__Research protocol__

20th December 2022

__Title:__

Use of topical anaesthetics in cutaneous head and neck malignancies: a randomized

controlled trial

__Investigators__:

1. O'Neill RJ

2. Affendi A

3. McHugh N

4. Skinner LJ

Corresponding investigator:

Rory O'Neill,

Department of Otolaryngology

University Hospital Waterford

Dunmore Road,

Waterford,

Ireland

Email: oneillrjj@gmail.com

V. 2.0

1. __Background:__

Operations on cutaneous tissues of the head and neck are some of the most frequently

performed types of operation performed. They can often successfully be performed using

local anaesthetic (LA). However, tissues in this anatomic area are some of most sensitive

tissues in the body to nociceptive pain. As such, local anaesthetic can be a distressing

experience for patients in many ways. Unfortunately, it is also the most common anatomical

site for cutaneous malignancies. Advanced age and chronic sun exposure are two potent risk

factors. The majority of these lesions are resected under local anaesthetic for several reasons

including economic, patient-factors, theatre availability and speed. However, one of the

major disadvantages of local anaesthetic such as lidocaine is pain during administration. This

is exacerbated as the head and neck area is one of the most sensitive parts of the body.

Several interventions have been used to reduce pain from needles and injections including

ethylene chloride cryoanalgesic spray and topical anaesthetic agents including EMLA

(lidocaine and prilocaine) and Ametop ointments. These have been extensively used in

paediatric populations with great success to reduce pain during procedures requiring

hypodermics such as cannulation. Several studies have trialled these interventions in adult

populations across a variety of anatomical locations with variable results.

1.1. __Hypothesis__:

EMLA and ethyl chloride reduce pain associated with local anaesthetic administration

1.2. __Aim__

The aim of this study is to assess if ethylene chloride or EMLA are effective in reducing the

pain associated with local anaesthetic administration

2. Outcome Measures

2.1. Primary outcome measure:

The primary outcome measure is patient reported pain on a numeric rating scale (NRS) (1; no

pain, 10; worst pain imaginable)

2.2.Secondary outcome measures:

Patient satisfaction measured on NRS scale of 1=not bad at all, to 10=worst experience

imaginable.

Analysis of risk factors associated with pain from local anaesthetic in the head and neck

including size of resection and injection volume:

- Pathology – malignant versus benign

- Local anaesthetic volume

- Size of resection

- Site of resection

3. Methodological design

3.1. Study design

Randomized controlled trial

3.2. Selection:

Patients will be selected from those attending scheduled excision of cutaneous head and neck

malignancies at our centre

3.3.Inclusion criteria:

V. 2.0

76   •   Aged at least 18 years

77   •   Receiving surgery to cutaneous tissues of the head and neck

78   •   Procedure performed under local anaesthetic

79

80   **3.4.Exclusion criteria:**

81   •   Paediatric patients

82   •   Surgery performed under general anaesthetic

83   •   Mucosal operative site (e.g. oral cavity)

84   •   Significant cognitive impairment (e.g. severe dementia)

85   •   Known sensitivity/allergy to EMLA

86   •   History of a pain disorder (e.g. complex regional pain syndrome).

87

88   **3.5.Sample size calculation:**

89 A formal sample size calculation will be performed after an initial pilot study of ten patients

90 per group to calculate the effect size. Other studies on using topical anaesthetic agents in

91 other non head and neck anatomical sites typically required less than 50 participants per

92 group. G*Power 3.1 (Universität Düsseldorf) software will be used to calculate the necessary

93 sample size. We will likely employ an α error probability of 0.05 and a power of 95%. A 10%

94 margin for safety will be used to mitigate the possible risks of participant attrition

95

96   **3.6.Randomization:**

97 Computer randomization will be performed. A random number sequence will be generated

98 using randomizer.org® with numbers allocated using stratified permuted blocks of four and

99 these will be concealed in individual sealed envelopes with the aid of a research contributor.

100 Participants will be allocated in order of recruitment and in participants with more than two

101 lesions will have the more superiorly located lesion allocated first.

102

3.7. Interventions

104 Patients will be split into 4 groups:

105 • EMLA

106 • Aqueous ointment

107 • Ethyl chloride spray

108 • no treatment.

109

3.8. Study procedures

111 Written informed consent will be obtained prior to group allocation. Following group

112 allocation, topical agents will be administered as follows. EMLA (EMLA cream 5% 25g

113 lidocaine, 25g prilocaine) and aqueous cream will be applied to cover the surgical site,

114 delivered via an unmarked syringe to achieve single blinding. A Tegaderm® adhesive

115 dressing will then be applied over this to prevent the cream from drying out, and it will be

116 removed in the theatre before the administration of LA. The local anesthetic to be used will

117 be 1% lidocaine with 1:200,000 adrenaline and will be injected via a 25-gauge needle

118 attached to a 10ml syringe. A 5ml syringe will be occasionally used when it is not possible to

119 inject via a 10ml syringe.

120 EC will be applied to the surgical site before LA injection. The area will be sprayed at a

121 distance of 5-10cm for 4-8 seconds until the skin slightly blanches, and the fluid will be

122 allowed to evaporate.

123

124

125

3.9. <u>Assessing outcomes</u>

126

127 The key focus in this study will be the assessment of pain linked to the injection of local

128 anesthesia (LA). Following the LA administration, each participant will be prompted to

129 evaluate the pain they undergo using a numeric rating scale (NRS; 1=no pain, 10=worst pain

130 imaginable). Subsequent to the procedure, patients will be inquired about their overall

131 perception of the experience (1=not bad at all, 10=worst experience imaginable).

132

4. <u>Statistical analysis</u>

133

134 The distribution pattern of variables will be assessed using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test.

135 The Kruskal-Wallis test and Mann Whitney test will be employed to compare groups for non-

136 parametric data and for covariate analysis. The Chi-squared test will be applied to detect

137 differences for categorical data. Spearman's Rho will be used to quantify the strength of the

138 linear relationship between non-parametric continuous variables. A per protocol analysis will

139 be conducted as it is believed that in cases where patients are unable to describe their pain by

140 using a number, it will disproportionately affect the results by conducting a "worst case

141 scenario" analysis. Furthermore, due to a minimal interval between intervention and

142 measurement of pain outcomes in this study, there will be low rates of attrition. Statistical

143 analysis will be performed using SPSS v.26 (Aramonk, US). Statistical significance will be

144 considered at $p < 0.05$.

145

146

147

148

149

5. Miscellaneous

5.1. Ethical considerations:

This trial will be registered with the University Hospital Waterford Research and Ethics Committee where full ethical approval will be obtained prior to study commencement. It is considered that patient risks from this study are negligible.

5.2. Funding:

No funding will be necessary for this study

5.3. Dissemination of results

Results will be prepared into a scientific manuscript for publication and presented at scientific surgical meetings