CHILDREN'S ONCOLOGY GROUP

COG Supportive Care Endorsed Guidelines

Version date: July 23, 2025

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

Supportive Care Guidelines Currently Endorsed by COG	
1. Guideline for **Antibacterial Prophylaxis** Administration in Pediatric Cancer and Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation Date of endorsement: June 2020	See page 3
2. Clinical Practice Guideline for Systemic **Antifungal Prophylaxis** in Pediatric Patients with Cancer and Hematopoietic Stem-Cell Transplantation Recipients Date of endorsement: August 2020	See page 6
3. Prevention and Treatment of **Chemotherapy-induced Nausea and Vomiting** in Children Receiving Chemotherapy Dates of endorsement: Oct 2016, Jan 2018, July 2021, February 2023 and December 2023.	See page 11
4. Guidelines on the Management of **Chronic Pain** in Children Date of endorsement: July 2021	See page 21
5. Prevention of **Cisplatin-induced Ototoxicity** in Children and Adolescents with Cancer: a Clinical Practice Guideline Date of endorsement: August 2020	See page 24
6. Guideline for the Management of **Clostridioides difficile Infection** in Pediatric Patients With Cancer and Hematopoietic Cell Transplantation Recipients Date of endorsement: August 2024	See page 25
7. Less Restrictions in **Daily Life**: a Clinical Practice Guideline for Children with Cancer Date of endorsement: March 2025	See page 27
8. Guideline for the Management of **Fatigue** in Children and Adolescents with Cancer or Pediatric Hematopoietic Cell Transplant Recipients: 2023 Update Date of endorsement: January 2024	See page 29

9. Guideline for Management of **Fever and Neutropenia** Date of endorsement: May 2023	See page 30
10. **Fertility Preservation** for Patients with Cancer Date of endorsement: November 2018	See page 33
11. **Food Restrictions** to Prevent Infections Date of endorsement: June 2025	See page 37
12. Guideline for the Prevention of Oral and Oropharyngeal **Mucositis** Date of endorsement: December 2021	See page 38
13. Treatment of Pediatric Venous **Thromboembolism** Date of endorsement: May 2019	See page 41

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

Table of Contents

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*see Appendix 1

Table of Contents

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*see Appendix 1

Table of Contents

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

This document summarizes four clinical practice guidelines on the topic of chemotherapy-induced nausea and vomiting:
I. The "Classification of the Acute Emetogenicity of Chemotherapy in Pediatric Patients: A Clinical Practice Guideline" developed by the Pediatric Oncology Group of Ontario (endorsed by the COG Supportive Care Guideline Task Force in August 2019).
II. The "Antiemetics: ASCO Guideline Update" developed by the American Society of Clinical Oncology (endorsed by the COG Supportive Care Guideline Task Force in December 2020)
III. The "Prevention of acute and delayed chemotherapy-induced nausea and vomiting in pediatric cancer patients: A clinical practice guideline" developed by the Pediatric Oncology Group of Ontario (endorsed by the COG Supportive Care Guideline Task Force in February 2023) and
IV. The "Prevention and treatment of anticipatory chemotherapy-induced nausea and vomiting in pediatric cancer patients and hematopoietic stem cell recipients: Clinical practice guideline update" developed by the Pediatric Oncology Group of Ontario (endorsed by the COG Supportive Care Guideline Task Force in July 2021).
V. The "Treatment of breakthrough and prevention of refractory chemotherapy-induced nausea and vomiting in pediatric cancer patients: Clinical practice guideline update" developed by the Pediatric Oncology Group of Ontario (endorsed by the COG Supportive Care Guideline Task Force in December 2023).

3.1 **Classification of Chemotherapy Emetogenicity**

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

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

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

Summary of Recommendations for the Classification of Chemotherapy Emetogenicity

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence*
1. Which chemotherapy regimens are highly emetogenic?	
Single-agent regimens: Asparaginase (*Erwinia*) IV ≥ 20,000 IU/m^2/dose Busulfan IV ≥ 0.8mg/kg/dose Busulfan PO ≥ 1mg/kg/dose Carboplatin IV ≥ 175 mg/m^2/dose Cisplatin IV ≥ 12 mg/m^2/dose Cyclophosphamide IV ≥ 1,200 mg/m^2/dose Cytarabine IV ≥ 3g/m^2/day Dactinomycin IV ≥ 1.35 mg/m^2/dose Doxorubicin IV ≥ 30 mg/m^2/dose Idarubicin PO ≥ 30 mg/m^2/dose Melphalan IV Methotrexate IV ≥ 12 g/m^2/dose	Strong recommendation Very low to high quality of evidence
Multiple-agent regimens: Cyclophosphamide ≥ 600 mg/m^2/dose + dactinomycin ≥ 1 mg/m^2/dose Cyclophosphamide ≥ 400 mg/m^2/dose + doxorubicin ≥ 40 mg/m^2/dose Cytarabine IV ≥ 90 mg/m^2/dose + methotrexate IV ≥ 150 mg/m^2/dose Cytarabine IV + teniposide IV Dacarbazine IV ≥ 250 mg/m^2/dose + doxorubicin IV ≥ 60 mg/m^2/dose Dactinomycin IV ≥ 900 µg/m^2/dose + ifosfamide IV ≥ 3 g/m^2/dose Etoposide IV ≥ 60 mg/m^2/dose + ifosfamide IV ≥ 1.2 g/m^2/dose Etoposide IV ≥ 250 mg/m^2/dose + thiotepa IV ≥ 300 mg/m^2/dose	

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence*
2. Which single-agent and multiple-agent chemotherapy regimens are moderately emetogenic?	
Single-agent regimens: Cyclophosphamide IV 1000 mg/m^2/dose Cytarabine IV 75 mg/m^2/dose Dactinomycin IV 10 μg/kg/dose Doxorubicin IV 25 mg/m^2/dose Gemtuzumab IV 3–9mg/m^2/dose Imatinib PO > 260 mg/m^2/day Interferon alpha IV 15–30 million U/m^2/day Ixabepilone IV 3–10 mg/m^2/dose Methotrexate IV 5 g/m^2/dose Methotrexate IT Topotecan PO 0.4–2.3 mg/m^2/day Multiple-agent regimens: Cytarabine IV 100 mg/m^2/dose + daunorubicin IV 45 mg/m^2/dose + etoposide IV 100 mg/m^2/dose + prednisolone PO + thioguanine PO 80mg/m^2/dose Cytarabine 60 or 90 mg/m^2/dose + methotrexate 120 mg/m^2/dose Liposomal doxorubicin IV 20–50 mg/m^2/dose + topotecan PO 0.6mg/m^2/day	Strong recommendation Very low to high quality of evidence

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence*
3. Which single-agent and multiple-agent chemotherapy regimens are of low emetogenicity?	
Single-agent regimens: Cyclophosphamide IV 500 mg/m^2/dose Cyclophosphamide PO2–3 mg/kg/dose Dasatinib PO 60–120 mg/m^2/dose Erlotinib PO 35–150 mg/m^2/day Everolimus PO 0.8–9mg/m^2/day Gefitinib PO 150–500 mg/m^2/day Imatinib PO 260 mg/m^2/day Mafosfamide IT 1–6.5 mg/dose Melphalan PO 0.2 mg/kg/dose Mercaptopurine PO ≤ 4.2mg/kg/dose Methotrexate 38–83 mg/m^2/dose IV Mitoxantrone IV ≤ 33 mg/m^2/dose Procarbazine PO 50–100 mg/m^2/day Ruxolitinib PO 15–21 mg/m^2/dose Selumetinib PO 20–30 mg/m^2/dose Sorafenib PO 150–325 mg/m^2/dose Temozolomide PO 200 mg/m^2/dose Multiple-agent regimens: Cytarabine IV 60 mg/m^2/dose + methotrexate IV 90 mg/m^2/dose	Strong recommendation Very low to moderate quality of evidence
4. Which single-agent and multiple-agent chemotherapy regimens are minimally emetogenic?	
Single-agent regimens: Asparaginase (*E. coli*) IM ≤ 6000 IU/m^2/dose Asparaginase (*Erwinia*) IM ≤ 25 000 IU/m^2/dose Chlorambucil ≤ 0.2mg/kg/day PO Doxorubicin IV 10 mg/m^2/dose Liposomal doxorubicin IV ≤ 50 mg/m^2/dose Mercaptopurine PO ≤ 4.2mg/kg/dose Methotrexate PO/SC ≤ 10 mg/m^2/dose Pracinostat PO 25–45 mg/m^2/dose Vincristine IV ≤ 1.5mg/m^2/dose Multiple-agent regimens: Cisplatin ≤ 60 mg/m^2/dose intra-arterially + doxorubicin ≤ 30 mg/m^2/dose intra-arterially Cisplatin ≤ 60 mg/m^2/dose intra-arterially + pirarubicin ≤ 30 mg/m^2/dose intra-arterially Mercaptopurine PO ≤ 2.5mg/kg/dose + methotrexate PO ≤ 0.1mg/kg/day	Strong recommendation Very low to low quality of evidence

*see Appendix 1

3.2 **Prevention of Acute Chemotherapy-induced Nausea and Vomiting**

The "Antiemetics: ASCO Update" developed by the American Society of Clinical Oncology was endorsed by the COG in December 2020.

The source guideline is published (Hesketh P, Kris MG, Basch E et al. JCO 2020; 38 (24): 2782-97.) and is available at: https://ascopubs.org/doi/10.1200/JCO.20.01296

The "Prevention of acute and delayed chemotherapy-induced nausea and vomiting in pediatric cancer patients: A clinical practice guideline" developed by the Pediatric Oncology Group of Ontario was endorsed by the COG in February 2023.

The source guideline is published (Patel P, Robinson PD, Cohen M, et al. Prevention of acute and delayed chemotherapy-induced nausea and vomiting in pediatric cancer patients: A clinical practice guideline. Pediatr Blood Cancer. 2022 Dec;69(12):e30001) and is available at: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1002/pbc.30001

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

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

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence*
1. In pediatric patients receiving highly emetogenic chemotherapy (HEC), what strategies are recommended to prevent acute CINV?	
• Use a 5HT3RA + dexamethasone + (fos)aprepitant	Strong recommendation High quality evidence
• Use palonosetron + dexamethasone in patients unable to receive (fos)aprepitant	Strong recommendation Moderate quality evidence
• Use palonosetron + (fos)aprepitant in patients unable to receive dexamethasone	Strong recommendation Low quality evidence
• Use palonosetron in patients unable to receive dexamethasone + (fos)aprepitant	Strong recommendation Moderate quality evidence
• Consider adding olanzapine to other CPG-consistent antiemetics	Conditional recommendation Moderate quality evidence

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence
2. In pediatric patients receiving moderately emetogenic chemotherapy (MEC), what strategies are recommended to prevent acute CINV?	
a. Use a 5HT3RA + dexamethasone	Strong recommendation Moderate quality evidence
b. Use a 5HT3RA + (fos)aprepitant in patients unable to receive dexamethasone	Strong recommendation Low quality evidence
c. Use a 5HT3RA in patients unable to receive dexamethasone + (fos)aprepitant	Strong recommendation Low quality evidence
d. Consider using palonosetron as the preferred 5HT3RA in patients unable to receive dexamethasone + (fos)aprepitant	Conditional recommendation Low quality evidence
e. Consider adding olanzapine to other CPG-consistent antiemetics in patients unable to receive dexamethasone + (fos)aprepitant	Conditional recommendation Low quality evidence
3. In pediatric patients receiving low emetogenic chemotherapy (LEC), what strategies are recommended to prevent acute CINV?	
a. Use a 5HT3RA	Strong recommendation Low quality evidence
4. In pediatric patients receiving minimally emetogenic chemotherapy (minEC), what strategies are recommended to prevent acute CINV?	
a. Do not use prophylaxis routinely	Strong recommendation Very low quality evidence

CINV, chemotherapy-induced nausea and vomiting; 5HT3RA, serotonin-3 receptor antagonist; (fos)aprepitant, IV fosaprepitant or oral aprepitant
*see Appendix 1

3.3 **Prevention and Treatment of Delayed Chemotherapy-Induced Nausea and Vomiting**

The "Prevention of acute and delayed chemotherapy-induced nausea and vomiting in pediatric cancer patients: A clinical practice guideline" developed by the Pediatric Oncology Group of Ontario was endorsed by the COG in February 2023.

The source guideline is published (Patel P, Robinson PD, Cohen M, et al. Prevention of acute and delayed chemotherapy-induced nausea and vomiting in pediatric cancer patients: A clinical practice guideline. Pediatr Blood Cancer. 2022 Dec;69(12):e30001) and is available at: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1002/pbc.30001

The purpose of this guideline is to provide evidence-based guidance on strategies for delayed chemotherapy-induced nausea and vomiting prevention. The recommendations of the endorsed guideline are presented below.

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

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence*
1. In pediatric patients receiving highly emetogenic chemotherapy (HEC), what strategies are recommended to prevent delayed CINV?	
a. Use palonosetron in the acute phase as the preferred 5HT3RA in patients at high risk of delayed phase CINV	Strong recommendation Moderate quality evidence
b. Use oral aprepitant in the delayed phase, if (fos)aprepitant started in the acute phase	Strong recommendation High quality evidence
c. Add dexamethasone in the delayed phase in patients who received granisetron or ondansetron in the acute phase	Strong recommendation Moderate quality evidence
d. Consider adding dexamethasone in the delayed phase in patients who received palonosetron in the acute phase	Conditional recommendation Moderate quality evidence
e. Use dexamethasone in the delayed phase in patients unable to receive oral aprepitant	Strong recommendation Moderate quality evidence
f. Continue olanzapine in the delayed phase, if started in the acute phase	Strong recommendation Moderate quality evidence
g. Do not use 5HT3RAs in the delayed phase	Strong recommendation Low quality evidence
2. In pediatric patients receiving moderately emetogenic chemotherapy (MEC), what strategies are recommended to prevent delayed CINV?	
a. Consider using dexamethasone in the delayed phase	Conditional recommendation Low quality evidence
b. Continue oral aprepitant in the delayed phase in patients receiving single-day chemotherapy who received (fos)aprepitant in the acute phase	Strong recommendation Moderate quality evidence
c. Consider not using oral aprepitant in the delayed phase in patients receiving multi-day chemotherapy (≥ 3 days) who received (fos)aprepitant in the acute phase	Conditional recommendation Low quality evidence
d. Continue olanzapine in the delayed phase, if started in the acute phase	Strong recommendation Low quality evidence
3. In pediatric patients receiving low emetogenic chemotherapy (LEC), what strategies are recommended to prevent delayed CINV?	
a. Do not use prophylaxis routinely in the delayed phase	Strong recommendation Very low quality evidence
4. In pediatric patients receiving minimally emetogenic chemotherapy (minEC), what strategies are recommended to prevent delayed CINV?	
a. Do not use prophylaxis routinely in the delayed phase	Strong recommendation Very low quality evidence

CINV, chemotherapy-induced nausea and vomiting; 5HT3RA, serotonin-3 receptor antagonist; (fos)aprepitant, IV fosaprepitant or oral aprepitant

*See Appendix 1

3.4 **Prevention and Treatment of Anticipatory Chemotherapy-Induced Nausea and Vomiting**

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

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

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

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

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

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

*See Appendix 1.

3.5 Treatment of Breakthrough and Prevention of Refractory Chemotherapy-induced Nausea and Vomiting

The "Treatment of breakthrough and prevention of refractory chemotherapy-induced nausea and vomiting in pediatric cancer patients: Clinical practice guideline update", developed by the Pediatric Oncology Group of Ontario, was endorsed by the COG in December 2023.

The source guideline is published (Patel P, Robinson PD, Phillips R, et al. Pediatr Blood Cancer 2023; 70:e30395.) and is available at: https://doi.org/10.1002/pbc.30395

The purpose of this guideline is to provide those caring for pediatric oncology or hematopoietic stem cell recipients up to 18 years of age with updated recommendations for the treatment of breakthrough CINV and the prevention of refractory CINV. Breakthrough CINV is defined as nausea and/or vomiting that occurs during the acute or delayed phase of chemotherapy despite receipt of CINV prophylaxis. Refractory CINV occurs in patients who have experienced breakthrough CINV in previous chemotherapy blocks. The recommendations of the endorsed guideline are presented below.

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

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence*
1. What strategies are recommended to treat breakthrough CINV in pediatric patients?	
1.1 Escalate the antiemetic agents provided in the current chemotherapy block to those recommended for CINV prophylaxis for chemotherapy of the next higher level of emetogenic risk in pediatric patients with breakthrough CINV receiving acute and delayed CINV prophylaxis recommended for minEC, LEC or MEC.	Strong recommendation Low-quality evidence
1.2 In pediatric patients receiving acute or delayed CINV prophylaxis recommended for HEC who are not already receiving palonosetron, consider giving palonosetron instead of ondansetron/granisetron at the next scheduled ondansetron/granisetron administration time during the acute phase of the current chemotherapy block	Conditional recommendation Low-quality evidence
1.3 In pediatric patients receiving acute or delayed CINV prophylaxis recommended for HEC, consider adding one or more of the following antiemetic agents in the current chemotherapy block in patients who are not already receiving them: • dexamethasone • (fos)aprepitant† • olanzapine	Conditional recommendation Moderate-quality evidence
1.4 In pediatric patients receiving acute or delayed CINV prophylaxis recommended for HEC, consider adding metoclopramide in the current chemotherapy block in pediatric patients unable to receive olanzapine	Conditional recommendation Low-quality evidence

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence*
2. What strategies are recommended to prevent refractory CINV in pediatric patients who have experienced breakthrough CINV?	
2.1 Use CPG-consistent antiemetic agents that controlled breakthrough CINV in previous chemotherapy blocks	Strong recommendation Low-quality evidence
2.2 Use the antiemetic agents recommended for CINV prophylaxis for chemotherapy of the next higher level of emetogenic risk in patients who did not experience control of breakthrough CINV in previous chemotherapy blocks and are receiving minEC or LEC	Strong recommendation Moderate-quality evidence
2.3 Consider adding one or more of the following, if not already receiving them, in patients who did not experience control of breakthrough CINV in previous chemotherapy blocks and are receiving MEC or HEC: • dexamethasone • (fos)aprepitant† • olanzapine	Conditional recommendation Moderate-quality evidence
2.4 Consider offering one or more of the following to patients who experience refractory CINV despite receipt of all suitable CPG-consistent antiemetic agents: • CINV-focused dietary counselling • yoga	Conditional recommendation Low-quality evidence

HEC, highly emetogenic chemotherapy; MEC, moderately emetogenic chemotherapy; LEC, low emetogenic chemotherapy; minEC, minimally emetogenic chemotherapy.

*See Appendix 1

†IV fosaprepitant or oral aprepitant

Table of Contents

4. Management of Chronic Pain in Children

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*see Appendix 1

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

BEST PRACTICES FOR THE CLINICAL MANAGEMENT OF CHRONIC PAIN IN CHILDREN
1. Children with chronic pain and their families and caregivers must be cared for from a biopsychological perspective; pain should not be treated simply as a biomedical problem.
2. A comprehensive biopsychosocial assessment is essential to inform pain management and planning. As a component of this assessment, healthcare providers should use age-, context- and culturally appropriate tools to screen for, and monitor, pain intensity and its impact on the quality of life of the child and family.
3. Children with chronic pain must have a thorough evaluation of any underlying conditions and access to appropriate treatment for those conditions, in addition to appropriate interventions for the management of pain. Chronic pain in childhood often exists with comorbid conditions affecting the child's health, and social and emotional well-being, which require concurrent management.
4. Children presenting with chronic pain should be assessed by healthcare providers who are skilled and experienced in the evaluation, diagnosis and management of chronic pain.
5. Management, whether with physical therapies, psychological or pharmacological interventions, or combinations thereof, should be tailored to the child's health; underlying condition; developmental age; physical, language and cognitive abilities; and social and emotional needs.
6. Care of children with chronic pain should be child- and family-centred. That is, the child's care should: i. focus on, and be organized around, the health needs, preferences and expectations of the child, and their families and communities; ii. be tailored to the family's values, culture, preferences and resources; and iii. promote engagement and support children and their families to play an active role in care through informed and shared decision-making.
7. Families and caregivers must receive timely and accurate information. Shared decision-making and clear communication are essential to good clinical care. Communication with patients should correspond to their cognitive, development and language abilities. There must be adequate time in a comfortable space for discussions and questions regarding care management plans and progress.

BEST PRACTICES FOR THE CLINICAL MANAGEMENT OF CHRONIC PAIN IN CHILDREN
8. The child and their family and caregivers should be treated in a comprehensive and integrated manner: all aspects of the child's development and well-being must be attended to, including their cognitive, emotional and physical health. Moreover, the child's educational, cultural and social needs and goals must be addressed as part of the care management plan.
9. In children with chronic pain, an interdisciplinary, multimodal approach should be adopted which is tailored to the needs and desires of the child, family and caregivers, and to available resources. The biopsychosocial model of pain supports the use of multiple modalities to address the management of chronic pain.
10. Policy-makers, programme managers and healthcare providers, as well as families and caregivers must attend to opioid stewardship to ensure the rational and cautious use of opioids. The essential practices of opioid stewardship in children include: i. Opioids must only be used for appropriate indications and prescribed by trained providers, with careful assessments of the benefits and risks. The use of opioids by individuals, their impact on pain and their adverse effects must be continuously monitored and evaluated by trained providers. ii. The prescribing provider must have a clear plan for the continuation, tapering or discontinuation of opioids according to the child's condition. The child and family must be apprised of the plan and its rationale. iii. There must be due attention to procurement, storage and the disposal of unused opioids.

Table of Contents

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

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

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

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

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

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

*see Appendix 1

Table of Contents

6. Guideline for the Management of Clostridioides difficile Infection in Pediatric Patients with Cancer and Hematopoietic Cell Transplantation Recipients

The "Guideline for the Management of *Clostridioides difficile* Infection in Pediatric Patients with Cancer and Hematopoietic Cell Transplantation Recipients: 2024 Update" developed by the Pediatric Oncology Group of Ontario (POGO) was endorsed by the COG Supportive Care Guideline Committee in August 2024.

The source guideline is published (Patel P, Robinson PD, Fisher BT, et al. Guideline for the management of *Clostridioides difficile* Infection in pediatric patients with cancer and hematopoietic cell transplantation recipients: 2024 Update. eClinMed 2024.) and is available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2024.102604

The purpose of the source guideline is to update the previously created clinical practice guideline for the management of *Clostridioides difficile* in pediatric patients with cancer and pediatric hematopoietic cell transplantation recipients. Recommendations and good practice statements from the endorsed clinical practice guideline are presented in the tables below.

Summary of Recommendations for the Management of *Clostridioides difficile* Infection (CDI) in Pediatric Patients with Cancer and Hematopoietic Cell Transplantation (HCT) Recipients

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence*
What interventions should be used for the prevention of CDI in pediatric patients with cancer and HCT recipients?	
1. We suggest that probiotics not be used routinely for the prevention of CDI in pediatric patients with cancer and HCT recipients	Conditional recommendation Low quality evidence
What interventions should be used for the treatment of CDI in pediatric patients with cancer and HCT recipients?	
2. Use either oral metronidazole or oral vancomycin for the treatment of non-severe CDI in pediatric patients with cancer and HCT recipients	Strong recommendation Low quality evidence
3. Use either oral vancomycin or oral fidaxomicin for the treatment of severe CDI in pediatric patients with cancer or HCT recipients	Strong recommendation Low quality evidence
4. Consider fidaxomicin for the treatment of recurrent CDI in pediatric patients with cancer and HCT recipients	Conditional recommendation Low quality evidence
5. Do not use fecal microbiota transplantation routinely for the treatment of CDI in pediatric patients with cancer and HCT recipients	Strong recommendation Low quality evidence
6. We suggest that monoclonal antibodies not be used routinely for the treatment of CDI in pediatric patients with cancer and HCT recipients	Conditional recommendation Low quality evidence
7. We suggest that probiotics not be used routinely for the treatment of CDI in pediatric patients with cancer and HCT recipients	Conditional recommendation Low quality evidence

*see Appendix 1

Summary of Good Practice Statements for the Management of *Clostridioides Difficile* Infection (CDI) in Pediatric Patients with Cancer and Hematopoietic Cell Transplantation (HCT) Recipients

GOOD PRACTICE STATEMENTS
1. In pediatric patients with cancer and HCT recipients experiencing CDI, follow infection control practices including isolation according to jurisdictional policies
2. In pediatric patients with cancer and HCT recipients, especially those who have experienced CDI, minimize systemic antibacterial administration where feasible

Table of Contents

7. Less restrictions in daily life: a clinical practice guideline for children with cancer

"Less restrictions in daily life: a clinical practice guideline for children with cancer", developed by the Dutch Children's Oncology Group, was endorsed by the COG Supportive Care Guideline Committee in March 2025.

The source guideline is published (Stavleu DC, Mulder RL, Kruimer DM, et al. Less restrictions in daily life: a clinical practice guideline for children with cancer. Supportive Care in Cancer. 2024;32(7):419.) and is available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s00520-024-08537-9

The purpose of the source guideline is to develop a clinical practice guideline for clinicians, children, and their parents regarding social restrictions in children with cancer. The good practice statement and clinical practice guideline-derived recommendations from the endorsed clinical practice guideline are presented in the table below. The source guideline also includes expert opinion statements. Those who are reviewing the clinical practice guideline-derived recommendations for implementation may consider reviewing the expert opinion statements for added context.

Summary of Recommendations for Less Restrictions in Daily Life: a Clinical Practice Guideline for Children with Cancer

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence*
1. We recommend against the use of bath toys that have a reservoir (in which water can be retained) or bath toys that cannot be dried thoroughly.	Strong recommendation Very low quality evidence
2.1 We suggest not to use warm publicly accessible bubble baths.	Weak recommendation Very low quality evidence
3. We suggest not to use chlorhexidine bathing or other bath wipes as it does not have an added value to basic hygiene measures.	Weak recommendation Very low quality evidence
9.1 We suggest allowing to keep domestic pets in the households of children with cancer.	Weak recommendation Very low quality evidence
11 We recommend allowing children with cancer to attend school or kindergarten irrespective of neutropenia (unless someone in their class or group has a contagious disease with potential severe consequences, e.g. varicella zoster).	Strong recommendation Very low quality evidence
13.1 We suggest allowing children with cancer to swim (irrespective of neutropenia).	Weak recommendation Very low quality evidence

*see Appendix 1

Good Practice Statement for Less Restrictions in Daily Life:
a Clinical Practice Guideline for Children with Cancer

GOOD PRACTICE STATEMENT
Proper hand hygiene should be performed by parents, caregivers and medical personnel.

Table of Contents

8. Management of Fatigue in Children and Adolescents with Cancer and in Pediatric Hematopoietic Cell Transplant Recipients

The "Guideline for the management of fatigue in children and adolescents with cancer or pediatric hematopoietic cell transplant recipients: 2023 update" was endorsed by the COG Supportive Care Guideline Task Force in January 2024.

The source guideline is published (Patel P, Robinson PD, van der Torre P, et al. Guideline for the management of fatigue in children and adolescents with cancer or pediatric hematopoietic cell transplant recipients: 2023 update. eClinicalMedicine 2023; 63: 102147.) and is available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2023.102147

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

The recommendations of the endorsed guideline are presented below.

Summary of Recommendations for the Management of Fatigue in Children and Adolescents with Cancer or Pediatric Hematopoietic Cell Transplant (HCT) Recipients

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence*
What are effective interventions for the management of fatigue in children and adolescents with cancer or pediatric HCT recipients?	
• Use physical activity interventions to manage fatigue in children and adolescents with cancer or paediatric HCT recipients	Strong recommendation High quality evidence
• Do not routinely use pharmacological approaches to manage fatigue in children and adolescents with cancer or pediatric HCT recipients	Strong recommendation Moderate quality evidence
• Offer relaxation, mindfulness, or both to manage fatigue in children and adolescents with cancer or pediatric HCT recipients	Strong recommendation Moderate quality evidence
• In settings where strongly recommended approaches are not feasible or were not successful, consider offering cognitive or cognitive behavioural therapies to manage fatigue in children and adolescents with cancer or pediatric HCT recipients	Conditional recommendation Moderate quality evidence
Routinely assess for fatigue, ideally using a validated scale, in children and adolescents with cancer or pediatric HCT recipients	Good practice statement

*see Appendix 1

Table of Contents

9. Guideline for the Management of Fever and Neutropenia in Pediatric Patients with Cancer and Hematopoietic Cell Transplantation Recipients

The "Guideline for the Management of Fever and Neutropenia in Pediatric Patients with Cancer and Hematopoietic Cell Transplantation Recipients: 2023 Update" was endorsed by the COG Supportive Care Guideline Committee in May 2023.

The source guideline is published in the Journal of Clinical Oncology 2023 41:9, 1774-1785: https://ascopubs.org/doi/abs/10.1200/JCO.22.02224

The purpose of this guideline is to provide evidence-based recommendations for the empiric management of fever and neutropenia in pediatric patients with cancer and hematopoietic cell transplant patients. The recommendations of the endorsed guideline are presented below.

Summary of Recommendations for the Empiric Management of Fever and Neutropenia

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence*
A. Initial Management	
Risk Stratification	
A1. Adopt a validated risk stratification strategy and incorporate it into routine clinical management	Strong recommendation Low quality evidence
Evaluation	
A2. Obtain blood cultures at onset of fever and neutropenia from all lumens of central venous catheters	Strong recommendation Low quality evidence
A3. Consider obtaining peripheral blood cultures concurrent with central venous catheter cultures	Conditional recommendation Moderate quality evidence
A4. Consider urinalysis and urine culture in patients where a clean-catch, mid-stream specimen is readily available	Conditional recommendation Low quality evidence
A5. Obtain chest radiography only in patients with respiratory signs or symptoms	Strong recommendation Moderate quality evidence
Treatment	
A6. In high-risk fever and neutropenia:	
A6a. Use monotherapy with an antipseudomonal β-lactam, a fourth generation cephalosporin or a carbapenem as empiric antibacterial therapy in pediatric high-risk fever and neutropenia	Strong recommendation High quality evidence
A6b. Reserve addition of a second anti-Gram-negative agent or a glycopeptide for patients who are clinically unstable, when a resistant infection is suspected or for centers with a high rate of resistant pathogens	Strong recommendation Moderate quality evidence
A7. In low-risk fever and neutropenia:	
A7a. Consider initial or step-down outpatient management if the infrastructure is in place to ensure careful monitoring and follow-up	Conditional recommendation Moderate quality evidence

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence*
A7b. Consider oral antibacterial therapy administration if the patient is able to tolerate this route of administration reliably	Conditional recommendation Moderate quality evidence
B. Ongoing Management	
Modification of Treatment	
B1. In patients who are responding to initial empiric antibacterial therapy, discontinue double coverage for Gram-negative infection or empiric glycopeptide (if initiated) after 24 to 72 hours if there is no specific microbiologic indication to continue combination therapy	Strong recommendation Moderate quality evidence
B2. Do not broaden the initial empiric antibacterial regimen based solely on persistent fever in patients who are clinically stable	Strong recommendation Low quality evidence
B3. In patients with persistent fever who become clinically unstable, escalate the initial empiric antibacterial regimen to include coverage for resistant Gram-negative, Gram-positive, and anaerobic bacteria	Strong recommendation Very low-quality evidence
Cessation of Treatment	
B4. In both high-risk and low-risk fever and neutropenia patients who have been clinically well and afebrile for at least 24 hours, discontinue empiric antibacterial therapy if blood cultures remain negative at 48 hours, if there is evidence of marrow recovery	Strong recommendation Low quality evidence
B5. In patients with low-risk fever and neutropenia who have been clinically well and afebrile for at least 24 hours, consider discontinuation of empiric antibacterial therapy if blood cultures remain negative at 48 hours despite no evidence of marrow recovery	Conditional recommendation Moderate quality evidence
C. Empiric Antifungal Treatment	
Risk Stratification	
C1. Invasive fungal disease high-risk patients are those with AML, high-risk acute lymphoblastic leukemia, or relapsed acute leukemia; those with prolonged neutropenia; those receiving high-dose steroids; and those undergoing allogeneic HCT in the first year after HCT without evidence of T-cell reconstitution, or receiving steroids or multiple immune suppressive agents to prevent or treat graft-versus-host disease. Those not meeting these criteria are categorized as invasive fungal disease low-risk patients.	Strong recommendation Low quality evidence
Evaluation	
C2. In terms of biomarkers to guide empiric antifungal management for prolonged (≥ 96 hours) fever with neutropenia in invasive fungal disease high-risk patients:	
C2a. Consider not using serum galactomannan	Conditional recommendation Moderate quality evidence
C2b. Do not use β-D-glucan.	Strong recommendation Low quality evidence
C2c. Do not use fungal polymerase chain reaction testing in blood	Strong recommendation Moderate quality evidence

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence*
C3. In terms of imaging for the evaluation of prolonged (≥ 96 hours) fever with neutropenia in invasive fungal disease high-risk patients:	
C3a. Perform CT of the lungs.	Strong recommendation Low quality evidence
C3b. Consider imaging of abdomen such as ultrasound	Conditional recommendation Low quality evidence
C3c. Consider not routinely performing CT of sinuses in patients without localizing signs or symptoms	Conditional recommendation Low quality evidence
Treatment	
C4. In invasive fungal disease high-risk patients with prolonged (≥ 96 hours) fever with neutropenia unresponsive to broad-spectrum antibacterial therapy, initiate caspofungin or liposomal amphotericin B for empirical antifungal therapy unless a pre-emptive antifungal therapy approach is chosen	Strong recommendation High quality evidence
C5. In non-HCT invasive fungal disease high-risk patients not receiving antimold prophylaxis with prolonged (≥ 96 hours) fever with neutropenia, consider a pre-emptive antifungal therapy approach by deferring empiric antifungal therapy and initiating antifungal therapy only if evaluation suggests of indicates invasive fungal disease	Conditional recommendation Moderate quality evidence
C6. In invasive fungal disease low-risk patients with prolonged (≥ 96 hours) fever with neutropenia, consider withholding empiric antifungal therapy	Conditional recommendation Low quality evidence

HCT, hematopoietic cell transplant

*see Appendix 1

Table of Contents

10. Fertility Preservation for Patients with Cancer

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

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

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

Summary of Recommendations for Fertility Preservation for Patients with Cancer

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

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

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

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

Table of Contents

11. Guideline on Use of Food Restrictions to Prevent Infections

"Use of food restrictions to prevent infections in paediatric patients with cancer and haematopoietic cell transplantation recipients: a systematic review and clinical practice guideline", developed by the Pediatric Oncology Group of Ontario, was endorsed by the COG Supportive Care Guidelines sub-Committee in June 2025.

The source guideline is published (Phillips R, Fisher BT, Ladas E, et al. Use of food restrictions to prevent infections in paediatric patients with cancer and haematopoietic cell transplantation recipients: a systematic review and clinical practice guideline. eClinical Med 2025; 81:103093.) and is available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2025.103093

The purpose of the source guideline is to provide to develop evidence-based recommendations on the use of food restrictions to prevent infections in pediatric patients being treated for cancer or undergoing hematopoietic cell transplant (HCT). The good practice statement and recommendations from the endorsed clinical practice guideline are presented in the tables below.

Good Practice Statement on the Use of Food Restrictions to Prevent Infections in Pediatric Patients with Cancer and Hematopoietic Cell Transplantation (HCT) Recipients

GOOD PRACTICE STATEMENT
Follow practices for safe food handling, storing, preparation and consumption outlined by applicable health authorities.

Summary of Recommendations on the Use of Food Restrictions to Prevent Infections in Pediatric Patients with Cancer and Hematopoietic Cell Transplantation (HCT) Recipients

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence*
1. Should food restrictions be used to prevent infections in pediatric patients with cancer?	
We suggest that food restrictions not be routinely used for the prevention of infections in paediatric patients with cancer.	Conditional recommendation Moderate quality evidence
2. Should food restrictions be used to prevent infections in paediatric HCT recipients?	
We suggest that food restrictions not be routinely used for the prevention of infections in paediatric autologous HCT and allogeneic HCT recipients.	Conditional recommendation Low quality evidence

*see Appendix 1

Table of Contents

12. Guideline for the Prevention of Oral and Oropharyngeal Mucositis

The "Clinical practice guideline for the prevention of oral and oropharyngeal mucositis in pediatric cancer and hematopoietic stem cell transplant patients: 2021 update" developed by the Pediatric Oncology Group of Ontario (POGO) was endorsed by the COG Supportive Care Guideline Committee in December 2021.

The source clinical practice guideline is published (Patel P, et al. Clinical practice guideline for the prevention of oral and oropharyngeal mucositis in pediatric cancer and hematopoietic stem cell transplant patients: 2021 update. Eur J Cancer 2021; 154: 92-101.) and is available at: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S095980492100321X

The purpose of the source clinical practice guideline was to update the 2015 clinical practice guideline for mucositis prevention in pediatric cancer and HSCT patients. The recommendations of the source clinical practice guideline are presented below.

Summary of Recommendations for the Prevention of Oral and Oropharyngeal Mucositis

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence*
What prophylactic interventions are effective at preventing or reducing the severity of oral and oropharyngeal mucositis in pediatric patients (0 to 18 years) receiving treatment for cancer or undergoing HSCT?	
1. Use cryotherapy for older, cooperative pediatric patients receiving treatment for cancer or undergoing HSCT who will receive short infusions of melphalan or 5-fluorouracil. ***Remarks:*** The panel valued the absence of documented adverse effects, low costs and consistent benefits associated with cryotherapy. The duration of melphalan and 5-fluorouracil administration in the included trials was 30 min or less where infusion duration was described. The panel did not believe that cryotherapy would be feasible for chemotherapy administrations longer than 1 h.	Strong recommendation High-quality evidence

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence*
2. Consider using cryotherapy for older, cooperative pediatric patients receiving treatment for cancer or undergoing HSCT who will receive short infusions of chemotherapy associated with mucositis other than melphalan or 5-fluorouracil. ***Remarks:*** The panel hypothesized that the efficacy of cryotherapy is likely generalizable to chemotherapy other than melphalan and 5-fluorouracil. However, the indirectness of the data lowered the panel's certainty and resulted in a conditional recommendation. It is important to counsel families and patients that mucositis may develop even with diligent cryotherapy use, and the efficacy of cryotherapy may vary depending on the chemotherapy regimen administered.	Conditional recommendation Moderate-quality evidence
3. Do not administer palifermin routinely to pediatric patients with cancer receiving treatment for cancer or undergoing HSCT. ***Remarks:*** While the panel acknowledged the significant reduction in severe mucositis associated with palifermin, the observed effect size was relatively modest. Based on its known short-term adverse effects, its potential for long-term negative effects on cancer outcomes, high costs and restricted availability, the panel made a strong recommendation against its routine use.	Strong recommendation High-quality evidence
4. Use intraoral photobiomodulation therapy in the red light spectrum (620–750 nm) for pediatric patients undergoing autologous or allogeneic HSCT and for pediatric patients who will receive radiotherapy for head and neck carcinoma. ***Remarks:*** The panel valued the consistent benefits of photobiomodulation therapy and data regarding feasibility in pediatric patients. The ability to deliver photobiomodulation therapy requires specialized equipment, training and protective eyewear for the patient and those in attendance. The panel believed these requirements to be acceptable given the magnitude of benefit and the restricted patient populations included in the recommendation based on direct data. The ability to deliver photobiomodulation therapy to very young children requires assistance and support from family members and may not always be successful.	Strong recommendation High-quality evidence

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence*
5. Consider using intraoral photobiomodulation therapy in the red light spectrum (620–750 nm) for pediatric patients who will receive radiotherapy for head and neck cancers other than carcinoma. ***Remarks:*** Although direct data were not available, the panel hypothesized that the efficacy of photobiomodulation therapy for head and neck carcinoma patients receiving radiotherapy is likely generalizable to pediatric patients who will receive radiotherapy for other head and neck cancers such as rhabdomyosarcoma. However, the indirectness of the data lowered the panel's certainty and resulted in a conditional recommendation.	Conditional recommendation Moderate-quality evidence
6. Do not administer GCSFs to pediatric patients receiving treatment for cancer or undergoing HSCT for the purpose of mucositis prevention. ***Remarks***: While the panel recognized that patients receive GCSFs for other indications including shortening the duration of neutropenia, the absence of benefit, adverse effects and costs led the panel to make a strong recommendation against its use for the purpose of mucositis prevention.	Strong recommendation High-quality evidence

HSCT: hematopoietic stem cell transplant; GCSFs: granulocyte colony-stimulating factors
*see Appendix 1

Table of Contents

13. Treatment of Pediatric Venous Thromboembolism

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

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

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

Summary of Recommendations for Treatment of Pediatric Venous Thromboembolism

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

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

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

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

*see Appendix 1

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

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

Strength of Recommendations:

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

Strength of Recommendations Determinants:

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

Quality of Evidence or Certainty in Evidence

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

Guyatt, G.H., et al., *GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations.* BMJ, 2008; 336: 924-926.
Guyatt, G.H., et al., *GRADE: going from evidence to recommendations.* BMJ, 2008; 336: 1049-1051.