Published in final edited form as:

Patient. 2018 April ; 11(2): 147–153. doi:10.1007/s40271-017-0279-z.

Symptom Monitoring in Pediatric Oncology using Patient-Reported Outcomes: Why, How, and Where Next

Allison Barz Leahy^{1,§}, Chris Feudtner^{2,3}, and Ethan Basch^{4,5}

¹Division of Oncology, The Children's Hospital of Philadelphia; Philadelphia, PA, USA

²Pediatric Advanced Care Team, Department of Medical Ethics, The Children's Hospital of Philadelphia; Philadelphia, PA, USA

³Department of Pediatrics, Medical Ethics and Health Policy, The Perelman School of Medicine at the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA

⁴Department of Health Policy and Management, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA

⁵Lineberger Comprehensive Cancer Center, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA

Abstract

Symptom monitoring using patient-reported outcomes (PROs) is not common in pediatric oncology, despite interest from stakeholders, including patients, families, clinicians, and regulatory organizations as well as proven clinical benefit in adult oncology. This article examines the foundational data for patient-reported symptom reporting in this population and posits the next investigative steps toward the implementation of patient-reported symptom monitoring in the care and research of pediatric oncology patients. The reasoning behind and feasibility of monitoring symptoms in pediatric oncology patients using PRO measures is discussed, as well as specific tools that have been developed to track symptoms in this population, including innovative, electronic self-reporting platforms built to engage children in the symptom reporting process. Aspects of engaging both patients and clinicians in the symptom self-report process are reviewed, as are the experiences of “early adopters” of this process in pediatric oncology and across pediatrics. It is clear that there are key issues that remain regarding the use of PROs for symptom monitoring, including selection of specific outcomes to monitor, how to resolve discrepant reports,

§Corresponding author: Allison Barz Leahy, MD, The Children's Hospital of Philadelphia, Colket Translational Research Building, 10th floor, 3501 Civic Center Blvd Philadelphia, PA 19104, Phone: 267-253-8133, barza@email.chop.edu.

Compliance with Ethical Standards:

1. No specific funding source was used for the preparation of this article. Dr. Barz Leahy is supported by a National Institute of Health T32 HD060550.
2. Conflicts of interest:
 - Allison Barz Leahy: No conflicts of interest exist.
 - Chris Feudtner: No conflicts of interest exist.
 - Ethan Basch: No financial conflicts of interest exist. Dr. Basch's research group has received grant funding from the National Cancer Institute and PCORI to support research on patient-reported outcomes.

and determination of benefit. Next steps for investigation of these issues are discussed. Unanswered questions notwithstanding, work should continue to make patient-reported symptom monitoring an established, evidence-based part of routine and research practice in pediatric oncology.

1. INTRODUCTION

For children with cancer, both the cancer and the treatment generate symptoms and adverse events.[1] Accordingly, the US National Academy of Medicine and the American Cancer Society have called the integration of patient-reported outcome measures into pediatric research and care “essential.”[2] Similarly, the National Cancer Institute named symptom management “a priority for accelerated funding” aimed at deploying PROs measurements to all cancer patients in an effort to optimize patient outcomes and decrease costs associated with poorly controlled symptoms.[3] In adult oncology, the practice of tracking symptoms and toxicities using patient-reported outcomes has increased and correlates with increased survival.[4] PROs use in pediatric oncology, however, is not yet common.[5] In this commentary, we make eight recommendations to remedy this situation, discussing the current state of PROs use for children with cancer and outlining the rationale and path toward the implementation of patient-reported symptom information in the care of all pediatric oncology patients.

2. “PATIENT-SIDE” BARRIERS TO REPORTING SYMPTOMS ADDRESSED USING PROs

Data suggests that children and their families believe that experiencing side-effects from chemotherapy is necessary to cure their cancer[6], despite evidence that good symptom management decreases treatment-related complications and increases quality of life.[1] Children under-report their symptom severity during the clinical interview to avoid complaining or “bothering” the physician with a symptom perceived as inherent in the treatment, or in an effort to protect their family from worry. Qualitative work has demonstrated that children can feel “silenced” by their healthcare providers.[7,8]

These “patient-side” barriers can, in part, be surmounted by the use of patient-reported outcomes. Standardized patient-elicited assessments can normalize the symptom-reporting process, reassure the child that the physician values their experience, and generate more reliable symptom data.[9] This, in turn, enables better control of those symptoms. The use of symptom self-reporting increases patient engagement in care, enhances communication with the treating team[10], and allows symptom management to be custom tailored to the patient. In adults, better symptom management has resulted in less emergency room utilization, improved patient engagement, and a significant survival benefit.[4,11] In this era of personalized medicine and customized healthcare, hearing and using the child’s voice will advance our ability to alleviate pain and distress, and to improve outcomes.

3. FEASIBILITY OF MONITORING SYMPTOMS WITH PRO MEASURES

A scientifically rigorous foundation supports the collection of patient-reported outcomes in pediatric cancer, with studies highlighting the feasibility of the practice and providing useful descriptions of symptom burden at all stages of treatment.

3.1 Cross-Sectional Symptom Reporting with No Feedback to the Clinical Team

Pediatric self-reported symptom burden has thus far been elicited primarily using cross-sectional designs. Children's reports typically confirm the expectations of oncologists: known side-effects of chemotherapy, like pain and vomiting, are experienced throughout treatment. [12–17] Other, less obvious treatment comorbidities have also been identified, such as insomnia [13–15], numbness[16], and itch[13,16], and psychologic symptoms. [12,15] Further, symptoms generating the most distress for children are not the most clinically evident ones, but rather symptoms such as nausea, feeling sad[14,17], insomnia[13], lack of appetite and pain.[13,14,18]. These studies support the feasibility of eliciting self-reported symptom information from children between the ages of eight and eighteen at single time points during treatment. Each reported high enrollment and completion rates with good “ease of use,” indicating that children can, and will, self-report symptom information. Additionally, they suggest that self-report of the less visible sequelae of treatment, both physical and emotional, will help us to better understand a child's experience with cancer treatment and provide opportunities for enhanced supportive care.

3.2 Longitudinal Symptom Reporting with No Feedback to the Clinical Team

The feasibility of longitudinal symptom collection suggests that patient-reported outcomes can be used as a dynamic clinical tool to optimize symptom management. Children are able to complete symptom assessments in multiple domains at multiple time points during chemotherapy with excellent enrollment rates and minimal attrition.[19,20] Trials with longer surveillance periods (greater than three months) show lower enrollment rates, with less adherence to repeated measures[18,21], but demonstrate, nonetheless, the viability of the concept and illustrate essential aspects of the childhood cancer experience: that symptoms fluctuate over the duration of treatment, different chemotherapy regimens result in different symptoms; and that the individual response to treatment is widely variable. The theme of “invisible” symptom prevalence is again noted[18,20], lending importance to providing a standard method for patients to provide this information directly to their healthcare team.

3.3 Symptom Reporting with Feedback to the Clinical Team

Three studies have examined the effect of providing pediatric patient-reported symptom information to their healthcare provider in real-time. Investigators in the Netherlands developed the Quality of Life in Childhood Oncology (QLIC-ON) PRO-file and tracked four health-related quality of life (HRQoL) domains in children who had completed treatment for their cancer. In a sequential cohort design, three clinic encounters were captured, with information from the QLIC-ON PRO-file provided to treating oncologists. Findings included enhanced identification of emotional problems, with sub-group analysis that demonstrated overall improvement in HRQoL for children aged 5–7. Given promising results, the authors

called for the exploration of longitudinal reporting and study of the tool in children actively receiving treatment.[22]

The Symptom Monitoring & Systematic Assessment in Young Survivors (SyMon-SAYS) was an 8-week feasibility study that captured self-reported fatigue from children and young adults who had received chemotherapy in the preceding six months. Fatigue information was relayed to clinicians prior to each visit and when participants' fatigue met certain severity thresholds. Notably, both clinicians and patients felt that self-reporting fatigue had no perceivable impact on treatment strategies[23], highlighting the imperative that PROs should be selected according to patients' needs, treatment goals, and clinical actionability.

The PediQUEST (Pediatric Quality of Life and Evaluation of Symptoms Technology) study was a longitudinal self-report study that relayed information to the treatment team for clinical decision-making. The population was limited to children with advanced cancer, with reports collected at least monthly. Symptom reports and email alerts were provided to the treatment team, without guidance on how to respond.[24] The perceived benefits from self-reporting included helping the parent understand what the child was feeling and the use of symptom reports as a "communication enhancer" in discussions with the doctor. No significant change in the child's symptoms or HRQoL was seen, but post-hoc subgroup analysis revealed benefit to emotional HRQoL and improved scores on a total sickness measure.[25]

These results merit further investigation of patients on active therapy. Successful integration of symptom monitoring via patient-reported outcome measures requires demonstrating the clinical usefulness of the information and should focus on symptoms that are thought to be clinically actionable or meaningful to patients. [26–28] Future directions may also include investigation of clinical decision support to aid clinician response.

4. DEVELOPING PEDIATRIC ONCOLOGY SPECIFIC SYMPTOM MONITORING TOOLS

Several noteworthy measures have been used to monitor symptoms in pediatric oncology patients. Select pediatric PROMIS measures have been validated for children undergoing chemotherapy, including pain interference and fatigue.[19,29,30] Similarly, the Memorial Symptom Assessment Scale (MSAS) has been validated[12,13] and used frequently to characterize pediatric symptom burden, including in longitudinal studies such as PediQUEST.[31]

New PRO measures have also been recently developed. The Patient-Reported Outcomes Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events (PRO-CTCAE) was developed for use in adults to evaluate symptomatic toxicity as a companion to the CTCAE[32,33], the standardized language of symptom severity applied in U.S. clinical trials. A pediatric version, the pediatric PRO-CTCAE, has been designed to assess symptomatic adverse events via child self- or proxy-report[27,28] and is currently being validated.[34,35] Specific symptom items may be selected from a bank to develop a questionnaire that elicits only

symptoms of interest and includes the attributes of presence, frequency, severity, and interference.[34] An electronic version has not yet been created.

The Symptom Screening in Pediatrics (SSPedi) was developed by a Canadian group to provide unidimensional symptom screening in pediatric oncology patients.[26,36] An electronic version is currently being validated.[37,38] Designed as a symptom screen, only a child form exists, without a proxy version. The instrument includes fifteen items, with selection based on expert opinion[26] and confirmed in cognitive interviews.[37] In contrast to the pediatric PRO-CTCAE, SSPedi captures symptom interference (“bother”) without symptom prevalence or severity.

5. DEVELOPING AND INVESTING IN SELF-REPORTING PLATFORMS

A handful of programs developed for symptom-reporting by children with cancer have been published, each highlighting needed aspects of future program development.[23,39,40]

The first, SyMon-SAYS, discussed previously, found a strong preference for internet-based reporting.[23] Two others “Pain Squad”[39] and “Pain Buddy,” utilized a “gamified” approach, including the use of avatars[40] and an adherence-based rewards system[39] with excellent participation and patient satisfaction. In “Pain Buddy,” a report of pain automatically triggered electronic skill training in evidence-based pain management techniques, teaching children how to use guided imagery, progressive muscle relaxation, diaphragmatic breathing, mindfulness, and distraction. This innovative feature empowers children in the self-management of their symptoms, a critical next step in this field. Pediatric participants found the skill training useful and the program desirable to recommend to friends.[40] Construct validity and reliability for “Pain Squad” was assessed, but was not for “Pain Buddy.” This raises the question as to whether the game-like approach could alter a child’s self-reported symptoms through distraction or improvement in mood, particularly as some studies suggest that playing certain health-related video games can be used for that purpose.[41] This should be explored in further investigations of these methods.

6. ENGAGING STAKEHOLDERS TO FACILITATE THE USE OF PRO SYMPTOM INFORMATION

Integrating patient-reported outcomes into practice requires engagement of patients and their clinicians.

6.1 Optimizing Patient Engagement

Patients require platforms that are convenient and easy to use, capture information that is of concern to the patients and their families, and is felt to be meaningfully used by their care team. High retention rates and reported usefulness in the PediQUEST study shows the investment in longitudinal symptom reporting that pediatric patients and their families have if they feel it is of benefit.[24] Further, nearly three-quarters of participants reported that they would “very much” like to continue reporting following study conclusion.[25] This suggests that caregiver engagement in patient-reported symptom monitoring may be achieved by the recognition that it enhances communication with the treating team and aids

in understanding what their child is feeling. Children, particularly younger ones, though, need to be engaged in other ways. The gamification of tools described above may be an important method to engage this audience.

Increasingly, a “bring your own device” design is being used for PROs, in which patients enter data into clinical and research databases on their own tablets and smartphones[42]; the same approach should be pursued in pediatrics. The rising presence of technology and internet access in children’s lives [43] should be leveraged to make symptom reporting convenient for patients and their families.

6.2 Optimizing Clinician Logistics

While a survey revealed that the overwhelming majority (94%) of pediatric oncologists in international cooperative groups saw value in the routine collection and use of PROs, barriers to implementation were felt to be mainly logistic, namely: the time required and disruption of the clinical workflow.[5] The advancement of symptom monitoring via PROs must address these concerns. The data must be easy to interpret and be linked to evidence-based supportive care interventions. Effective methods to present PRO data to clinicians and patients have been detailed. [44–46] This includes a preference for a line graph, with clear delineation of what is “good” and “bad,” descriptive labels in addition to numerical scores, and parsimonious use of colors. More work is needed to enhance point-of-care symptom management decision support.

7. LEARNING FROM THE EXPERIENCE OF EARLY ADOPTERS

Symptom monitoring using PROs in routine care can be guided by the experience of early adopters. In pediatric oncology, an international study found that 27% of responders reported that their institution obtained PROs as part of their clinical practice[5], however, there remains little in the literature describing that experience. Based on the implementation of the QLIC-ON Pro-file experience in the Netherlands, a practical guide was generated to help guide implementation of PRO interventions in clinical settings[47] and to posit future directions.[48] Experience in other areas of clinical practice is also relevant. For example, one children’s hospital in the US has adopted PROs in rheumatology, cardiomyopathy [49], inflammatory bowel disease and cystic fibrosis clinics.[50] Published reports suggests that patients and clinicians have been receptive to these initiatives and, in some cases, self-reported data has been hypothesis-generating for more traditional research questions.[49]

8. EMPLOYING SYMPTOM MONITORING PROS IN TREATMENT TRIALS

As new classes of cancer therapeutics are developed, novel toxicity profiles have emerged. [51] Utilizing symptom monitoring PROs in the evaluation of these agents is important, given emerging evidence that traditional adverse event reporting underestimates patient symptoms.[52] Further, from the patient perspective, when treatment options offer similar survival rates, differences in the types or degree of symptoms posed by new therapeutics could aid in treatment selection. In the future, longitudinal PRO symptom measurement in clinical trials could enhance adverse event monitoring and more accurately capture the patient experience with novel regimens.

9. INVESTIGATING KEY QUESTIONS ABOUT SYMPTOM MONITORING

PROs

Advancement of symptom monitoring PROs will require ongoing research in at least three areas.

First, we must determine the most important outcomes to collect in the clinically heterogeneous pediatric oncology population. When patients experience highly bothersome symptoms such as pain or dyspnea, they likely always matter. The prevalence of such symptoms, though, varies across different forms of pediatric cancer. Other symptoms, even if they occur with similar intensity, may bother some patients more than others. Thus far, selection of symptom-monitoring PRO measures has been driven by expert oncologist opinion and generalized patient input, with limited stratification based on diagnosis type, treatment phase, or availability of effective symptom prevention or amelioration interventions.

Second, we need to study discrepancies between a physician's interpretation of a child's symptoms and a child's own report. In adults, oncologists have higher symptom-grading thresholds[53] and underestimate symptom severity in comparison to patient self-report. [54,55] In children, agreement in symptom severity is more concordant for visible symptoms, such as immobility, than for "invisible" symptoms, such as pain or feelings. [12,13] This may indicate that the clinician fails to understand the severity of a child's symptoms, but other factors may be at play. In some cases, children over-[56]or under-report[57]their symptom severity for secondary gain or because they don't want to cause worry or feel that they can't be helped. Feelings of anxiety or depression may drive symptom scores high or undercut the ability to accurately report. Moving beyond simple identification of these discrepancies, we need to understand what psychological or social factors generate them and how to manage clinical care when clinician assessment and patient PRO symptom reports diverge.

Third, we do not yet know whether the routine use of symptom monitoring PRO measures will benefit patients. Because small sample sizes and heterogeneous populations limit the statistical significance of single-institution trials, the evaluation of clinical outcomes associated with patient-reported symptom information must be pursued in a collaborative, multi-institutional manner. Suitable designs would include a pragmatic clustered randomized control trial approach or a step-wedge evaluation.

10. CONCLUSION

We now have the knowledge and technical capacity to make the child's voice a formal part of the clinical encounter as a dynamic, important, actionable piece of data. Given the availability of well-developed PRO tools, as well as ethical imperative to measure our patients' experiences, and evidence of benefits – what will facilitate wider implementation of PROs in pediatric oncology? First, PROs need to be integrated into clinical trials, since so many pediatric patients are treated on protocol. Second, technologies for collecting this information need to be seamlessly integrated into practice: likely through the electronic

health record system at the clinic or hospital. Third, the culture needs to change. We need to come to expect this information as a part of routine practice, like blood pressure or heart rate. Clinical champions need to advocate for patient-centered care and enlist administrative leaders to facilitate implementation. Substantial strides have been made in the methods of PROs, and now is the time to focus on implementation.

Acknowledgments

Allison Barz Leahy: Literature review, development of central ideas and arguments, preparation of manuscript.

Chris Feudtner: Refinement of central ideas and arguments. Review and revision of manuscript, final approval.

Ethan Basch: Concept design and refinement. Review and revision of manuscript, final approval.

References

1. Ullrich, CK., Billett, AL., Berde, CB. Symptom Management in Children with Cancer. In: Orkin, SH.Nathan, DG.Ginsburg, D.Look, AT.Fisher, DE., Lux, SE., editors. Nathan and Oski's Hematology of Infancy and Childhood. Elsevier Health Sciences; 2009. p. 2349-96.
2. Kirch R, Reaman G, Feudtner C, Wiener L, Schwartz LA, Sung L, et al. Advancing a comprehensive cancer care agenda for children and their families: Institute of Medicine Workshop highlights and next steps. *CA Cancer J Clin*. 2016 Sep; 66(5):398–407. [PubMed: 27145249]
3. The National Cancer Institute. Blue Ribbon Panel Report 2016. 2016 Oct 14.:1–74.
4. Basch E, Deal AM, Dueck AC, Scher HI, Kris MG, Hudis C, et al. Overall Survival Results of a Trial Assessing Patient-Reported Outcomes for Symptom Monitoring During Routine Cancer Treatment. *JAMA*. 2017 Jun 4.:1–2.
5. Schepers SA, Haverman L, Zadeh S, Grootenhuis MA, Wiener L. Healthcare Professionals' Preferences and Perceived Barriers for Routine Assessment of Patient-Reported Outcomes in Pediatric Oncology Practice: Moving Toward International Processes of Change. *Pediatr Blood Cancer*. 2016 Aug 11; 63(12):2181–8. [PubMed: 27511830]
6. Woodgate RL, Degner LF. Expectations and Beliefs About Children's Cancer Symptoms: Perspectives of Children With Cancer and Their Families. *Oncology Nursing Forum*. 2007 Feb 20; 30(3):479–91.
7. Woodgate RL, Degner LF, Yanofsky R. A different perspective to approaching cancer symptoms in children. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management*. 2003 Sep; 26(3):800–17. [PubMed: 12967729]
8. Carter B. Chronic pain in childhood and the medical encounter: professional ventriloquism and hidden voices. *Qual Health Res*. 2002 Jan; 12(1):28–41. [PubMed: 11797923]
9. Sikorskii A, Given CW, Given B, Jeon S, You M. Differential Symptom Reporting by Mode of Administration of the Assessment. *Med Care*. 2009 Aug; 47(8):866–74. [PubMed: 19584761]
10. Takeuchi EE, Keding A, Awad N, Hofmann U, Campbell LJ, Selby PJ, et al. Impact of Patient-Reported Outcomes in Oncology: A Longitudinal Analysis of Patient-Physician Communication. *Journal of Clinical Oncology*. 2011 Jul 20; 29(21):2910–7. [PubMed: 21690465]
11. Basch E, Deal AM, Kris MG, Scher HI, Hudis CA, Sabbatini P, et al. Symptom Monitoring With Patient-Reported Outcomes During Routine Cancer Treatment: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *J Clin Oncol*. 2016 Feb 20; 34(6):557–65. [PubMed: 26644527]
12. Collins JJ, Byrnes ME, Dunkel IJ, Lapin J, Nadel T, Thaler HT, et al. The Measurement of Symptoms in Children with Cancer. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management*. 2000 May; 19(5): 363–77. [PubMed: 10869877]
13. Collins JJ, Devine TD, Dick GS, Johnson EA, Kilham HA, Pinkerton CR, et al. The measurement of symptoms in young children with cancer: the validation of the Memorial Symptom Assessment Scale in children aged 7–12. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management*. 2002 Jan; 23(1):10–6. [PubMed: 11779663]

14. Goodenough B. Children's Self-Report of Symptoms and Anticipation for Symptom Change. *Journal of Cancer Pain & Symptom Palliation*. 2005 Dec 15; 1(2):3–13.
15. Baggott C, Cooper BA, Marina N, Matthay KK, Miaskowski C. Symptom Cluster Analyses Based on Symptom Occurrence and Severity Ratings Among Pediatric Oncology Patients During Myelosuppressive Chemotherapy. *Cancer Nurs*. 2012; 35(1):19–28. [PubMed: 21921793]
16. Zhukovsky DS, Rozmus CL, Robert RS, Bruera E, Wells RJ, Chisholm GB, et al. Symptom profiles in children with advanced cancer: Patient, family caregiver, and oncologist ratings. *Cancer*. 2015 Jul 28; 121(22):4080–7. [PubMed: 26218240]
17. Rodgers C, Kollar D, Taylor O, Bryant R, Crockett K, Gregurich MA, et al. Nausea and vomiting perspectives among children receiving moderate to highly emetogenic chemotherapy treatment. *Cancer Nurs*. 2012 May; 35(3):203–10. [PubMed: 21915041]
18. Rodgers C, Wills-Bagnato P, Sloane R, Hockenberry M. Health-Related Quality of Life among Children and Adolescents during Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplant Recovery. *J Pediatr Oncol Nurs*. SAGE Publications. 2015 Sep; 32(5):329–36.
19. Menard JC, Hinds PS, Jacobs SS, Cranston K, Wang J, DeWalt DA, et al. Feasibility and acceptability of the patient-reported outcomes measurement information system measures in children and adolescents in active cancer treatment and survivorship. *Cancer Nurs*. 2014 Jan; 37(1):66–74. [PubMed: 24036439]
20. Baggott, C., Dodd, M., Kennedy, C., Marina, N., Matthay, KK., Cooper, BA., et al. *Journal of Pediatric Oncology Nursing*. Vol. 27. SAGE PublicationsSage CA; Los Angeles, CA: 2010 Oct 21. Changes in Children's Reports of Symptom Occurrence and Severity During a Course of Myelosuppressive Chemotherapy; p. 307-15.
21. Dobrozsi S, Yan K, Hoffmann R, Panepinto J. Patient-reported health status during pediatric cancer treatment. *Pediatr Blood Cancer*. 2016 Nov 3.64(4):e26295.
22. Engelen V, Detmar S, Koopman H, Maurice-Stam H, Caron H, Hoogerbrugge P, et al. Reporting health-related quality of life scores to physicians during routine follow-up visits of pediatric oncology patients: Is it effective? *Pediatr Blood Cancer*. 2011 May 16; 58(5):766–74. [PubMed: 21584933]
23. Lai J-S, Yount S, Beaumont JL, Cella D, Toia J, Goldman S. A patient-centered symptom monitoring and reporting system for children and young adults with cancer (SyMon-SAYS). *Pediatr Blood Cancer*. 2015 Apr 9; 62(10):1813–8. [PubMed: 25856587]
24. Dussel V, Orellana L, Soto N, Chen K, Ullrich C, Kang TI, et al. Feasibility of Conducting a Palliative Care Randomized Controlled Trial in Children With Advanced Cancer: Assessment of the PediQUEST Study. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management*. 2015 Jun; 49(6):1059–69. [PubMed: 25640275]
25. Wolfe J, Orellana L, Cook EF, Ullrich C, Kang T, Geyer JR, et al. Improving the care of children with advanced cancer by using an electronic patient-reported feedback intervention: results from the PediQUEST randomized controlled trial. *J Clin Oncol*. 2014 Apr 10; 32(11):1119–26. [PubMed: 24616307]
26. Tomlinson D, Dupuis LL, Gibson P, Johnston DL, Portwine C, Baggott C, et al. Initial development of the Symptom Screening in Pediatrics Tool (SSPedi). *Support Care Cancer*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. 2014 Jan; 22(1):71–5.
27. Reeve BB, Withycombe JS, Baker JN, Hooke MC, Lyons JC, Mowbray C, et al. The first step to integrating the child's voice in adverse event reporting in oncology trials: a content validation study among pediatric oncology clinicians. *Pediatr Blood Cancer*. 2013 Jul; 60(7):1231–6. [PubMed: 23335328]
28. Weaver MS, Reeve BB, Baker JN, Martens CE, McFatrigh M, Mowbray C, et al. Concept-elicitation phase for the development of the pediatric patient-reported outcome version of the Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events. *Cancer*. 2016 Jan 1; 122(1):141–8. [PubMed: 26421973]
29. DeWalt DA, Gross HE, Gipson DS, Selewski DT, DeWitt EM, Dampier CD, et al. PROMIS(®) pediatric self-report scales distinguish subgroups of children within and across six common pediatric chronic health conditions. *Qual Life Res*. 2015 Sep; 24(9):2195–208. [PubMed: 25715946]

30. Hinds PS, Nuss SL, Ruccione KS, Withycombe JS, Jacobs S, DeLuca H, et al. PROMIS pediatric measures in pediatric oncology: valid and clinically feasible indicators of patient-reported outcomes. *Pediatr Blood Cancer*. 2013 Mar; 60(3):402–8. [PubMed: 22829446]
31. Wolfe J, Orellana L, Ullrich C, Cook EF, Kang TI, Rosenberg A, et al. Symptoms and Distress in Children With Advanced Cancer: Prospective Patient-Reported Outcomes From the PediQUEST Study. *J Clin Oncol*. 2015 Jun 10; 33(17):1928–35. [PubMed: 25918277]
32. Patient-Reported Outcomes version of the Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events (PRO-CTCAE™) [Internet]. [healthcaresdelivery.cancer.gov](https://healthcaresdelivery.cancer.gov/pro-ctcae/). [cited 2017 May 15]. Available from: <https://healthcaresdelivery.cancer.gov/pro-ctcae/>
33. Basch, E., Reeve, BB., Mitchell, SA., Clauser, SB., Minasian, LM., Dueck, AC., et al. *J Natl Cancer Inst*. Vol. 106. Oxford University Press; 2014 Sep. Development of the National Cancer Institute's patient-reported outcomes version of the common terminology criteria for adverse events (PRO-CTCAE); p. dju244-4.
34. Reeve BB, McFatrach M, Pinheiro LC, Weaver MS, Sung L, Withycombe JS, et al. Eliciting the child's voice in adverse event reporting in oncology trials: Cognitive interview findings from the Pediatric Patient-Reported Outcomes version of the Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events initiative. *Pediatr Blood Cancer*. 2016 Sep 21.64(3):e26261.
35. Reeve BB, McFatrach M, Pinheiro LC, Freyer DR, Basch EM, Baker JN, et al. Cognitive Interview-Based Validation of the Patient-Reported Outcomes Version of the Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events in Adolescents with Cancer. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management*. 2017 Apr; 53(4):759–66. [PubMed: 28062347]
36. Dupuis LL, Ethier M-C, Tomlinson D, Hesser T, Sung L. A systematic review of symptom assessment scales in children with cancer. *BMC Cancer*. 2012 Sep 26; 12(1):1–1. [PubMed: 22212211]
37. O'Sullivan C, Dupuis LL, Gibson P, Johnston DL, Baggott C, Portwine C, et al. Refinement of the symptom screening in pediatrics tool (SSPedi). *Br J Cancer*. 2014 Sep 23; 111(7):1262–8. [PubMed: 25101569]
38. O'Sullivan C, Dupuis LL, Gibson P, Johnston DL, Baggott C, Portwine C, et al. Evaluation of the electronic self-report Symptom Screening in Pediatrics Tool (SSPedi). *BMJ Support Palliat Care*. British Medical Journal Publishing Group. 2016 Nov 1. bmjspcare–2015–001084.
39. Stinson JN, Jibb LA, Nguyen C, Nathan PC, Maloney AM, Dupuis LL, et al. Construct validity and reliability of a real-time multidimensional smartphone app to assess pain in children and adolescents with cancer. *Pain*. 2015 Dec; 156(12):2607–15. [PubMed: 26580680]
40. Fortier MA, Chung WW, Martinez A, Gago-Masague S, Sender L. Pain buddy: A novel use of m-health in the management of children's cancer pain. *Computers in Biology and Medicine*. 2016 Sep.76:202–14. [PubMed: 27479493]
41. Primack BA, Carroll MV, McNamara M, Klem ML, King B, Rich M, et al. Role of video games in improving health-related outcomes: a systematic review. *Am J Prev Med*. 2012 Jun; 42(6):630–8. [PubMed: 22608382]
42. Coons SJ, Eremenco S, Lundy JJ, O'Donohoe P, O'Gorman H, Malizia W. Capturing Patient-Reported Outcome (PRO) Data Electronically: The Past, Present, and Promise of ePRO Measurement in Clinical Trials. *The Patient - Patient-Centered Outcomes Research*. 2014 Oct 10; 8(4):301–9.
43. Kabali HK, Irigoyen MM, Nunez-Davis R, Budacki JG, Mohanty SH, Leister KP, et al. Exposure and Use of Mobile Media Devices by Young Children. *PEDIATRICS*. American Academy of Pediatrics. 2015 Dec; 136(6):1044–50.
44. Bantug ET, Coles T, Smith KC, Snyder CF, Rouette J, Brundage MD, et al. Graphical displays of patient-reported outcomes (PRO) for use in clinical practice: What makes a pro picture worth a thousand words? *Patient Educ Couns*. 2016 Apr; 99(4):483–90. [PubMed: 26603445]
45. Dobrozsi S, Panepinto J. Child and parent preferences for graphical display of patient-reported outcome data. *Pediatr Blood Cancer*. 2017 Apr 14.32(9):e26499.
46. Smith KC, Brundage MD, Tolbert E, Little EA, Bantug ET, Snyder CF, et al. Engaging stakeholders to improve presentation of patient-reported outcomes data in clinical practice. *Support Care Cancer*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. 2016 Oct; 24(10):4149–57.

47. Engelen V, Haverman L, Koopman H, van Meeteren NS, van den Bergh EM, Vrijmoet-Wiersma J, et al. Development and implementation of a patient reported outcome intervention (QLIC-ON PROfile) in clinical paediatric oncology practice. *Patient Educ Couns*. Elsevier Ireland Ltd. 2010 Nov 1; 81(2):235–44.
48. Schepers SA, Engelen VE, Haverman L, Caron HN, Hoogerbrugge PM, Kaspers GJL, et al. Patient reported outcomes in pediatric oncology practice: Suggestions for future usage by parents and pediatric oncologists. *Pediatr Blood Cancer*. 2014 Mar 20; 61(9):1707–10. [PubMed: 24648289]
49. Bevans KB, Moon J, Carle AC, Mara CA, Lai J-S, DiMarco L, et al. Patient reported outcomes as indicators of pediatric health care quality. *Acad Pediatr*. 2014 Sep; 14(5 Suppl):S90–6. [PubMed: 25169465]
50. Kaplan HC, Thakkar SN, Burns L, Chini B, Dykes DM, McPhail GL, et al. Protocol of a Pilot Study of Technology-Enabled Coproduction in Pediatric Chronic Illness Care. *JMIR Res Protoc*. 2017 Apr 28;6(4):e71. [PubMed: 28455274]
51. Maude SL, Barrett D, Teachey DT, Grupp SA. Managing cytokine release syndrome associated with novel T cell-engaging therapies. *Cancer J*. 2014 Mar; 20(2):119–22. [PubMed: 24667956]
52. Miller TP, Li Y, Kavcic M, Troxel AB, Huang Y-SV, Sung L, et al. Accuracy of Adverse Event Ascertainment in Clinical Trials for Pediatric Acute Myeloid Leukemia. *J Clin Oncol*. 2016 May 1; 34(13):1537–43. [PubMed: 26884558]
53. Atkinson TM, Rogak LJ, Heon N, Ryan SJ, Shaw M, Stark LP, et al. Exploring differences in adverse symptom event grading thresholds between clinicians and patients in the clinical trial setting. *J Cancer Res Clin Oncol*. 2017 Apr; 143(4):735–43. [PubMed: 28093637]
54. Fromme EK, Eilers KM, Mori M, Hsieh Y-C, Beer TM. How Accurate Is Clinician Reporting of Chemotherapy Adverse Effects? A Comparison With Patient-Reported Symptoms From the Quality-of-Life Questionnaire C30. *Journal of Clinical Oncology*. 2004 Sep; 22(17):3485–90. [PubMed: 15337796]
55. Basch E, Jia X, Heller G, Barz A, Sit L, Fruscione M, et al. Adverse symptom event reporting by patients vs clinicians: relationships with clinical outcomes. *J Natl Cancer Inst*. 2009 Dec 2; 101(23):1624–32. [PubMed: 19920223]
56. Walker LS. Social Consequences of Children's Pain: When Do They Encourage Symptom Maintenance? *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*. 2002 Dec 1; 27(8):689–98. [PubMed: 12403859]
57. Woodgate RL, Degner LF, Yanofsky R. A different perspective to approaching cancer symptoms in children. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management*. 2003 Sep; 26(3):800–17. [PubMed: 12967729]

Key Points for Decision Makers

- Patient-reported outcomes in pediatric oncology are not commonly used despite evidence that collecting them is feasible and that patients, families, and physicians are interested in their use.
- Specific symptom monitoring PRO tools exist for use in the pediatric oncology population, and innovative electronic reporting platforms have been developed to engage children in the self-report process.
- Using PROs as dynamic, clinically-actionable data has the potential to improve outcomes of children with cancer, but more work must be done to study their implementation and use.