

**The following guideline is no longer current and its  
recommendations may no longer be valid.  
This document is provided for historical purposes only.**

**ARCHIVED: July 2022**

## **Guideline for the Management of Fever and Neutropenia in Children with Cancer and/or Undergoing Hematopoietic Stem-Cell Transplantation**

### **COG Supportive Care Endorsed Guidelines**

Click [here](#) to see all the COG Supportive Care Endorsed Guidelines.

#### DISCLAIMER

**For Informational Purposes Only:** The information and contents offered in or in connection with the *Children's Oncology Group Supportive Care Endorsed Guidelines* (the "Guidelines") is provided only for informational purposes to children affected by cancer, their families and their health care providers. The Guidelines are not intended to substitute for medical advice, medical care, diagnosis or treatment obtained from doctors or other healthcare providers.

While the Children's Oncology Group tries to provide accurate and up-to-date information, the information in the Guidelines may be or may become out of date or incomplete. The information and guidelines may not conform to current standard of care, state-of-the art, or best practices for a particular disease, condition, or treatment. Some information in the Guidelines may be intended to be used by clinical researchers in special clinical settings or situations that may not apply to you, your child or your patient.

**Special Notice to cancer patients and their parents and legal guardians:** The Children's Oncology Group is a research organization and does not provide individualized medical care or treatment.

*The Guidelines are not intended to replace the independent clinical judgment, medical advice, screening, health counseling, or other intervention performed by your or your child's doctor or other healthcare provider. Please do not rely on this information exclusively and seek the care of a doctor or other medical professional if you have any questions regarding the Guidelines or a specific medical condition, disease, diagnosis or symptom.*

*Please contact "911" or your emergency services for any health emergency!*

**Special Notice to physicians and other healthcare providers:** This document is aimed specifically at members of the Children's Oncology Group or Member affiliates who have agreed to collaborate with the Children's Oncology Group in accordance with the relevant procedures and policies for study conduct and membership participation. Requirements and restrictions applicable to recipients of U.S. governmental funds or restrictions governing certain private donations may apply to the use and distribution of the Guidelines and the information contained herein.

The Guidelines are not intended to replace your independent clinical judgment, medical advice, or to exclude other legitimate criteria for screening, health counseling, or intervention for specific complications of childhood cancer treatment. The Guidelines provided are not intended as a sole source of guidance in the evaluation of childhood cancer patients. Nor are the Guidelines intended to exclude other reasonable alternative care. Specific patient care decisions are the prerogative of the patient, family and healthcare provider.

**Warranty or Liability Assumed by Children's Oncology Group and Related Parties:** While the Children's Oncology Group has tried to assure that the Guidelines are accurate and complete as of the date of publication, no warranty or representation, express or implied, is intended to be made in or with the Guidelines. No liability is assumed by the Children's Oncology Group or any affiliated party or member thereof for damage resulting from the use, review, or access of the Guidelines.

The “Guideline for the Management of Fever and Neutropenia in Children with Cancer and/or Undergoing Hematopoietic Stem-Cell Transplantation” was endorsed by the COG Supportive Care Guideline Committee in September 2017.

The source guideline is published in the Journal of Clinical Oncology 2017; 35: 2082-94:  
<http://ascopubs.org/doi/abs/10.1200/JCO.2016.71.7017>

The purpose of this guideline is to provide evidence-based recommendations for the empiric management of pediatric febrile neutropenia. The recommendations of the endorsed guideline are presented below.

### Summary of Recommendations for the Empiric Management of Febrile Neutropenia

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence
<b>A. Initial Management of Febrile Neutropenia</b>	
<b>Risk Stratification</b>	
A1. Adopt a validated risk stratification strategy and incorporate it into routine clinical management	Strong recommendation Low quality evidence
<b>Evaluation</b>	
A2. Obtain blood cultures at onset of febrile 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	Weak recommendation Moderate quality evidence
A4. Consider urinalysis and urine culture in patients in whom a clean-catch, midstream specimen is readily available	Weak recommendation Low quality evidence
A5. Obtain chest radiography only in patients with respiratory signs or symptoms	Strong recommendation Moderate quality evidence
<b>Treatment</b>	
A6a. In high-risk febrile neutropenia: Use monotherapy with an antipseudomonal $\beta$ -lactam, fourth generation cephalosporin, or a carbapenem as empirical therapy in pediatric high-risk febrile neutropenia	Strong recommendation High quality evidence
A6b. In high-risk febrile neutropenia: Reserve addition of second 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
A7a. In low-risk febrile neutropenia: Consider initial or step-down outpatient management if infrastructure is in place to ensure careful monitoring and follow-up.	Weak recommendation Moderate quality evidence
A7b. In low-risk febrile neutropenia: Consider oral antibiotic administration if the child is able to tolerate this route of administration reliably.	Weak recommendation Moderate quality evidence

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence
<b>B. Ongoing Management of Febrile Neutropenia</b>	
<b>Modification of Treatment</b>	
B1. In patients who are responding to initial empiric antibiotic 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 modify initial empirical antibacterial regimen based solely on persistent fever in children who are clinically stable	Strong recommendation Low quality evidence
B3. In children with persistent fever who become clinically unstable, escalate the initial empirical antibacterial regimen to include coverage for resistant gram-negative, gram-positive, and anaerobic bacteria	Strong recommendation Very low quality evidence
<b>Cessation of Treatment</b>	
B4. In all patients, discontinue empirical antibiotics in patients who have negative blood cultures at 48 hours, who have been afebrile for at least 24 hours, and who have evidence of marrow recovery	Strong recommendation Low quality evidence
B5. In patients with low-risk febrile neutropenia, consider discontinuation of empirical antibiotics at 72 hours in patients who have negative blood cultures and who have been afebrile for at least 24 hours, irrespective of marrow recovery status, as long as careful follow-up is ensured	Weak recommendation Moderate quality evidence
<b>C. Empiric Antifungal Treatment ≥96 Hours after Initiation of Empiric Antibacterial Treatment</b>	
<b>Risk Stratification</b>	
C1. Patients at high risk of invasive fungal disease are those with AML, high-risk ALL, or relapsed acute leukemia and children undergoing allogeneic HSCT. Children with prolonged neutropenia and children receiving high-dose corticosteroids are also at high risk of invasive fungal disease. All others should be categorized as Invasive Fungal Disease low risk.	Strong recommendation Low quality evidence
<b>Evaluation</b>	
C2a. In terms of biomarkers to guide empirical antifungal management for prolonged (≥ 96 hours) febrile neutropenia in invasive fungal disease high-risk patients: Consider not using serum galactomannan	Weak recommendation Moderate quality evidence
C2b. In terms of biomarkers to guide empirical antifungal management for prolonged (≥ 96 hours) febrile neutropenia in invasive fungal disease high-risk patients: Do not use β-D-glucan.	Strong recommendation Low quality evidence
C2c. In terms of biomarkers to guide empirical antifungal management for prolonged (≥ 96 hours) febrile neutropenia in invasive fungal disease high-risk patients: Do not use fungal PCR testing in blood	Strong recommendation Moderate quality evidence

RECOMMENDATIONS	Strength of Recommendation and Quality of Evidence
C3a. In terms of imaging for the evaluation of prolonged (≥ 96 hours) febrile neutropenia in invasive fungal disease high-risk patients: Perform CT of the lungs.	Strong recommendation Low quality evidence
C3b. In terms of imaging for the evaluation of prolonged (≥ 96 hours) febrile neutropenia in invasive fungal disease high-risk patients: Consider imaging of abdomen in patients without localizing signs or symptoms.	Weak recommendation Low quality evidence
C3c. In terms of imaging for the evaluation of prolonged (≥ 96 hours) febrile neutropenia in invasive fungal disease high-risk patients: Consider not routinely performing CT of sinuses in patients without localizing signs or symptoms.	Weak recommendation Low quality evidence
<b>Treatment</b>	
C4. In invasive fungal disease patients with prolonged (≥ 96 hours) febrile neutropenia unresponsive to broad-spectrum antibacterial agents, initiate caspofungin or liposomal amphotericin B for empirical antifungal therapy.	Strong recommendation High quality evidence
C5. In invasive fungal disease low risk patients with prolonged (≥ 96 hours) febrile neutropenia, consider withholding empirical antifungal therapy.	Weak recommendation Low quality evidence

ARCHIVED

## Appendix 1: GRADE

### Strength of Recommendations:

<b>Strong Recommendation</b>	When using GRADE, panels make strong recommendations when they are confident that the desirable effects of adherence to a recommendation outweigh the undesirable effects.
<b>Weak Recommendation</b>	Weak 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

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