 10,000/\text{mm}^3$) (4).
- Because the signs and symptoms can be very similar, **acute uncomplicated pyelonephritis** should be immediately differentiated from complicated renal colic:
 - concomitant fever ($> 38^\circ\text{C}$) makes imaging obligatory (5). A radiological evaluation of the upper urinary tract should be offered to every patient presenting with flank pain and fever to rule out urinary tract obstruction irrespective of the accompanying symptoms, duration of the episode and urine macroscopic or microscopic findings.
 - imaging is also imperative in patients with acute flank pain and a solitary kidney (LE: 4).
- Acute flank pain in patients with an increased risk for thromboembolic events should raise the suspicion of **renal infarction** (6).
- Careful abdominal examination can reveal an abdominal **aortic aneurysm** (misdiagnosed in 30% of patients).
- **Renal vein thrombosis** (RVT) may often present with symptoms of acute flank pain, proteinuria, haematuria, hypotension and renal insufficiency.
- **Obstruction of the UPJ** can result in acute flank or abdominal pain after a high fluid volume intake, especially in paediatric patients.
- **Renal papillary necrosis** is not uncommon in the course of systemic diseases such as diabetes mellitus or analgesic nephropathy; the passage of sloughed papillae down the ureter may cause flank pain and haematuria.
- **Testicular torsion** should always be excluded in children with acute abdominal/flank pain.
- **Torsion of the appendix testis** can also result in abdominal pain or radiate to the flank.
- **Spontaneous bleeding** either within the kidney or to the retroperitoneum can be caused by kidney tumours (including angiomyolipomas), bleeding disorders or anticoagulation; acute flank pain is sometimes the presenting symptom.

Recommendation

	GR
Febrile patients ($\geq 38^\circ\text{C}$) with acute flank pain and/or with a solitary kidney need urgent imaging.	B

6.2.2 Laboratory evaluation

All patients with acute flank pain require a urine test (red and white cells, bacteria or urine nitrite), blood cell count, and serum creatinine measurement. In addition, febrile patients with flank pain require C-reactive protein and urine culture. Pyelonephritis \pm obstructive uropathy should be suspected when the white blood count exceeds $15,000/\text{mm}^3$.

6.2.3 **Diagnostic imaging**

6.2.3.1 *Ultrasonography*

Unenhanced helical computed tomography has high sensitivity and specificity for the evaluation of acute flank pain (7,8) (LE: 1a). Unenhanced helical computed tomography is superior because it detects ureteral stones with a sensitivity and specificity of 94-100%, regardless of stone size, location and chemical composition, and identifies extrarenal causes of flank pain in about one-third of all patients presenting with it. In addition, it does not need contrast agent, and is a time-saving technique (8,9) (LE: 1a).

6.2.3.2 *Intravenous urography (IVU)*

The use of US in the management of acute flank pain has been increasing. If the findings of pelvic and/or ureteral dilatation, stone visualisation and the absence of ureteral ejaculation are combined, sensitivity to ureteral dilatation can be 96% (7,10,11) (LE: 2a). Together with a plain abdominal radiograph, US can be accepted when computed tomography (CT) is not available (7,12-16) (LE: 1b). The disadvantages of US include inability to differentiate dilatation from true obstruction and the need for highly specialised personnel (12). Sensitivity varies from 58-96% in untrained staff in emergency rooms (15), but evidence suggests that, with even short training, non-specialists can be highly effective at excluding disorders such as abdominal aortic aneurysm, free abdominal fluids, gallstones and obstructive uropathy (15) (LE: 2b). US is the diagnostic imaging modality of choice during pregnancy.

6.2.3.3 *Unenhanced helical CT (UHCT)*


IVU reliably provides information on the anatomy of the urinary collecting system (ureteral and renal pelvic dilatation) in 80-90% of cases and can identify ureteral calculi in 40-60% of cases.

Direct identification of ureteral calculi can be achieved in 40-60% of cases, whereas indirect signs (e.g. ureteral and renal pelvic dilatation) allows detection in 80-90% of cases. Drawback is that IVU results can be hampered by poor quality related to suboptimal bowel preparation, toxicity of contrast agents, allergic and anaphylactic reactions, and by significant radiation exposure. In emergency cases, IVU should be avoided due to the risk of fornix rupture.

UHCT or IVU should be considered in patients initially evaluated by other means who are still febrile after 72 h of treatment to rule out further complicating factors (renal, perinephric or prostatic abscesses) (8,9).

Table 33 shows comparative results of UHCT US and IVU in assessing acute flank pain and suspicion of ureterolithiasis (17-19). Figure 2 summarises the diagnostic approach to non-traumatic acute flank pain.

Figure 2: Diagnostic approach to non-traumatic acute flank pain



CT = computed tomography; UTI = urinary tract infection.

Recommendation

	GR
UHCT is the diagnostic imaging modality with the highest sensitivity and specificity for evaluation of non-traumatic acute flank pain.	A
US can be an alternative to UHCT in the initial approach to non-traumatic acute flank pain.	A

Table 33: Comparative results of UHCT, US and IVU in assessment of acute flank pain and suspected ureterolithiasis (12)

Imaging modality	Performance	Ref. no.
UHCT	Sensitivity 100%, specificity 96%, accuracy 98%	17
Abdominal radiograph + US versus UHCT	UHCT: sensitivity and specificity of 100% US: sensitivity 100%, specificity 90%	18
Low-dose UHCT versus IVU	UHCT: sensitivity 97%, specificity 96% Low-dose UHCT is superior to IVU	19

6.3 Initial emergency treatment

6.3.1 Systemic analgesia

Pain relief is usually the first, most urgent, therapeutic step (20,21):

- Intravenous (iv) non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (nsaids) are very effective in most cases, e.g. a bolus of diclofenac sodium, 75 mg (le: 1a) (21); a slow iv injection of ketorolac, 30 mg, 4 times daily, is equivalent to diclofenac in the treatment of renal colic (22).
- Tests have shown a single dose of dipyron to be less effective than diclofenac, 75 mg (23) (le: 1a), but a slow iv infusion of dipyron, 1 g or 2 g, is just as effective as diclofenac (24).
- In cases of unresponsiveness to diclofenac (25) (le: 1b), or contraindication of NSAIDs (24) (le: 1b), iv papaverine hydrochloride (120 mg) is a safe and effective alternative.
- Large-scale studies have shown that NSAIDs and opioids are both effective analgesics, but vomiting is more prevalent with opioids (particularly pethidine) (21).
- The combination of iv morphine + ketorolac seems superior to either drug alone, and appears to be associated with a decrease in the need for rescue doses of analgesia (26).
- Antimuscarinics are often used in acute renal colic; there is no evidence that hyoscine butylbromide reduces opioid requirements in this condition (26) (LE: 1b).

The origin of the pain should be immediately clarified in febrile patients and those with a solitary kidney.

Recommendation

	GR
In patients presenting with acute flank pain NSAIDs such as diclofenac (75 mg bolus) and dipyron (1-2 g slow iv injection) are the drugs of first choice.	A

6.3.2 Local analgesia

A number of manipulations have been tested in the field of acute renal colic.

- Local warming of the abdomen and lower back region seems to decrease pain in patients with acute renal colic (27) (LE: 1a).
- Trigger-point injection of lidocaine can provide effective pain relief in 50% of patients with renal colic (28); it is significantly better than iv butylscopolamine bromide + sulpyrine (28) (LE: 1a). There are no comparative studies with NSAIDs.

6.3.3 Supportive therapy

Patients with acute flank pain often present with moderate to severe dehydration. Fever, vomiting and anorexia produce serious discomfort and should be treated from the outset. If possible, iv fluids should be generous (60 mL/h normal saline and 60 mL/h 5% glucose solution), but maintenance iv fluids (20 mL/h normal saline) can be as effective as forced hydration with regard to pain perception and analgesic use (29) (LE: 1b). No clear evidence supports using diuretics to treat acute ureteral colic (30). Metoclopramide chloride (0.5 mg/kg/24 h in three divided doses) can be effective in controlling nausea and vomiting irrespective of aetiology (infectious, obstructive, oncological).

6.3.4 **Upper urinary tract decompression**

If pain relief cannot be achieved using medical therapy and there are signs of infection and impaired renal function, upper urinary tract drainage should be undertaken. The main indications for stenting for urgent relief of obstruction include (31):

- urine infection with urinary tract obstruction
- urosepsis
- intractable pain and/or vomiting
- obstruction of a solitary or transplanted kidney
- bilateral obstructing stones
- ureteral calculus obstruction in pregnancy.

6.4 **Aetiological treatment**

6.4.1 **Urolithiasis**

General concepts for treating urolithiasis have been defined in the *EAU Guidelines on Urolithiasis* (32).

6.4.2 **Infectious conditions**

Infectious uncomplicated conditions (i.e. acute pyelonephritis in otherwise healthy individuals) should be treated with appropriate antibiotics and analgesics according to the *EAU Guidelines on Urological Infections* (33).

The first-line treatment of mild cases should be an oral fluoroquinolone (twice daily for 7 days) in areas with low rates of fluoroquinolone-resistant *Escherichia coli*. In areas with raised resistance rates, or in pregnancy, lactation or adolescence, a second- or third-generation oral cephalosporin is recommended. Pain can usually be controlled with oral NSAIDs (diclofenac 75 mg, three times daily, or dipyron 500 mg three times daily) except in pregnant or lactating women.

6.4.3 **Other conditions**

6.4.3.1 *Uretero-pelvic junction obstruction*

Uretero-pelvic junction obstruction can result in intermittent flank or abdominal pain. Symptoms may worsen during brisk diuresis (after consumption of caffeine or alcohol). Dismembered or non-dismembered pyeloplasty is standard. A ureteral stent can help to relieve pain in very symptomatic patients prior to definitive surgery. Outcomes are excellent, with resolution of the obstruction in 90-95% of cases, including newborns (34).

6.4.3.2 *Papillary necrosis*

Papillary necrosis commonly presents as painless macroscopic haematuria, but can be complicated by ureteral obstruction. As well as symptomatic treatment, treatment should be given for the underlying cause of papillary necrosis, such as interstitial nephritis, acute pyelonephritis, diabetes mellitus, analgesic abuse or sickle cell disease. Ureteral obstruction due to sloughed papillae can be successfully treated with ureteroscopy or temporary ureteral stenting (35).

6.4.3.3 *Renal infarction*

There is no specific treatment for acute renal infarction, but the underlying disease (atrial fibrillation, left ventricular thrombus or a hypercoagulable state) may require anticoagulation with iv heparin followed by warfarin to prevent future events (36).

6.4.3.4 *RVT*

RVT is often clinically silent, but can present with acute flank pain. Systemic anticoagulation with heparin to prevent further propagation of thrombus or other thromboembolic phenomena (37) is standard, but the successful use of fibrinolytic agents in selected patients without clinical contraindications has been reported (38). Thrombectomy or nephrectomy is reserved for cases refractory to medical therapy.

6.4.3.5 *Intra- or peri-renal bleeding*

Acute spontaneous intra- or peri-renal bleeding often results in acute flank pain. Spontaneous renal haemorrhage (Wunderlich's syndrome), is an unusual and life-threatening cause of acute abdomen. Nephrectomy is usually the only therapeutic alternative (39,40).

6.4.3.6 *Testicular cord torsion*

Testicular cord torsion can produce lower abdomen and flank pain; it should be treated surgically at once.

6.5 References

1. Chen MY, Zagoria RJ, Saunders HS, et al. Trends in the use of unenhanced helical CT for acute urinary colic. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 1999 Dec;173(6):1447-50.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10584780>
2. Dalrymple NC, Verga M, Anderson KR, et al. The value of unenhanced helical computerized tomography in the management of acute flank pain. *J Urol* 1998 Mar;159(3):735-40.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9474137>
3. Levine JA, Neitlich J, Verga M, et al. Ureteral calculi in patients with flank pain: correlation of plain radiography with unenhanced helical CT. *Radiology* 1997 Jul;204(1):27-31.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9205218>
4. Eskelinen M, Ikonen J, Lipponen P. Usefulness of history-taking, physical examination and diagnostic scoring in acute renal colic. *Eur Urol* 1998 Dec;34(6):467-73.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9831787>
5. Pearle M. Management of the acute stone event. *AUA Update Series* 2008. Vol 27. Lesson 30. American Urological Association, Education and Research Inc, Linthicum, MD.
6. Roche-Nagle G, Rubin BB. Considerations in the diagnosis and therapy for acute loin pain. *Am J Emerg Med* 2009 Feb;27(2):254.e3-4.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19371555>
7. Catalano O, Nunziata A, Altei F, et al. Suspected ureteral colic: primary helical CT versus selective helical CT after unenhanced radiography and sonography. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2002 Feb;178(2):379-87.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11804898>
8. Worster A, Preyra I, Weaver B, et al. The accuracy of noncontrast helical computed tomography versus intravenous pyelography in the diagnosis of suspected acute urolithiasis: a meta-analysis. *Ann Emerg Med* 2002 Sep;40(3):280-6.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12192351>
9. Katz DS, Scheer M, Lumerman JH, et al. Alternative or additional diagnoses on unenhanced helical computed tomography for suspected renal colic: experience with 1000 consecutive examinations. *Urology* 2000 Jul;56(1):53-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10869622>
10. Heidenreich A, Desgrandschamps F, Terrier F. Modern approach of diagnosis and management of acute flank pain: review of all imaging modalities. *Eur Urol* 2002 Apr;41(4):351-62.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12074804>
11. Wang LJ, Ng CJ, Chen JC, et al. Diagnosis of acute flank pain caused by ureteral stones: value of combined direct and indirect signs on IVU and unenhanced helical CT. *Eur Radiol* 2004 Sep;14(9):1634-40.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15060838>
12. ACR Appropriateness Criteria. Acute onset flank pain, suspicion of stone disease. American College of Radiology–Medical Specialty Society, 1995 (revised 2007). NGC:005991
13. Noble VE, Brown DF. Renal ultrasound. *Emerg Med Clin North Am* 2004 Aug;22(3):641-59.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15301843>
14. Gaspari R, Horst K. Emergency ultrasound and urinalysis in the evaluation of flank pain. *Acad Emerg Med* 2005 Dec;12(12):1180-4.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16282510>
15. Kartal M, Eray O, Erdogan T, et al. Prospective validation of a current algorithm including bedside US performed by emergency physicians for patients with acute flank pain suspected for renal colic. *Emerg Med J* 2006 May;23(5):341-4.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16627832>
16. Pfister SA, Deckart A, Laschke S, et al. Unenhanced helical computed tomography vs intravenous urography in patients with acute flank pain: accuracy and economic impact in a randomized prospective trial. *Eur Radiol* 2003 Nov;13(11):2513-20.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12898174>
17. Boulay I, Holtz P, Foley WD, et al. Ureteral calculi: diagnostic efficacy of helical CT and implications for treatment of patients. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 1999 Jun;172(6):1485-90.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10350277>
18. Ripollés T, Agramunt M, Errando J, et al. Suspected ureteral colic: plain film and sonography vs unenhanced helical CT. A prospective study in 66 patients. *Eur Radiol* 2004 Jan;14(1):129-36.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12819916>

19. Liu W, Esler SJ, Kenny BJ, et al. Low-dose nonenhanced helical CT of renal colic: assessment of ureteric stone detection and measurement of effective dose equivalent. *Radiology* 2000 Apr;215(1): 51-4.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10751467>
20. Tiselius H-G, Alken P, Buck C, et al. Guidelines on urolithiasis. Chapter 5. Treatment of patients with renal colic. In: EAU Guidelines. Edition presented at the 24th EAU Congress, Stockholm, 2009, pp. 21-2.
<http://www.uroweb.org/nc/professional-resources/guidelines/online/>
21. Holdgate A, Pollock T. Nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) versus opioids for acute renal colic. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2005 Apr;18(2):CD004137.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15846699>
22. Cohen E, Hafner R, Rotenberg Z, et al. Comparison of ketorolac and diclofenac in the treatment of renal colic. *Eur J Clin Pharmacol* 1998 Aug;54(6):455-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9776434>
23. Edwards JE, Meseguer F, Faura C, et al. Single dose dipyron for acute renal colic pain. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2002(4):CD003867.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12519613>
24. Collaborative Group of the Spanish Society of Clinical Pharmacology and García-Alonso F. Comparative study of the efficacy of dipyron, diclofenac sodium and pethidine in acute renal colic. *Eur J Clin Pharmacol* 1991;40(6):543-6.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1884733>
25. Snir N, Moskovitz B, Nativ O, et al. Papaverine hydrochloride for the treatment of renal colic: an old drug revisited. A prospective, randomized study. *J Urol* 2008 Aug;179(4):1411-4.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18289563>
26. Yencilek F, Aktas C, Goktas C, et al. Role of papaverine hydrochloride administration in patients with intractable renal colic: randomized prospective trial. *Urology* 2008 Nov;72(5):987-90.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18789511>
27. Kober A, Dobrovits M, Djavan B, et al. Local active warming: an effective treatment for pain, anxiety and nausea caused by renal colic. *J Urol* 2003 Sep;170(3):741-4.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12913687>
28. Iguchi M, Katoh Y, Koike H, et al. Randomized trial of trigger point injection for renal colic. *Int J Urol* 2002 Sep;9(9):475-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12410926>
29. Springhart WP, Marguet CG, Sur RL, et al. Forced versus minimal intravenous hydration in the management of acute renal colic: a randomized trial. *J Endourol* 2006 Oct;20(10):713-6.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17094744>
30. Worster A, Richards C. Fluids and diuretics for acute ureteric colic. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2005 Jul;20(3):CD004926.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16034958>
31. Tiselius H-G, Alken P, Buck C, et al. Guidelines on urolithiasis. Chapter 16. Internal stenting—when and why. In: EAU Guidelines. Edition presented at the 24th EAU Congress, Stockholm, 2009, pp. 93-5.
<http://www.uroweb.org/nc/professional-resources/guidelines/online/>
32. Tiselius H-G, Alken P, Buck C, et al. Guidelines on urolithiasis. Chapters 5-19. In: EAU Guidelines. Edition presented at the 24th EAU Congress, Stockholm, 2009, pp. 21-115.
<http://www.uroweb.org/nc/professional-resources/guidelines/online/>
33. Grabe M, Bishop MC, Bjerkklund-Johansen TE, et al. Guidelines on urological Infections. Chapter 2. Uncomplicated urinary tract infections in adults. In: EAU Guidelines. Edition presented at the 24th EAU Congress, Stockholm, 2009, pp. 11-29.
<http://www.uroweb.org/nc/professional-resources/guidelines/online/>
34. Sutherland RW, Chung SK, Roth DR, et al. Pediatric pyeloplasty: outcome analysis based on patient age and surgical technique. *Urology* 1997 Dec;50(6):963-6.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9426731>
35. Vijayaraghavan SB, Kandasamy SV, Mysamy A, et al. Sonographic features of necrosed renal papillae causing hydronephrosis. *J Ultrasound Med* 2003 Sep;22(9):951-6.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14510267>
36. Leong FT, Freeman LJ. Acute renal infarction. *J R Soc Med* 2005 Mar;98:121-2.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15738558>
37. Markowitz G, Brignol F, Burns E, et al. Renal vein thrombosis treated with thrombolytic therapy: case report and brief review. *Am J Kidney Dis* 1995 May;25(5):801-6.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7747736>

38. Kim HS, Fine DM, Atta MG. Catheter-directed thrombectomy and thrombolysis for acute renal vein thrombosis. *J Vasc Interv Radiol* 2006 May;17(5):815-22.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16687747>
39. Albi G, del Campo L, Tagarro D. Wunderlich's syndrome: causes, diagnosis and radiological management. *Clin Radiol* 2002 Sep;57(9):840-5.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12384111>
40. Quintero Rodríguez R, Arrabal Martín M, Camacho Martínez E, et al. [Conservative treatment of Wunderlich syndrome in a functional monorenal patient]. *Actas Urol Esp* 1993 May;17(5):325-8.
[Article in Spanish]
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8342432>

7. ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THE TEXT

This list is not comprehensive for the most common abbreviations.

AMPA	α -amino-3-hydroxyl-5-methyl-4-isoxazole-propionate
ATC	around-the-clock
CNS	central nervous system
COX	cyclo-oxygenase
CT	computed tomography
EDTMP	ethylenediaminetetramethylenephosphonate
EORTC	European Organisation for Research and Treatment of Cancer
ESWL	extracorporeal shock wave lithotripsy
GABA	gamma-aminobutyric acid
GFR	glomerular filtration rate
GCP	good clinical practice
IASP	International Association for the Study of Pain
im	intramuscular
iv	intravenous
IVU	intravenous urography
¹³¹ J-MIBG	¹³¹ J-metaiodobenzylguanidine
MRI	magnetic resonance imaging
NMDA	N-methyl-D-aspartate
NRS	numerical rating scale
NSAIDs	non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs
PACU	post-anaesthesia care unit
PCa	prostate cancer
PCA	patient-controlled analgesia
PCEA	patient-controlled epidural analgesia
prn	as needed
PRPE	perineal radical prostatectomy
RCC	renal cell carcinoma
RLND	retroperitoneal lymph node dissection
sc	subcutaneous
¹⁵³ Sm	samarium-153
⁸⁹ Sr	strontium-89
SRI	selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors
SPECT	single photon emission computed tomography
TCA	tricyclic antidepressants
TCC	transitional cell carcinoma
TURB	transurethral resection of bladder tumour
TURP	transurethral resection of prostate
UHCT	unenhanced helical CT
VAS	visual analogue scale
VRS	verbal rating scale
WHO	World Health Organization

Conflict of interest

All members of the General Pain Management Guidelines working group have provided disclosure statements on all relationships that they have and that might be perceived to be a potential source of conflict of interest. This information is kept on file in the European Association of Urology Central Office database. This guidelines document was developed with the financial support of the European Association of Urology. No external sources of funding and support have been involved. The EAU is a non-profit organisation and funding is limited to administrative assistance and travel and meeting expenses. No honoraria or other reimbursements have been provided.