



# HHS Public Access

Author manuscript

Breast. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2020 August 22.

Published in final edited form as:

Breast. 2013 October ; 22(5): 616–627. doi:10.1016/j.breast.2013.07.052.

## Supportive and Palliative Care for Metastatic Breast Cancer: Resource Allocations in Low- and Middle-Income Countries. Breast Health Global Initiative 2013 Consensus Statement

James Cleary<sup>1</sup>, Henry Ddungu<sup>2,3</sup>, Sandra R. Distelhorst<sup>3</sup>, Carla Ripamonti<sup>4</sup>, Gary M. Rodin<sup>5</sup>, Mohammad A. Bushnaq<sup>6</sup>, Joe N. Clegg-Lampsey<sup>7</sup>, Stephen R. Connor<sup>8</sup>, Msemu B. Diwani<sup>9</sup>, Alexandru Eniu<sup>10</sup>, Joe B. Harford<sup>11</sup>, Suresh Kumar<sup>12</sup>, M. R. Rajagopal<sup>13</sup>, Beti Thompson<sup>3</sup>, Julie R. Gralow<sup>3,14</sup>, Benjamin O. Anderson<sup>3,14</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Wisconsin Comprehensive Cancer Center, Madison, Wisconsin, USA; <sup>2</sup>Uganda Cancer Institute, Kampala, Uganda; <sup>3</sup>Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, Seattle, Washington, USA; <sup>4</sup>Fondazione IRCCS, Istituto Nazionale dei Tumori di Milano, Milano, Italy; <sup>5</sup>Princess Margaret Cancer Center, University Health Network, Toronto, Ontario, Canada; <sup>6</sup>Jordan Palliative Care Society, Amman, Jordan; <sup>7</sup>University of Ghana Medical School, Accra, Ghana; <sup>8</sup>Worldwide Palliative Care Alliance and London, UK and Open Society Foundations, New York, USA; <sup>9</sup>Ocean Road Cancer Institute, Dar es Salaam, United Republic of Tanzania; <sup>10</sup>Cancer Institute Ion Chiricuta, Cluj-Napoca, Romania; <sup>11</sup>National Cancer Institute, Bethesda, Maryland, USA; <sup>12</sup>Institute of Palliative Medicine, Medical College, Kerala, India; <sup>13</sup>Pallium India, Kerala, India; <sup>14</sup>University of Washington, Seattle Cancer Care Alliance, Seattle, Washington, USA.

### Abstract

Many women diagnosed with breast cancer in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) present with advanced-stage disease. While cure is not a realistic outcome, site-specific interventions, supportive care, and palliative care can achieve meaningful outcomes and improve quality of life.

As part of the 5<sup>th</sup> Breast Health Global Initiative (BHGI) Global Summit, an expert international panel identified thirteen key resource recommendations for supportive and palliative care for

---

**Corresponding author:** Benjamin O. Anderson, MD, Chair and Director, The Breast Health Global Initiative, Joint Member, Epidemiology Section, Division of Public Health Sciences, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center; Director, SCCA Breast Health Clinic, Professor of Surgery and Global Health-Medicine, Department of Surgery, University of Washington, 1959 NE Pacific St, BB437A-Bx 356410, Seattle, WA 98195-6410; Tel: 206-543-6352 Fax: (206) 543-8136; banderso@fhcrc.org.

Panel members:

Benjamin O. Anderson (BHGI Director, USA), Mohammad A. Bushnaq (Jordan), Rolando Camacho-Rodriguez (Summit Co-chair, Cuba), James Cleary (Co-chair, USA), Joe N. Clegg-Lampsey (Ghana), Stephen R. Connor (USA), Henry Ddungu (Co-chair, Uganda), Msemu B. Diwani (Tanzania), Alexandru Eniu (Romania), Margaret Fitch (USA), Julie R. Gralow (Summit Co-chair, USA), Sudhir Gupta (India), Joe B. Harford (USA), Suresh Kumar (India), Gertrude Nakigudde (Uganda), Mati N. Nejmi (Morocco), M.R. Rajagopal (India), Gary M. Rodin (USA), Carla Ripamonti (Italy), Beti Thompson (BHGI Advisor, USA)

**Publisher's Disclaimer:** This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

**Conflict of Interest Statement:** BOA received consulting compensation from GE Healthcare and Navidea Biopharmaceuticals. JC received consulting/grant/research support from Procetus, grant/research support from Amgen, and was on the data safety and monitoring committee for KangLaiTe. MN received consulting support from Sanofi-Aventis. All other authors and panel members reported no potential conflict of interest.

metastatic breast cancer. The recommendations are presented in three resource-stratified tables: health system resource allocations, resource allocations for organ-based metastatic breast cancer, and resource allocations for palliative care. These tables illustrate how health systems can provide supportive and palliative care services for patients at a basic level of available resources, and incrementally add services as more resources become available.

The health systems table includes health professional education, patient and family education, palliative care models, and diagnostic testing. The metastatic disease management table provides recommendations for supportive care for bone, brain, liver, lung, and skin metastases as well as bowel obstruction. The third table includes the palliative care recommendations: pain management, and psychosocial and spiritual aspects of care.

The panel considered pain management a priority at a basic level of resource allocation and emphasized the need for morphine to be easily available in LMICs. Regular pain assessments and the proper use of pharmacologic and non-pharmacologic interventions is recommended. Basic-level resources for psychosocial and spiritual aspects of care include health professional and patient and family education, as well as patient support, including community-based peer support.

### Keywords

metastatic breast cancer; supportive care; palliative care; site-specific metastasis; low- and middle-income countries; resource allocations

---

## Supportive and Palliative Care for Metastatic Breast Cancer

Many women diagnosed with breast cancer in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) present with advanced metastatic disease, or they may present with locally advanced disease and undergo treatment with curative intent but nonetheless develop metastases. Common sites for breast cancer metastases are bone, brain, liver, and lung; less common sites are intra-abdominal and skin. Cure is not usually a realistic treatment outcome for metastatic disease<sup>1</sup>, but site-specific interventions (aimed at prolonging life), supportive care measures (treatment of side-effects of therapy, both physical and psychosocial), and palliative care measures (treatment of advanced disease symptoms, including pain management, psychosocial and spiritual issues), can achieve meaningful outcomes and maintain a reasonable quality of life. Allocation of resources specifically for supportive and palliative care should be part of comprehensive oncology care programs.<sup>1,2</sup>

### Defining “Supportive Care” and “Palliative Care”

The terms “supportive care” and “palliative care” are sometimes used interchangeably.<sup>3</sup> However, supportive care in cancer is the prevention and management of the adverse effects of cancer and its treatment. This includes management of physical and psychological symptoms and side effects across the continuum of the cancer experience from diagnosis through anticancer treatment to post-treatment care. Enhancing rehabilitation, secondary cancer prevention, survivorship and end-of-life care are integral to supportive care. According to European Association for Palliative Care (EAPC), supportive care is more appropriate for patients still receiving antineoplastic therapies and also extends to survivors,

whereas palliative care has its major focus on patients with far advanced disease where antineoplastic therapies has been withdrawn.<sup>4</sup>

For the purposes of this Breast Health Global Initiative (BHGI) consensus statement we acknowledge: 1) the broad, expanded definition of “palliative care” introduced by the World Health Organization, which calls for palliative care to be introduced at the time of diagnosis of cancer or the start of treatment<sup>5</sup>; and 2) the practical need to be able to identify and categorize common components of treatment-related, site-specific supportive care interventions for metastatic disease and end-of-life-related palliative care, in order to establish evidence-based criteria for program implementation.

## Existing Evidence and Guidelines

Evidence-based breast cancer clinical guidelines for treatment of metastatic breast cancer from international organizations<sup>6</sup>, high-income countries (HICs)<sup>7,8</sup> and LMICs<sup>9,10</sup>, all recommend supportive/palliative care as part of metastatic breast cancer care. These guidelines expand the concept of palliative care, previously limited to end-of-life care, to include supportive care offered concurrently with curative or life-prolonging treatments for patients with all stages of cancer. Palliative care in this broader setting may reduce time spent in hospitals<sup>11,12</sup> and may be more effective in meeting patients’ goals than usual approaches to end-of-life care practiced by oncologists.<sup>13</sup> There is increasing agreement that patients should be informed about supportive and palliative care services as soon as a diagnosis of advanced disease is made, or soon after the start of tumor-specific treatment.<sup>4,14,15</sup> Implementing this broader concept of palliative and supportive care is challenging<sup>16</sup>, even in HRCs<sup>14,17,18</sup>, and requires interdisciplinary approaches<sup>2</sup> and shared understanding of the need for health systems to identify and provide supportive care resources. This consensus statement is one of three companion reports, developed by the BHGI as part of the 2012 Global Summit that provides resource-stratified recommendations covering the continuum of supportive and palliative care services for breast cancer patients. The other consensus statements cover supportive care during treatment<sup>19</sup>, and supportive care after curative treatment<sup>20</sup>.

## BHGI Global Summit and Expert Panel Consensus Process

All three BHGI supportive care consensus statements provide recommendations for breast cancer supportive care program implementation in LMICs. Methods developed by the BHGI for the structured creation of evidence-based, 4-tier resource-stratified guidelines and consensus statements (see Table 1) have been previously described.<sup>21,22</sup> A systematic literature review was performed in preparation for the 5th BHGI Global Summit, which was held in association with the International Atomic Energy Association (IAEA), in Vienna, Austria, on October 2, 2012. Supportive care was chosen as a theme for the global summit, as it emphasizes often-overlooked aspects of medical care, which are not always considered directly related to curative intent. The Metastatic Disease and Palliative Care Consensus Panel presented on key topics and then performed consensus analysis through facilitated expert panel discussions to draft the core resource-stratified table matrices, which are the primary outcome of the panel examination and deliberation. Companion consensus

statements, *Supportive Care during Treatment*<sup>19</sup>, and *Supportive Care after Curative Treatment*<sup>20</sup>, were developed in parallel during this 2012 Global Summit. Supportive care is an under-researched area of medicine, especially in LMICs.

Systematic reviews and meta-analyses are often not available for select topics, or include only studies from HICs. When studies from LMICs are available on a topic, they are provided as additional references.

## Key Resources Needed for Supportive Care with Metastatic Disease

The expert international panel identified thirteen key resource recommendations for supportive and palliative care for metastatic breast cancer. The recommendations are presented in three sections 1) health systems resource allocations; 2) resource allocation for organ-based metastatic disease management; and 3) resource allocations palliative care. In each section, a description of a resource category is followed by resource-stratified consensus panel recommendations. Recommendations are also presented in resource-stratified tables. These resource-stratified tables illustrate how a health system can provide supportive care services to patients with metastatic breast cancer, starting at a basic level of resource allocation and incrementally adding program resources. The section *Special Concerns and Emerging Issues in LMICs* highlights key issues from the panel deliberations. If a topic is covered in more detail in another companion consensus statement, a link and reference is provided.

## Health Systems (Table 2)

### Health Professional Education/Training (Table 2, Row 1)

**Description:** The term “health professional” was chosen by the consensus panel to acknowledge the range in medical and other professionals who provide supportive and palliative care services in LMICs. When specialists are identified as a required resource, it is assumed that a specialist has a certification for their area of expertise.

Health professional education for supportive care for metastatic disease and palliative end-of-life care should focus on training multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary teams, and coordination of care. Even in the lowest resource settings, breast cancer patients should have multiple care providers, with coordination of care as a key component of supportive and palliative care program implementation. Efforts are underway in high-resource settings to create interdisciplinary teams and educate primary-care physicians, nurses, and other specialists, such as oncologists and surgeons, in palliative care. Including nursing staff in palliative care training is important, as nurses report a lack of skills training, as well as confidence and tools needed to provide adequate palliative care.<sup>23</sup>

Health professionals working with breast cancer patients should be trained to recognize and manage site-specific metastases using clinical practice guidelines adapted to available resources. (See the companion BHGI consensus statement, *Supportive Care during Treatment*<sup>19</sup>, for a list of guidelines that address cancer symptom management, including pain management.) Pain management for cancer patients should be part of standard medical

and nursing school training programs<sup>24–27</sup>, as well as part of continuing education efforts. Pain management education should include the distinction between nociceptive and neuropathic pain, and the importance of adequate pain medication.<sup>28</sup> The method of training may vary based on available resources.<sup>29</sup> Although diploma and certificate courses are the most comprehensive, less costly short courses and distance learning can also provide important pain management training by focusing on improving skills or overcoming barriers to adequate pain management.<sup>28</sup> Barriers identified included regulatory hindrances to opioid access, and fear of opioids among the public, professionals and administrators. Other barriers identified include insufficient capacity for nonpharmacological interventions, lack of coordination between services, and limited provider interaction time with patients.<sup>25</sup> Health professional training efforts should include home-based care management for terminally ill patients<sup>30</sup>, and include community health nurses who visit patients in their homes.

**Note:** “Multidisciplinary team approach” refers to a patient care model that includes experts from different disciplines, whereas an “interdisciplinary team approach” requires a more integrated and coordinated approach to patient care, where experts from different disciplines establish shared patient care goals for a more holistic approach to patient care.

**#1. Panel recommendations:** At **basic levels** of resource allocation, health professional education should include the appropriate use of clinical practice guidelines and awareness of alternative and complementary medicine use in the community. Pain management education should include simple pain assessment strategies, the appropriate use of available pain and psychotropic medications, including morphine, and knowledge of the side-effects of such medications. Awareness of skin complications should be included. The psychosocial and spiritual aspects of end-of-life should be included. Health literacy, cultural literacy and communication skills should be part of health professional supportive care training. At **limited levels**, health professional education should include the importance of referrals to available specialists, awareness of complex breast cancer pain syndromes, and the need to refer select patients to pain specialists/programs. It should also include the emotional and spiritual aspects of death and dying. At **enhanced levels**, health professional education should include palliative care training of nursing staff, and regular in-service interdisciplinary palliative care discussions (updates).

### **Patient, Family and Caregiver Education (Table 2, Row 2)**

**Description:** Communication with patients and families about treatments and side-effects can affect patient responses.<sup>31,32</sup> Patients should be encouraged to report new, persistent symptoms to their healthcare team, outside of scheduled appointments. For patients with good health literacy, written instructions on pain management plans and symptom control should be provided. Skilled questioning by health professionals during patient interactions can help elicit patient preferences.<sup>33</sup> Educating family members is a critical component of supportive care: they are often involved in patient care, yet they may not accurately interpret, communicate or act on patient preferences, and family perception of patient wishes may differ from the physician’s perception.<sup>32</sup> Physicians were found in one study to be more responsive to family preferences for place of discharge, and more responsive to patient preference for discontinuation of late treatment.<sup>32</sup> Advanced directives are important tools to

convey patient preferences in order to help patients, families and health providers communicate more effectively about end-of-life choices, and to document patient decisions. Cultural or family traditions regarding the sharing of end-of-life information should be respected. Patient education should be tailored to the health literacy of the patient and their preferred method of receiving information, and their social and cultural values.<sup>34</sup> Patient-family-physician conferences should be part of routine patient care, with a focus on patient-centered decision-making. (See the Care Model section in this manuscript.)

**#2. Panel recommendations:** At **basic levels** of resource allocation, patient education should focus on late-disease risks, complications of advanced disease, and palliative care treatments and their side-effects. Patients and their families should be provided with information on pain management, skin care, and psychosocial and spiritual aspects of end-of-life care. At **limited levels**, patient and family education should include emotional and spiritual aspects of death and dying, and be culturally appropriate. Advanced care planning information should be available.

### Care Models (Table 2, Row 3)

**Description:** Training health professionals and educating patients provides the foundation for supportive and palliative care, but establishing effective care models for delivery, especially at the end of life, is equally important. The location of end-of-life care is a primary concern for patients and their families. A recent review of end-of-life care in 34 countries found that most patients wished to die at home (although this varied from 18–100%, based on country, income levels and disease status of those surveyed).<sup>35</sup> However, the accessibility of pain relief, the availability of affordable care, and the amount of assistance in coping with the burden of care, influenced the choice of location for end-of-life care.<sup>35</sup> Other research suggests that patient preference for the place of death may change over time due to a variety of factors.<sup>36</sup> Understanding and meeting patient preferences as they evolve over time should be a measured outcome for palliative care services.<sup>37</sup>

**#3. Panel recommendations:** At **basic levels** of resource allocation, patient-centered decision-making should be a key component of end-of-life care and should include patient-family-health professional conferences. Trained volunteer support and home- and hospital-based palliative care that includes community and family support should be available. At **limited levels**, trained palliative care nursing support should be available, including home-based and hospital-based support. Outpatient services and referrals for consulting should be available. Palliative care should include a multidisciplinary team approach. At **enhanced levels**, home-based palliative care should include back-up clinic and hospital support. Trained palliative care physicians should be available at outpatient clinics. In-patient palliative care units and interdisciplinary patient care should be available. Palliative care training centers and quality assurance systems should be in place. At **maximal levels**, palliative care specialist services should be considered.

### Diagnostic Testing (Table 2, Row 4)

**Description:** Although extensive metastatic work-ups in asymptomatic patients are not recommended, confirmation testing for metastasis and monitoring for late-disease



complications, such as spinal cord compression, should be available. Confirmation testing includes x-ray imaging and basic laboratory tests (eg, serum calcium, creatinine, and magnesium levels)<sup>8</sup>, and can help distinguish symptoms of site-specific metastases from comorbidities or treatment-related toxicities. (See the companion BHGI consensus statement, *Supportive Care during Treatment*<sup>19</sup>, for recommendations for treatment-related toxicities.)

**#4. Panel recommendations:** At **basic levels** of resource allocation, confirmation tests for metastatic disease in symptomatic patients are recommended.

## Supportive Care: Organ-based (Site-specific) Metastatic Disease Management

### Bone Metastases (Table 3, Row 1)

**Description:** Approximately 70–80% of advanced breast cancer patients develop bone metastases during the course of their disease.<sup>38</sup> Accelerated bone loss and associated complications, such as fractures, may also be a consequence of adjuvant treatment.<sup>39</sup> Although patients with bone-only metastases have a longer survival than those with visceral metastases, their symptom burden is high, and includes bone pain, hypercalcemia, pathologic fractures, and spinal cord compression.<sup>38</sup> Spinal cord compression can be a severely disabling and potentially life-threatening complication, requiring radiological studies, radiotherapy, or surgery.<sup>6</sup> Bone metastatic complications can severely affect quality of life, and significantly impact healthcare system costs.<sup>40</sup> Clinical practice guidelines provide detailed recommendations regarding treatment of bone metastases, including specific therapies such as radiotherapy<sup>41–43</sup>, bone-modifying agents such as bisphosphonates and denosumab<sup>44</sup>, and the prevention and treatment of side-effects of treatment, including osteonecrosis of the jaw<sup>45,46</sup>. Pain is a major symptom of bone metastasis and bone pain management is often inadequate, even in patients referred for palliative radiotherapy.<sup>47</sup> When symptom control is the main goal, radiotherapy may be given as single fractions. Surgery can alleviate spinal cord compression and pain, and ensure bone continuity and functionality, whereas radiotherapy and dexamethasone can help control bone pain and assist with re-calcification and stabilization, thus reducing spinal cord compression and minimizing risks of paraplegia.<sup>48</sup> Bisphosphonates should also be considered to prevent or delay onset of skeletal-related disease or treatment side-effects<sup>44</sup>, to treat malignancy-associated hypercalcemia<sup>49</sup>, and to reduce pain intensity. Overall, bisphosphonates are well-tolerated; adverse effects include influenza-like symptoms, arthralgia, and gastrointestinal symptoms.<sup>50</sup> Whereas radioisotopes have a high cost and require experienced nuclear medicine services.

**#5. Panel recommendations:** At **basic levels** of resource allocation, bone pain management should include steroids, non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs), opioids (eg, oral and parenteral morphine), and co-analgesics (following WHO pain ladder recommendations). Patients should be assessed for fractures and early spinal cord compression by enquiring about back pain, and with plain x-ray of the spine, as appropriate. At **limited levels**, radiotherapy (with dexamethasone) and surgery should be available. Patient follow-up should include routine evaluation for spinal cord compression or fractures

for high-risk patients. At **enhanced levels**, radioisotopes, bone-modifying agents (eg, bisphosphonates, denosumab) should be available. At **maximal levels**, radiofrequency ablation or cryoablation could be considered.

### **Bowel Obstruction (Table 3, Row 2)**

**Description:** Breast cancer metastasis to the bowel is rare, but can cause significant symptoms related to malignant bowel obstruction<sup>51,52</sup>, which is an indicator of poor prognosis.<sup>53,54</sup> Bowel obstruction can also be caused by adhesions, post-irradiation bowel damage, inflammatory bowel disease, and hernias.<sup>54</sup> Symptoms of bowel obstruction include bowel pain, nausea and vomiting, and constipation. Opioids are the most effective drug for managing pain associated with bowel obstruction; steroids may help to reduce inflammation at the site of obstruction<sup>55</sup>. Partial obstruction due to constipation may require laxatives.<sup>56</sup> Anti-emetics and anti-cholinergics are used to treat nausea and vomiting.<sup>52,53</sup> Nasogastric tubes should be available as a short-term intervention to drain stomach contents in order to reduce nausea. Gastric venting with percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy (PEG) tube placement can help reduce nausea and vomiting due to malignant gastrointestinal obstruction. PEG provides a rapid, safe method of achieving symptomatic relief without the risks of surgical procedures or the discomfort of a nasogastric tube.<sup>57,58</sup> Somatostatin analogues can reduce gastrointestinal secretions.<sup>59–61</sup>

**#6. Panel recommendations:** At **basic** levels of resource allocation, morphine (oral and parenteral) should be available. Steroids (to treat inflammation), laxatives (to treat partial bowel obstructions), and antiemetics and anticholinergics should be available, and used according to clinical practice guidelines. Nasogastric tube (NG-tube) should be available. At **limited levels**, expanded non-morphine opioids should be available for pain. At **enhanced levels**, gastric venting (venting G-tube) should be available to reduce nausea and vomiting due to malignant gastrointestinal obstruction. At **maximal levels**, somatostatin analogues could be considered.

**Note:** Drug therapy and procedures should be administered according to clinical practice guidelines for management of bowel obstruction, based on the degree of obstruction and the condition of the patient. Some therapies are contraindicated for fully obstructed bowels, and may require surgical interventions or more conservative management.<sup>56</sup> If early bowel obstruction is suspected, the use of motility agents may help overcome obstruction.

### **Brain (Table 3, Row 3)**

**Description:** Brain metastases are becoming increasingly prevalent as survival rates increase, with a reported incidence of brain metastases of 10–17% in clinical populations<sup>62,63</sup>, and 30% based on autopsy findings<sup>64</sup>. Brain metastases indicate a poor prognosis. Symptoms of brain metastasis include headache, neurological disturbances, or seizures, all of which can significantly reduce quality of life.<sup>42</sup> Drug therapies can reduce brain swelling and edema and manage symptoms such as headaches, nausea and vomiting, and seizures, although there is limited evidence for anticonvulsants as seizure prophylaxis.<sup>65</sup> More advanced treatments include stereostatic radiotherapy and surgical resection for small operable solitary metastases, or for decompression of tumor mass. Radiosurgery may be an



option for some unresectable brain metastases, but should include a risk-benefit analysis that balances the potential survival benefit against the adverse neurocognitive effects.<sup>6</sup>

**#7. Panel recommendations:** At **basic levels** of resource allocation, symptom management of brain swelling and edema should include the use of analgesics and steroids (dexamethasone is the drug of choice); nausea and vomiting can be managed with corticosteroids<sup>66</sup> and other anti-emetics. Anticonvulsants may be considered.<sup>65</sup> At **limited levels**, whole brain radiotherapy should be available.<sup>42,67</sup> At **enhanced levels**, stereostatic radiotherapy based on lesion size or accessibility<sup>68</sup>, and surgical resection, should be available.

#### Liver Metastases (Table 3, Row 4)

**Description:** About half of breast cancer patients with advanced disease develop liver metastases.<sup>69</sup> Symptoms include jaundice, pain (from capsular swelling, distension, and irritation), abdominal fullness, pruritus and bilious obstruction. Nausea and vomiting may occur due to gastric compression; anorexia, fever and liver failure may occur. Drug therapy can help manage some symptoms; more aggressive interventions (biliary stents, percutaneous drainage, or tumor embolization) may be needed to relieve bilious obstruction. Tumor embolization has been reported to give good results in several studies.<sup>70,71</sup> Liver resection has been reported to result in a longer survival.<sup>69</sup>

**#8. Panel recommendations:** At **basic levels** of resource allocation, symptom management of liver metastases includes pain control with analgesics and steroids, and anti-emetics and antihistamines for nausea or pruritus. At **enhanced levels**, biliary stents, percutaneous drainage, and tumor embolization should be available. At **maximal levels**, liver resection (selective metastasectomy) could be considered.

#### Lung Metastases (Table 3, Row 5)

**Description:** Lung metastasis is common in recurrent breast cancer. One study found that 71% of advanced breast cancer patients had metastatic lung cancer at autopsy.<sup>72</sup> Lung metastases can cause respiratory compromise by direct effect of the metastases on lung tissue, airway obstruction, or from pleural effusion. Symptoms include shortness of breath, exertional dyspnea, pleuritic pain and cough. Although surgical resection may prolong survival in a subset of patients<sup>73,74</sup>, it is not recommended as routine care. The use of oxygen therapy for hypoxemic patients should be discussed with patients and families.<sup>75</sup>

**#9. Panel recommendation:** At **basic levels** of resource allocation, treatment of breathlessness includes opioids, anxiolytics, antipsychotics, steroids, and fluid drainage by thoracentesis. Oxygen therapy for hypoxemic patients should be available, to be continued if a preliminary trial improves breathlessness. At **limited levels**, pleurodesis, by pleural drain, open thoracotomy or video-assisted thoracoscopic surgery (VATS) should be available. Radiotherapy should be available for management of metastases causing dyspnea or hemoptysis.

### Skin Metastases and Complications (Table 3, Row 6)

**Description:** Breast cancer is the most common cancer to metastasize to the skin.<sup>76</sup> Site-specific skin presentations include fungating wounds and chronic skin ulcers, which require regular wound management due to strong odor, exudate, and pain, which can cause psychosocial distress. Locally advanced breast cancer may also cause fungating wounds, and surgery can be complicated by impaired wound healing. Radiation dermatitis is a common complication of radiotherapy (both primary and adjuvant). Immediate attention to developing skin complications may prevent more serious complications. Best practice for skin care should be followed, including preventive measures to avoid skin breakdown and relieve symptoms (burning, itching or pain), with special attention to skin folds, moist areas and skin surfaces where rubbing/friction could occur. Aqueous cream to maintain skin moisture level and integrity, and short-term corticosteroid use to manage itching and burning, may be helpful.<sup>77</sup> Simple measures, such as washing skin with mild soap and water, are essential for the prevention and treatment of acute radiation dermatitis. Moist desquamation should be treated according to best practice for moist wound healing, with special attention to type of dressing based on amount of exudate, and with antibiotics as needed. Surgery may be considered, if needed.<sup>7</sup> Education for health professionals in assessing and dressing wounds using sterile techniques and good hygiene practice is important.

**#10. Panel recommendations:** At **basic levels** of resource allocation, management of skin complications includes wound and skin assessment, analgesics, broad-spectrum antibiotics, and simple dressings and skin barriers (for fragile skin and trauma prevention). Activated charcoal and topical metronidazole powder should be available. Patient and families should be taught wound dressing techniques. At **limited levels**, topical hemostasis agents (eg, silver nitrate) to treat bleeding, and radiotherapy and surgical debridement to manage necrotic skin complications and fungating wounds, should be available. At **enhanced levels**, more sophisticated dressing material should be available, as well as calcium alginate for hemostasis, and stoma/wound therapy. For patients with limited mobility, air or egg crate mattresses should be available. At **maximal levels**, plastic surgery, vacuum (negative pressure) wound therapy and mechanical beds may be considered.

**Note:** Because there are no clear, universally accepted guidelines for wound management, it is important that healthcare systems with limited resources focus on wound management strategies known to be effective, and ensure that health professionals are well educated about evidence-based recommendations.

## Palliative Care: Pain Management and End-of-Life Care

### Pain Management (Table 4, Row 1)

**Description:** Breast cancer patients report pain as a major symptom of disease and treatment. A systematic review<sup>78</sup> found that pain prevalence in patients ranged from 33% after treatment to 59% during treatment and 64% in patients with metastatic disease. Metastatic-disease-related pain can include local and diffuse bone pain, pain from spinal cord compression, bowel obstruction, or brain swelling, or from skin complications such as

ulcers and fungating wounds.<sup>79</sup> Pain management should include regular pain assessments, and proper use of pharmacologic and non-pharmacologic interventions. Health professional pain management education should be a primary focus of supportive care and palliative end-of-life medical training, and should include the universal principles of pain management: safe and effective use of strong opioids for cancer pain relief; understanding the relative differences in analgesic effects of various drugs; close and accurate clinical monitoring of patients' pain levels and well-being; and identifying pain-related emergencies (eg, bone fracture, spinal cord compression, infection, or bowel obstruction).<sup>79,80</sup>

Pain assessment tools should be simple and consider patient health literacy. Simple one-dimensional pain intensity tools, such as a body chart with a Numeric Pain Rating (NRS), Visual Analogue Scale (VAS), or verbal descriptor scale<sup>81</sup>, can be utilized. In patients with cognitive impairments and limited ability to communicate, behavioral observation of the patient's facial expressions, movement patterns and non-verbal sounds, and reports from family, may be used to make judgments of pain intensity.<sup>82</sup>

Other assessment tools that measure pain or treatment-outcome satisfaction include the Brief Pain Inventory (BPI), which is available in over a dozen languages<sup>83–87</sup>, the Palliative Outcome Scale<sup>88</sup>, the ESAS<sup>89–91</sup>, the Pain Management Index<sup>92</sup>, the Memorial Pain Assessment Card<sup>84,93</sup>, and the McGill Pain questionnaire<sup>94–96</sup>.

General pain management often requires multimodal approaches.<sup>97</sup> Resources often determine the availability and type of analgesics and adjuvant pain treatments. The WHO pain ladder has been used as a resource for developing pain management strategies in LMICs.<sup>98</sup> Non-pharmacologic pain management should also follow the WHO recommendations.<sup>99</sup> There are a number of comprehensive guidelines on cancer pain management available.<sup>15,79,99</sup> Side-effects of analgesics also need to be managed, and include fatigue, cognitive dysfunction, dry mouth, constipation, nausea, sweating and weight gain.<sup>100</sup>

**#11. Panel recommendations:** At **basic levels** of resource allocation, pain consideration is often a dialogue between the patient and health professional that elucidates the nature, location and extent of pain and its impact on daily life. A simple one-dimensional pain intensity tool can be used. Immediate-release oral morphine and parenteral morphine should be readily available, as should clinicians who are able to prescribe opioids. Pain-control remedies should follow the WHO ladder and include Step One analgesics and adjuvants (such as dexamethasone and tricyclic antidepressants) administered according to clinical practice guidelines. Basic non-pharmacologic pain management interventions should also be available and include management of pain-related physical symptoms. Patients' preference for alternative and complementary pain medication should be explored. At **limited levels**, additional pain-control remedies should include expanded access to drugs on the WHO ladder: Step 2 analgesics (such as codeine and tramadol), and slow-release oral morphine, and Step 3 opioid options (such as oxycodone or hydromorphone). Radiotherapy should be available (single fractions may be as effective as multiple fractions for pain relief.) Non-pharmacological methods should include physical therapy and occupational therapy for functional loss and pain management. At **enhanced levels**, the use of multidimensional pain

screening tools and pain care plans should be considered. Pain control remedies should include opioid pumps, and other strong opioids such as methadone and transdermal fentanyl. Consultation for pain therapy with a pain specialist should be available, and include management of complex pain syndromes. Surgery for spinal cord compression, fracture, or obstruction should be available. At **maximal levels**, locoregional anesthesia and spinal analgesia, such as neuraxial infusion of opioids, spinal cord stimulation and nerve blocks, could be considered.

### Psychosocial Aspects of End-of-Life Care (Table 4, Row 2)

**Description:** The diagnosis of metastatic disease can generate profound anxiety and fears of death and dying and raise spiritual concerns.<sup>101</sup> These fears may be heightened when there are few resources to support individuals and their families, and when there is social and cultural stigma associated with cancer. All health professionals working with cancer patients should have training in the psychosocial and spiritual aspects of cancer, as well as breast-cancer-specific complications related to body image and sexual health. (See the companion BHGI consensus statement, *Supportive Care during Treatment*<sup>19</sup>, for discussions on spirituality.) In addition, supportive and palliative care training should include specialists treating cancer patients.

Training in psychosocial components of end-of-life care should include awareness that depression can be a cumulative response to progression of metastatic cancer and proximity to death.<sup>102</sup> Severity of physical suffering, past history of depression/psychiatric illness, and a lack of social support can all increase the likelihood of depressive symptoms.<sup>103</sup> Assessment tools for depression and other psychosocial problems have been developed or adapted for use in LMICs.<sup>104–108</sup> A simplified distress thermometer (DT) and depressed mood thermometer (MT) have been used in a number of LMIC studies.<sup>109</sup> However, formal screening for psychosocial issues should be implemented only when resources for formal referral and treatment are available. Breast cancer patients with advanced disease, and their families, often require additional emotional support, which can be provided by breast cancer or general cancer community organizations and support groups. Clear and empathic communication between health professionals, patients and families is a critical aspect of psychosocial care required in any palliative care setting, and training in these skills is useful. Bereavement support should be available to families, including spiritual support in the community. (See the Spiritual Aspects section.)

**#12. Panel recommendations:** At **basic levels** of resource allocation, patient education is a primary intervention. Consideration of a patient's pain (through patient-provider dialogue, observations, and other appropriate means) should be provided. Community-based psychosocial support and bereavement support should be available. At **limited levels**, education of patients, their family, community, and health professionals should include emotional aspects of advanced breast cancer and death. Advance care planning should be offered. At **enhanced levels**, screening and referrals for depression and distress should be available. Referral to professional counseling for psychological, financial, legal and family matters should be available. Antidepressants should be available. At **maximal levels**, other psychosocial resources that require psychiatrist or psychologist, or

social worker coordinated care, such as formal psychosocial treatment programs, could be considered.

### Spiritual Aspects of End-of-Life Care (Table 4, Row 3)

**Description:** Spirituality is emerging as a distinct area of supportive care in HICs<sup>110–112</sup> and LMICs<sup>114–116</sup> and greater spiritual well-being has been associated with higher perceived quality of life and satisfaction with doctor-patient relationships in HICs.<sup>111,112</sup> The traditional role for health professionals has been to recognize the importance of religious/spiritual beliefs in seriously ill patients, and to refer patients to their own religious leader or community.<sup>110</sup> For many patients, the provision of spiritual care by a religious counselor is most desirable. A more active model for health professionals in assessing spiritual well-being of cancer patients is now recognized, and has been incorporated into many supportive cancer care programs.<sup>110</sup> Attention to spiritual well-being, which includes faith, a sense of meaning, and inner peace<sup>108</sup>, should be considered part of supportive breast cancer care.<sup>117,118</sup> Spiritual counseling either within or outside of religious practice may be helpful for breast cancer patients.<sup>113</sup> General assessment of spiritual health should be part of patient evaluations; health professionals should be aware of available support services within their community and health care system. (See the companion BHGI consensus statement, *Supportive Care during Treatment*<sup>19</sup>, for further recommendations and discussion on spirituality.)

**#13. Panel recommendations:** At basic levels of resource allocation, spiritual consideration (through patient-provider dialogue and other appropriate means) and referral to community-based spiritual support should be available from religion-based or nonreligious sources. At enhanced levels, clinic- or hospital-associated spiritual support, and hospital or hospice spiritual reflection and meditation space, should be available.

### Special Concerns and Emerging Issues in LMICs.

#### Communication skills for end-of-life care:

Effective communication between patients and health professionals has been associated with patient satisfaction with care at end-of-life.<sup>119</sup> However, many health professionals feel that they lack appropriate training to deal with end-of-life issues.<sup>120</sup> In that regard, many oncologists report the communicating of poor prognosis as one of the most challenging and stressful aspects of their profession.<sup>121</sup> Education about effective patient communication should be part of supportive care training programs, should be culturally sensitive and appropriate, and should recognize that patient educational needs may differ based on age, culture, religion and nationality.<sup>34</sup> The majority of patients want full disclosure of information, if it is communicated sensitively, to allow them to participate fully in decision-making.<sup>122</sup> A European Society for Medical Oncology (ESMO) survey of oncologists found that even when patients express a desire for information, many oncologists are unwilling, unable or uncomfortable in disclosing information regarding diagnosis, benefits of treatments, and prognosis.<sup>122</sup> Cultural competency is required in such communication<sup>34</sup>, as well as consideration of a patient's right to know and the patient's family dynamics. Talking about death may be considered taboo or bad luck in some cultures, or it may only be

considered appropriate to talk to certain family members about death. Enquiring into patient preferences for level and form of communication (eg, health literacy and cultural literacy) can be valuable. Further research is needed in order to better understand longitudinal, interactive, and interdisciplinary processes of decision-making in palliative care.<sup>123</sup>

### Screening tools:

Screening tools can help to identify patients who may benefit from early palliative care. The National Cancer Center Network (NCCN) developed screening criteria, and recommends that all patients be screened for palliative care needs.<sup>124</sup> In LMICs, where a less time-consuming tool may be needed<sup>125</sup>, these criteria can be of value to health systems in developing their own criteria and screening tools. Such quality improvement projects have been shown to increase frequency of, and indications for, palliative care referrals.<sup>126</sup>

### Referrals:

Quality palliative care benefits patients, family and caregivers, and in an HIC setting has been shown to reduce inpatient length of stay, admissions and overall costs.<sup>127</sup> Education of health professionals regarding appropriate use of clinical practice guidelines<sup>19</sup> and referral strategies are key to improving palliative care for advanced-stage disease. Lack of adequate physician education in palliative care has been associated with late referrals to palliative care in both HICs<sup>128,129</sup> and LMICs<sup>130</sup>. The under-detection of pain in breast cancer patients contributes to late referrals<sup>129</sup>; a lack of health system criteria for pain referrals also contributes to late or poor referral rates in HICs<sup>131</sup> and LMICs<sup>130</sup>. Barriers to early referrals include oncologists' concerns about "letting go" of patients<sup>132</sup>, inaccurate prognosis, logistical factors, and other medical concerns<sup>133</sup>, including the concern that referrals to palliative care would alarm patients and their families.<sup>134</sup> Coordinated interdisciplinary approaches, with education of health professionals and patients about palliative care, may improve referral rates for metastatic cancer patients,<sup>132</sup> and help transition patients with continuing needs to concurrent palliative care programs.<sup>135</sup> The broadening scope of palliative care, and its emerging integration into oncology programs, make education regarding the timing of palliative care referrals a high priority. Various models of "automatic" referral have been proposed, including palliative care consultation for all solid tumor patients admitted to hospital.<sup>136</sup> Such models, together with education, can also help to replace the older associations of palliative care exclusively with end-of-life, with a broader supportive care concept that includes early palliative care.<sup>137-140</sup>

### Discussion

This consensus statement expands on the 2008 BHGI guidelines for resource-stratified treatment of site-specific metastases of breast cancer and palliative care.<sup>141</sup> Palliative care requires interdisciplinary care teams to address physical, psychosocial, and spiritual needs of breast cancer patients and their families. Interdisciplinary teams should include pharmacists, psychologists and psychiatrists, nurses, social workers and spiritual caregivers, with access to the services of nutritionists, physical and respiratory therapists, and other specialists, including nurses trained in wound care. In LMICs, basic palliative care services often include trained volunteers and home- or hospital-based programs.



Pain management should be a priority in supportive care for metastatic breast cancer and end-of-life palliative care. Morphine should be available and easily accessible. Pain is often inadequately treated due to: 1) reluctance of patients to report unrelieved pain; 2) health professionals' inadequate knowledge of pain management techniques; 3) negative attitudes of health professionals toward the use of opioids; and 4) limitations in healthcare systems, including easy access to morphine. Pain assessment, using simple pain intensity tools or pain scales, should be a routine part of patient monitoring in order to assess whether existing treatments are providing adequate pain relief, or if pain medications can be reduced.

Integration of supportive care and palliative treatment into mainstream healthcare service provision has emerged as the “gold standard” in comparative analysis of palliative care development.<sup>142</sup> Introducing supportive care during initial treatment, continuing supportive care after initial curative treatment, and ensuring supportive care and palliative end-of-life care for metastatic breast cancer, will ensure breast cancer programs provide a continuum of care in LMICs.

Although research is scant with regards to identifying and quantifying the most effective components of palliative care programs, some comparative data are emerging.<sup>143</sup> A number of LMICs have reported implementation of palliative care programs.<sup>144,145</sup> A systematic review found a modest contribution to the palliative care literature from LMICs, with the majority of studies being from upper-middle-income countries, and 25% of the data from LMICs being published by HIC institutions.<sup>146</sup> Ongoing efforts and collaborations are required in terms of advocacy, policy making, and service development if global integration of palliative care into oncology programs is to be achieved. Collaborative research efforts are needed for the measurement and improvement of patient outcomes in LMICs.

### Financial acknowledgements:

BHGI received (2012 Global Summit) grants and contributions from Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, Susan G. Komen for the Cure® (Contract ID: INT-3063.0 / Tracking No: 221664); International Atomic Energy Agency Programme of Action for Cancer Therapy, National Cancer Institute, The Lancet Oncology, Elsevier, American Society of Clinical Oncology, Sheikh Mohammed Hussein Al-Amoudi Center of Excellence in Breast Cancer, Pan American Health Organization, European Society of Medical Oncology, European School of Oncology, Open Society Foundations, LIVESTRONG, and an unrestricted educational grant from Sanofi.

### References

1. Rayson D, McIntyre P. Transitions to palliation: two solitudes or inevitable integration? *Curr Oncol Rep.* 2007; 9(4): 285–9. [PubMed: 17588353]
2. Ferris FD, Bruera E, Cherny N, Cummings C, Currow D, Dudgeon D, et al. Palliative cancer care a decade later: accomplishments, the need, next steps -- from the American Society of Clinical Oncology. *J Clin Oncol.* 2009; 27(18): 3052–8. [PubMed: 19451437]
3. Hui D, De La Cruz M, Mori M, Parsons HA, Kwon JH, Torres-Vigil I, et al. Concepts and definitions for “supportive care,” “best supportive care,” “palliative care,” and “hospice care” in the published literature, dictionaries, and textbooks. *Support Care Cancer.* 2013; 21(3): 659–85. [PubMed: 22936493]
4. European Association for Palliative Care (EAPC). White paper on standards and norms for hospice and palliative care in Europe: Part 1. *Eur J Pall Care* 2009; 16/6:278–289
5. WHO. Palliative Care. World Health Organization: Available from: <http://www.who.int/cancer/palliative/en/>.

6. Cardoso F, Harbeck N, Fallowfield L, Kyriakides S, Senkus E. Locally recurrent or metastatic breast cancer: ESMO Clinical Practice Guidelines for diagnosis, treatment and follow-up. *Ann Oncol.* 2012; 23 Suppl 7: vii11–9. [PubMed: 22997442]
7. NCCN. National Comprehensive Cancer Network. Breast Cancer. Version 3.2013 [www.nccn.org](http://www.nccn.org).
8. Grunfeld E, Dhesy-Thind S, Levine M. Clinical practice guidelines for the care and treatment of breast cancer: follow-up after treatment for breast cancer (summary of the 2005 update). *CMAJ.* 2005; 172(10): 1319–20. [PubMed: 15883407]
9. Munshi A, Gupta S, Anderson B, Yarnold J, Parmar V, Jalali R, et al. Guidelines for locoregional therapy in primary breast cancer in developing countries: The results of an expert panel at the 8th Annual Women's Cancer Initiative - Tata Memorial Hospital (WCI-TMH) Conference *Indian J Med Paediatr Oncol.* 2012; 33(2): 112–22.
10. Shamieh O, Jazieh AR. Modification and implementation of NCCN Guidelines on palliative care in the Middle East and North Africa region. *J Natl Compr Canc Netw.* 2010; 8 Suppl 3: S41–7. [PubMed: 20697131]
11. Miccinesi G, Crocetti E, Morino P, Fallai M, Piazza M, Cavallini V, et al. Palliative home care reduces time spent in hospital wards: a population-based study in the Tuscany Region, Italy. *Cancer Causes Control.* 2003; 14(10): 971–7. [PubMed: 14750536]
12. Gomez-Batiste X, Tuca A, Corrales E, Porta-Sales J, Amor M, Espinosa J, et al. Resource consumption and costs of palliative care services in Spain: a multicenter prospective study. *J Pain Symptom Manage.* 2006; 31(6): 522–32. [PubMed: 16793492]
13. von Gunten CF. Evolution and effectiveness of palliative care. *Am J Geriatr Psychiatry.* 2012; 20(4): 291–7. [PubMed: 22367161]
14. Gaertner J, Wuerstlein R, Ostgathe C, Mallmann P, Harbeck N, Voltz R. Facilitating early integration of palliative care into breast cancer therapy. Promoting diseasespecific guidelines. *Breast Care.* 2011; 6(3): 240–4. [PubMed: 21779232]
15. Ripamonti CI, Santini D, Maranzano E, Berti M, Roila F. Management of cancer pain: ESMO Clinical Practice Guidelines. *Ann Oncol.* 2012; 23 Suppl 7: vii139–54. [PubMed: 22997447]
16. McNeil C Can guidelines be integrated into everyday practice? The NCCN in year 4. National Comprehensive Cancer Network. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* 1999; 91(9): 753–5. [PubMed: 10328101]
17. Gaertner J, Wuerstlein R, Klein U, Scheicht D, Frechen S, Wolf J, et al. Integrating palliative medicine into comprehensive breast cancer therapy - a pilot project. *Breast Care.* 2011; 6(3): 215–20. [PubMed: 21779227]
18. Levy MH, Back A, Benedetti C, Billings JA, Block S, Boston B, et al. NCCN clinical practice guidelines in oncology: palliative care. *J Natl Compr Canc Netw.* 2009; 7(4): 436–73. [PubMed: 19406043]
19. Cardoso F, Bese N, Distelhorst SR, Bevilacqua JLB, Ginsburg O, Grunberg SM, et al. Supportive care during treatment for breast cancer: resource allocations in LMCs. A Breast Health Global Initiative 2013 consensus statement. *Breast.* 2013; In this issue.
20. Ganz P, Yip C, Gralow J, Distelhorst SR, Albain KS, Andersen BL, et al. Supportive care after treatment for breast cancer: resource allocations in LMCs. A Breast Health Global Initiative 2013 consensus statement. *Breast.* 2013; In this issue.
21. Anderson BO, Shyyan R, Eniu A, Smith RA, Yip CH, Bese NS, et al. Breast cancer in limited-resource countries: an overview of the Breast Health Global Initiative 2005 guidelines. *Breast.* 2006; 12 Suppl 1: S3–15.
22. Anderson BO, Cazap E, El Saghir NS, Yip CH, Khaled HM, Otero IV, et al. Optimisation of breast cancer management in low-resource and middle-resource countries: executive summary of the Breast Health Global Initiative consensus, 2010. *Lancet Oncol.* 2011; 12(4): 387–98. [PubMed: 21463833]
23. Murray MA, Wilson K, Kryworuchko J, Stacey D, O'Connor A. Nurses' perceptions of factors influencing patient decision support for place of care at the end of life. *Am J Hosp Palliat Care.* 2009; 26(4): 254–63. [PubMed: 19213926]
24. Liao Z, Hao J, Guo Y, Reyes-Gibby C, Guo H. Assessment of cancer pain management knowledge in southwest China: A survey of 259 physicians from small city and county hospitals. *J Palliat Med.* 2013 6; 16(6):692–5. [PubMed: 23458651]

25. Luckett T, Davidson PM, Boyle F, Liauw W, Agar M, Green A, et al. Australian survey of current practice and guideline use in adult cancer pain assessment and management: Perspectives of oncologists. *Asia Pac J Clin Oncol*. 2012; 12(17): 12040. doi: 10.1111/ajco.12040.
26. Silvoniemi M, Vasankari T, Vahlberg T, Vuorinen E, Clemens KE, Salminen E. Physicians' self-assessment of cancer pain treatment skills--more training required. *Support Care Cancer*. 2012; 20(11): 2747-53. [PubMed: 22322593]
27. Jeba J, George R, Thangakunam B, Christopher DJ. Pain assessment and analgesic prescription for cancer patients in a medical ward: the influence of an educational intervention. *Natl Med J India*. 2009; 22(4): 177-80. [PubMed: 20120990]
28. Rajagopal M Setting up a Pain Management Program In: Kopf A, Patel N, editors. *Guide to Pain Management in Low-Resource Settings*. Washington D.C. International Association for the Study of Pain (IASP) p. 317-20.
29. Gysels M, Richardson A, Higginson IJ. Communication training for health professionals who care for patients with cancer: a systematic review of training methods. *Support Care Cancer*. 2005; 13(6): 356-66. [PubMed: 15586302]
30. Billings JA, Ferris FD, Macdonald N, Von Gunten C. The role of palliative care in the home in medical education: report from a national consensus Conference. *J Palliat Med*. 2001; 4(3): 361-71. [PubMed: 11596548]
31. Gysels M, Higginson IJ. Interactive technologies and videotapes for patient education in cancer care: systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised trials. *Support Care Cancer*. 2007; 15(1): 7-20. [PubMed: 17024500]
32. Hauke D, Reiter-Theil S, Hoster E, Hiddemann W, Winkler EC. The role of relatives in decisions concerning life-prolonging treatment in patients with end-stage malignant disorders: informants, advocates or surrogate decision-makers? *Ann Oncol*. 2011; 22(12): 2667-74. [PubMed: 21427061]
33. Mahon MM. Clinical decision making in palliative care and end of life care. *Nurs Clin North Am*. 2010; 45(3): 345-62. [PubMed: 20804882]
34. Kreps GL, Sivaram R. Strategic health communication across the continuum of breast cancer care in limited-resource countries. *Cancer*. 2008; 113(8 Suppl): 2331-7. [PubMed: 18837025]
35. Murray MA, Fiset V, Young S, Kryworuchko J. Where the dying live: a systematic review of determinants of place of end-of-life cancer care. *Oncol Nurs Forum*. 2009; 36(1): 69-77. [PubMed: 19136340]
36. Gomes B, Calanzani N, Gysels M, Hall S, Higginson IJ. Heterogeneity and changes in preferences for dying at home: a systematic review. *BMC Palliat Care*. 2013; 12: 7. [PubMed: 23414145]
37. Higginson IJ, Sen-Gupta GJ. Place of care in advanced cancer: a qualitative systematic literature review of patient preferences. *J Palliat Med*. 2000; 3(3): 287-300. [PubMed: 15859670]
38. Coleman RE. Clinical features of metastatic bone disease and risk of skeletal morbidity. *Clin Cancer Res*. 2006; 12(20 Pt 2): 6243s-9s. [PubMed: 17062708]
39. Walkington L, Coleman RE. Advances in management of bone disease in breast cancer. *Bone*. 2011; 48(1): 80-7. [PubMed: 20621652]
40. Delea T, McKiernan J, Brandman J, Edelsberg J, Sung J, Raut M, et al. Retrospective study of the effect of skeletal complications on total medical care costs in patients with bone metastases of breast cancer seen in typical clinical practice. *J Support Oncol*. 2006; 4(7): 341-7. [PubMed: 16892696]
41. Bese NS, Kiel K, El-Gueddari Bel K, Campbell OB, Awuah B, Vikram B, et al. Radiotherapy for breast cancer in countries with limited resources: program implementation and evidence-based recommendations. *Breast*. 2006; 12 Suppl 1: S96-102.
42. Feyer P, Sautter-Bihl ML, Budach W, Dunst J, Haase W, Harms W, et al. DEGRO Practical Guidelines for palliative radiotherapy of breast cancer patients: brain metastases and leptomeningeal carcinomatosis. *Strahlenther Onkol*. 2010; 186(2): 63-9. [PubMed: 20127222]
43. Lutz S, Berk L, Chang E, Chow E, Hahn C, Hoskin P, et al. Palliative radiotherapy for bone metastases: an ASTRO evidence-based guideline. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2011; 79(4): 965-76. [PubMed: 21277118]

44. Van Poznak CH, Von Roenn JH, Temin S. American society of clinical oncology clinical practice guideline update: recommendations on the role of bone-modifying agents in metastatic breast cancer. *J Oncol Pract.* 2011; 7(2): 117–21. [PubMed: 21731520]
45. Ripamonti CI, Maniezzo M, Campa T, Fagnoni E, Brunelli C, Saibene G, et al. Decreased occurrence of osteonecrosis of the jaw after implementation of dental preventive measures in solid tumour patients with bone metastases treated with bisphosphonates. The experience of the National Cancer Institute of Milan. *Ann Oncol.* 2009; 20(1): 137–45.
46. Ripamonti CI, Cislighi E, Mariani L, Maniezzo M. Efficacy and safety of medical ozone (O<sub>3</sub>) delivered in oil suspension applications for the treatment of osteonecrosis of the jaw in patients with bone metastases treated with bisphosphonates: Preliminary results of a phase I-II study. *Oral Oncol.* 2011; 47(3): 185–90. [PubMed: 21310650]
47. Mitera G, Fairchild A, DeAngelis C, Emmenegger U, Zurawel-Balaura L, Zhang L, et al. A multicenter assessment of the adequacy of cancer pain treatment using the pain management index. *J Palliat Med.* 2010; 13(5): 589–93. [PubMed: 20408764]
48. Souchon R, Wenz F, Sedlmayer F, Budach W, Dunst J, Feyer P, et al. DEGRO practice guidelines for palliative radiotherapy of metastatic breast cancer: bone metastases and metastatic spinal cord compression (MSCC). *Strahlenther Onkol.* 2009; 185(7): 417–24. [PubMed: 19714302]
49. Aapro MS, Coleman RE. Bone health management in patients with breast cancer: current standards and emerging strategies. *Breast.* 2012; 21(1): 8–19. [PubMed: 21958673]
50. Aapro M, Abrahamsson PA, Body JJ, Coleman RE, Colomer R, Costa L, et al. Guidance on the use of bisphosphonates in solid tumours: recommendations of an international expert panel. *Ann Oncol.* 2008; 19(3): 420–32. [PubMed: 17906299]
51. Correa R, Ripamonti C, Gerders H. Malignant bowel obstruction In: David MP, Feyer P, Ortner P, Zimmerman C, editors. *Supportive Oncology*. Philadelphia, USA: Elsevier; 2008 p. 326–41.
52. Ripamonti CI, Easson AM, Gerdes H. Management of malignant bowel obstruction. *Eur J Cancer.* 2008; 44(8): 1105–15. [PubMed: 18359221]
53. Ripamonti C, Bruera E. Palliative management of malignant bowel obstruction. *Int J Gynecol Cancer.* 2002; 12(2): 135–43. [PubMed: 11975672]
54. Ripamonti C, Twycross R, Baines M, Bozzetti F, Capri S, De Conno F, et al. Clinical-practice recommendations for the management of bowel obstruction in patients with end-stage cancer. *Support Care Cancer.* 2001; 9(4): 223–33. [PubMed: 11430417]
55. Feuer DJ, Broadley KE, Shepherd JH, Barton DP. Systematic review of surgery in malignant bowel obstruction in advanced gynecological and gastrointestinal cancer. The Systematic Review Steering Committee. *Gynecol Oncol.* 1999; 75(3): 313–22. [PubMed: 10600282]
56. Larkin PJ, Sykes NP, Centeno C, Ellershaw JE, Elsner F, Eugene B, et al. The management of constipation in palliative care: clinical practice recommendations. *Palliat Med.* 2008; 22(7): 796–807. [PubMed: 18838491]
57. Piccinni G, Angrisano A, Testini M, Merlicco D, Nacchiero M. Venting direct percutaneous jejunostomy (DPEJ) for drainage of malignant bowel obstruction in patients operated on for gastric cancer. *Support Care Cancer.* 2005; 13(7): 535–9. [PubMed: 15711947]
58. Pothuri B, Montemarano M, Gerardi M, Shike M, Ben-Porat L, Sabbatini P, et al. Percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy tube placement in patients with malignant bowel obstruction due to ovarian carcinoma. *Gynecol Oncol.* 2005; 96(2): 330–4. [PubMed: 15661217]
59. Mariani P, Blumberg J, Landau A, Lebrun-Jezekova D, Botton E, Beatrix O, et al. Symptomatic treatment with lanreotide microparticles in inoperable bowel obstruction resulting from peritoneal carcinomatosis: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled phase III study. *J Clin Oncol.* 2012; 30(35): 4337–43. [PubMed: 23109694]
60. Mercadante S, Ripamonti C, Casuccio A, Zecca E, Groff L. Comparison of octreotide and hyoscine butylbromide in controlling gastrointestinal symptoms due to malignant inoperable bowel obstruction. *Support Care Cancer.* 2000; 8(3): 188–91. [PubMed: 10789958]
61. Ripamonti C, Mercadante S, Groff L, Zecca E, De Conno F, Casuccio A. Role of octreotide, scopolamine butylbromide, and hydration in symptom control of patients with inoperable bowel obstruction and nasogastric tubes: a prospective randomized trial. *J Pain Symptom Manage.* 2000; 19(1): 23–34. [PubMed: 10687323]

62. Pestalozzi BC, Zahrieh D, Price KN, Holmberg SB, Lindtner J, Collins J, et al. Identifying breast cancer patients at risk for Central Nervous System (CNS) metastases in trials of the International Breast Cancer Study Group (IBCSG). *Ann Oncol*. 2006; 17(6): 935–44. [PubMed: 16603601]
63. Berghoff AS, Bago-Horvath Z, Ilhan-Mutlu A, Magerle M, Dieckmann K, Marosi C, et al. Brain-only metastatic breast cancer is a distinct clinical entity characterised by favourable median overall survival time and a high rate of long-term survivors. *Br J Cancer*. 2012; 107(9): 1454–8. [PubMed: 23047551]
64. Cahill KS, Chi JH, Day AL, Claus EB. Trends in survival after surgery for breast cancer metastatic to the brain and spinal column in medicare patients: a population-based analysis. *Neurosurgery*. 2011; 68(3): 705–13; discussion 713. [PubMed: 21164378]
65. Glantz MJ, Cole BF, Forsyth PA, Recht LD, Wen PY, Chamberlain MC, et al. Practice parameter: anticonvulsant prophylaxis in patients with newly diagnosed brain tumors. Report of the Quality Standards Subcommittee of the American Academy of Neurology. *Neurology*. 2000; 54(10): 1886–93. [PubMed: 10822423]
66. Vecht CJ, Hovestadt A, Verbiest HB, van Vliet JJ, van Putten WL. Dose-effect relationship of dexamethasone on Karnofsky performance in metastatic brain tumors: a randomized study of doses of 4, 8, and 16 mg per day. *Neurology*. 1994; 44(4): 675–80. [PubMed: 8164824]
67. Tsao M, Chow E, Wong R, E. R, Laperriere N. Whole brain radiotherapy for the treatment of multiple brain metastases (Protocol for a Cochrane Review). Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.; 2003.
68. Flickinger JC, Kondziolka D, Lunsford LD, Coffey RJ, Goodman ML, Shaw EG, et al. A multi-institutional experience with stereotactic radiosurgery for solitary brain metastasis. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 1994; 28(4): 797–802. [PubMed: 8138431]
69. Elias D, Di Pietroantonio D. Surgery for liver metastases from breast cancer. *HPB : the official journal of the International Hepato Pancreato Biliary Association*. 2006; 8(2): 97–9. [PubMed: 18333254]
70. Li XP, Meng ZQ, Guo WJ, Li J. Treatment for liver metastases from breast cancer: results and prognostic factors. *World J Gastroenterol*. 2005; 11(24): 3782–7. [PubMed: 15968739]
71. Cho SW, Kitisin K, Buck D, Steel J, Brufsky A, Gillespie R, et al. Transcatheter arterial chemoembolization is a feasible palliative locoregional therapy for breast cancer liver metastases. *Int J Surg Oncol*. 2010; 2010: 251621. [PubMed: 22312487]
72. Yhim HY, Han SW, Oh DY, Han W, Im SA, Kim TY, et al. Prognostic factors for recurrent breast cancer patients with an isolated, limited number of lung metastases and implications for pulmonary metastasectomy. *Cancer*. 2010; 116(12): 2890–901. [PubMed: 20564396]
73. Ludwig C, Stoelben E, Hasse J. Disease-free survival after resection of lung metastases in patients with breast cancer. *Eur J Surg Oncol*. 2003; 29(6): 532–5. [PubMed: 12875861]
74. Yoshimoto M, Tada K, Nishimura S, Makita M, Iwase T, Kasumi F, et al. Favourable long-term results after surgical removal of lung metastases of breast cancer. *Breast Cancer Res Treat*. 2008; 110(3): 485–91. [PubMed: 17899365]
75. Dalal S, Palat G, Bruera E, Sweeney C, Ripamonti C. Management of dyspnea. principles and practice of palliative care and supportive. (Berger AM, Von Roenn JH, Shuster JL Eds) 3rd Edition *Oncology* 2006.
76. Wong CY, Helm MA, Helm TN, Zeitouni N. Patterns of skin metastases: a review of 25 years, experience at a single cancer center. *Int J Dermatol*. 2013.
77. Kumar S, Juresic E, Barton M, Shafiq J. Management of skin toxicity during radiation therapy: a review of the evidence. *J Med Imaging Radiat Oncol*. 2010; 54(3): 264–79. [PubMed: 20598015]
78. van den Beuken-van Everdingen MH, de Rijke JM, Kessels AG, Schouten HC, van Kleef M, Patijn J. Prevalence of pain in patients with cancer: a systematic review of the past 40 years. *Ann Oncol*. 2007; 18(9): 1437–49. [PubMed: 17355955]
79. NCCN. National Comprehensive Cancer Network. Adult Pain. Version 1.2012 Available at [www.nccn.org](http://www.nccn.org).
80. Meldrum M The ladder and the clock: cancer pain and public policy at the end of the twentieth century. *J Pain Symptom Manage*. 2005; 29(1): 41–54. [PubMed: 15652438]



81. Powell R, Downing J, Ddungu H, Mwangi-Powel F. Pain History and Pain Assessment In: Kopf A, Patel N, editors. Guide to Pain Management in Low-Resource Settings. Washington D.C.: International Association for the Study of Pain (IASP) p. 67–79.
82. Hadjistavropoulos T, von Baeyer C, Craig K. Pain assessment in persons with limited ability to communicate In: Turk D, Melzack R, editors. Handbook of Pain Assessment. 2 ed. New York, NY: Guilford; 2001.
83. Kumar SP. Utilization of brief pain inventory as an assessment tool for pain in patients with cancer: a focused review. *Indian J Palliat Care*. 2011; 17(2): 108–15. [PubMed: 21976850]
84. Contreras J, Valcarcel F, Domine M, Escobar Y. Sensivity to change of the Spanish validated Memorial Pain Assessment Card in cancer patients. *Clin Transl Oncol*. 2008; 10(10): 654–9. [PubMed: 18940746]
85. Kim JA, Choi YS, Lee J, Park J, Lee MA, Yeom CH, et al. Reliability and validity of the Korean Cancer Pain Assessment Tool (KCPAT). *J Korean Med Sci*. 2005; 20(5): 877–82. [PubMed: 16224166]
86. Leppert W, Majkowicz M. Polish brief pain inventory for pain assessment and monitoring of pain treatment in patients with cancer. *J Palliat Med*. 2010; 13(6): 663–8. [PubMed: 20557234]
87. Nejmi M, Wang XS, Mendoza TR, Gning I, Cleeland CS. Validation and application of the Arabic version of the M. D. Anderson symptom inventory in Moroccan patients with cancer. *J Pain Symptom Manage*. 2010; 40(1): 75–86. [PubMed: 20619213]
88. Harding R, Selman L, Agupio G, Dinat N, Downing J, Gwyther L, et al. Validation of a core outcome measure for palliative care in Africa: the APCA African Palliative Outcome Scale. *Health Qual Life Outcomes*. 2010; 8: 10. [PubMed: 20100332]
89. Chinda M, Jaturapatporn D, Kirshen AJ, Udomsubpayakul U. Reliability and validity of a Thai version of the edmonton symptom assessment scale (ESAS-Thai). *J Pain Symptom Manage*. 2011; 42(6): 954–60. [PubMed: 21621964]
90. Zeng L, Zhang L, Culleton S, Jon F, Holden L, Kwong J, et al. Edmonton symptom assessment scale as a prognosticative indicator in patients with advanced cancer. *J Palliat Med*. 2011; 14(3): 337–42. [PubMed: 21254813]
91. Rayment C, Hjermstad MJ, Aass N, Kaasa S, Caraceni A, Strasser F, et al. Neuropathic cancer pain: Prevalence, severity, analgesics and impact from the European Palliative Care Research Collaborative-Computerised Symptom Assessment study. *Palliat Med*. 11 21, 2012, doi: 10.1177/0269216312464408
92. Mitera G, Zeiadin N, Kirou-Mauro A, DeAngelis C, Wong J, Sanjeevan T, et al. Retrospective assessment of cancer pain management in an outpatient palliative radiotherapy clinic using the Pain Management Index. *Pain Symptom Manage*. 2010; 39(2): 259–67.
93. Haugen DF, Hjermstad MJ, Hagen N, Caraceni A, Kaasa S. Assessment and classification of cancer breakthrough pain: a systematic literature review. *Pain*. 2010; 149(3): 476–82. [PubMed: 20236762]
94. Truong PT, Abnoui F, Yong CM, Hayashi A, Runkel JA, Phillips T, et al. Standardized assessment of breast cancer surgical scars integrating the Vancouver Scar Scale, Short-Form McGill Pain Questionnaire, and patients' perspectives. *Plast Reconstr Surg*. 2005; 116(5): 1291–9. [PubMed: 16217470]
95. Mystakidou K, Parpa E, Tsilika E, Kalaidopoulou O, Georgaki S, Galanos A, et al. Greek McGill Pain Questionnaire: validation and utility in cancer patients. *J Pain Symptom Manage*. 2002; 24(4): 379–87. [PubMed: 12505206]
96. Mystakidou K, Katsouda E, Parpa E, Tsilika E, Vlahos L. Use of the Greek McGill Pain Questionnaire in cancer patients. *Expert Rev Pharmacoecon Outcomes Res*. 2004; 4(2): 227–33. [PubMed: 19807527]
97. Patarica-Huber E, Boskov N, Pjevic M. Multimodal approach to therapy-related neuropathic pain in breast cancer. *J Buon*. 2011; 16(1): 40–5. [PubMed: 21674848]
98. Mishra S, Bhatnagar S, Gupta D, Nirwani Goyal G, Jain R, Chauhan H. Management of neuropathic cancer pain following WHO analgesic ladder: a prospective study. *Am J Hosp Palliat Care*. 2008; 25(6): 447–51. [PubMed: 19106278]



99. WHO. Pain ladder. World Health Organization Available at <http://www.who.int/cancer/palliative/painladder/en/>.
100. Jonsson T, Christrup LL, Hojsted J, Villesen HH, Albjerg TH, Ravn-Nielsen LV, et al. Symptoms and side effects in chronic non-cancer pain: patient report vs. systematic assessment. *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand*. 2011; 55(1): 69–74. [PubMed: 21039361]
101. Mosher CE, Duhamel KN. An examination of distress, sleep, and fatigue in metastatic breast cancer patients. *Psychooncology*. 2012; 21(1): 100–7. [PubMed: 21105175]
102. Lo C, Zimmermann C, Rydall A, Walsh A, Jones JM, Moore MJ, et al. Longitudinal study of depressive symptoms in patients with metastatic gastrointestinal and lung cancer. *J Clin Oncol*. 2010; 28(18): 3084–9. [PubMed: 20479397]
103. Rodin G, Lo C, Mikulincer M, Donner A, Gagliese L, Zimmermann C. Pathways to distress: the multiple determinants of depression, hopelessness, and the desire for hastened death in metastatic cancer patients. *Soc Sci Med*. 2009; 68(3): 562–9. [PubMed: 19059687]
104. Jafari N, Zamani A, Lazenby M, Farajzadegan Z, Emami H, Loghmani A. Translation and validation of the Persian version of the functional assessment of chronic illness therapy-Spiritual well-being scale (FACIT-Sp) among Muslim Iranians in treatment for cancer. *Palliat Supp Care*. 2013; 11(1): 29–35.
105. Lazenby M, Khatib J, Al-Khair F, Neamat M. Psychometric properties of the Functional Assessment of Chronic Illness Therapy--Spiritual Well-being (FACIT-Sp) in an Arabic-speaking, predominantly Muslim population. *Psychooncology*. 2013; 22(1): 220–7. [PubMed: 21957056]
106. Ku YL, Kuo SM, Yao CY. Establishing the validity of a spiritual distress scale for cancer patients hospitalized in southern Taiwan. *Int J Palliat Nurs*. 2010; 16(3): 134–8. [PubMed: 20357706]
107. Yong J, Kim J, Han SS, Puchalski CM. Development and validation of a scale assessing spiritual needs for Korean patients with cancer. *J Palliat Care*. 2008; 24(4): 240–6. [PubMed: 19227015]
108. Peterman AH, Fitchett G, Brady MJ, Hernandez L, Cella D. Measuring spiritual well-being in people with cancer: the functional assessment of chronic illness therapy--Spiritual Well-being Scale (FACIT-Sp). *Ann Behav Med*. 2002; 24(1): 49–58. [PubMed: 12008794]
109. Gil F, Grassi L, Travado L, Tomamichel M, Gonzalez JR. Use of distress and depression thermometers to measure psychosocial morbidity among southern European cancer patients. *Support Care Cancer*. 2005; 13(8): 600–6. [PubMed: 15761700]
110. Spirituality in Cancer Care. National Cancer Institute, USA; 2012 Available at <http://www.cancer.gov/cancertopics/pdq/supportivecare/spirituality/Patient/page1>.
111. Wildes KA, Miller AR, de Majors SS, Ramirez AG. The religiosity/spirituality of Latina breast cancer survivors and influence on health-related quality of life. *Psychooncology*. 2009; 18(8): 831–40. [PubMed: 19034922]
112. Purnell JQ, Andersen BL, Wilmot JP. Religious Practice and Spirituality in the Psychological Adjustment of Survivors of Breast Cancer. *Couns Values*. 2009; 53(3): 165. [PubMed: 20098664]
113. Djuric Z, Mirasolo J, Kimbrough L, Brown DR, Heilbrun LK, Canar L, et al. A pilot trial of spirituality counseling for weight loss maintenance in African American breast cancer survivors. *J Natl Med Assoc*. 2009; 101(6): 552–64. [PubMed: 19585923]
114. Ahmad F, Muhammad M, Abdullah AA. Religion and spirituality in coping with advanced breast cancer: perspectives from Malaysian Muslim women. *J Relig Health*. 2011; 50(1): 36–45. [PubMed: 20924683]
115. Harandy TF, Ghofranipour F, Montazeri A, Anooosheh M, Bazargan M, Mohammadi E, et al. Muslim breast cancer survivor spirituality: coping strategy or health seeking behavior hindrance? *Health Care Women Int*. 2010; 31(1): 88–98. [PubMed: 20390638]
116. Gullatte MM, Brawley O, Kinney A, Powe B, Mooney K. Religiosity, spirituality, and cancer fatalism beliefs on delay in breast cancer diagnosis in African American women. *J Relig Health*. 2010; 49(1): 62–72. [PubMed: 19184437]
117. Lagman RA, Yoo GJ, Levine EG, Donnell KA, Lim HR. “Leaving it to God” Religion and Spirituality among Filipina Immigrant Breast Cancer Survivors. *J Relig Health*. 2012.
118. Tate JD. The role of spirituality in the breast cancer experiences of African American women. *J Holist Nurs*. 2011; 29(4): 249–55. [PubMed: 21357179]

119. Baker R, Wu AW, Teno JM, Kreling B, Damiano AM, Rubin HR, et al. Family satisfaction with end-of-life care in seriously ill hospitalized adults. *JJ Am Geriatr Soc.* 2000; 48(5 Suppl): S61–9.
120. Murray MA, Stacey D, Wilson KG, O'Connor AM. Skills training to support patients considering place of end-of-life care: a randomized control trial. *J Palliat Care.* 2010; 26(2): 112–21. [PubMed: 20718396]
121. Cherny NI. Controversies in oncologist-patient communication: a nuanced approach to autonomy, culture, and paternalism. *Oncology (Williston Park).* 2012; 26(1): 37–43, 6. [PubMed: 22393795]
122. Cherny NI. Factors influencing the attitudes and behaviors of oncologists regarding the truthful disclosure of information to patients with advanced and incurable cancer. *Psychooncology.* 2011; 20(12): 1269–84. [PubMed: 20878723]
123. Belanger E, Rodriguez C, Groleau D. Shared decision-making in palliative care: a systematic mixed studies review using narrative synthesis. *Palliat Med.* 2011; 25(3): 242–61. [PubMed: 21273220]
124. NCCN. National Comprehensive Cancer Network. Palliative Care. Version 2.2012 Available from: [www.nccn.org](http://www.nccn.org)
125. Glare PA, Semple D, Stabler SM, Saltz LB. Palliative care in the outpatient oncology setting: evaluation of a practical set of referral criteria. *J Oncol Pract.* 2011; 7(6): 366–70. [PubMed: 22379418]
126. Reville B, Reifsnnyder J, McGuire DB, Kaiser K, Santana AJ. Education and referral criteria: Impact on oncology referrals to palliative care. *J Palliat Med.* 2013; 7;16(7):786–9. [PubMed: 23510168]
127. Currow DC, Allingham S, Bird S, Yates P, Lewis J, Dawber J, et al. Referral patterns and proximity to palliative care inpatient services by level of socio-economic disadvantage. A national study using spatial analysis. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2012; 12: 424. [PubMed: 23176397]
128. Ahluwalia SC, Fried TR. Physician factors associated with outpatient palliative care referral. *Palliat Med.* 2009; 23(7): 608–15. [PubMed: 19460830]
129. Akashi M, Yano E, Aruga E. Under-diagnosis of pain by primary physicians and late referral to a palliative care team. *BMC Palliat Care.* 2012; 11: 7. [PubMed: 22676380]
130. Baek YJ, Shin DW, Choi JY, Kang J, Mo HN, Kim YH, et al. Late referral to palliative care services in Korea. *J Pain Symptom Manage.* 2011; 41(4): 692–9. [PubMed: 21232909]
131. Bestall JC, Ahmed N, Ahmedzai SH, Payne SA, Noble B, Clark D. Access and referral to specialist palliative care: patients' and professionals' experiences. *Int J Palliat Nurs.* 2004; 10(8): 381–9. [PubMed: 15365492]
132. Broom A, Kirby E, Good P, Wootton J, Adams J. The art of letting go: referral to palliative care and its discontents. *Soc Sci Med.* 2013; 78: 9–16. [PubMed: 23219848]
133. Auret K, Bulsara C, Joske D. Australasian haematologist referral patterns to palliative care: lack of consensus on when and why. *Intern Med J.* 2003; 33(12): 566–71. [PubMed: 14656229]
134. Smith CB, Nelson JE, Berman AR, Powell CA, Fleischman J, Salazar-Schicchi J, et al. Lung cancer physicians' referral practices for palliative care consultation. *Ann Oncol.* 2012; 23(2): 382–7. [PubMed: 21804051]
135. Broom A, Kirby E, Good P, Wootton J, Adams J. Specialists' experiences and perspectives on the timing of referral to palliative care: a qualitative study. *J Palliat Med.* 2012; 15(11): 1248–53. [PubMed: 23039218]
136. Rocque GB, Barnett AE, Illig LC, Eickhoff JC, Bailey HH, Campbell TC, et al. Inpatient hospitalization of oncology patients: are we missing an opportunity for end-of-life care? *J Oncol Pract.* 2013; 9(1): 51–4. [PubMed: 23633971]
137. DeVader TE, Jeanmonod R. The effect of education in hospice and palliative care on emergency medicine residents' knowledge and referral patterns. *J Palliat Med.* 2012; 15(5): 510–5. [PubMed: 22401312]
138. Dalal S, Palla S, Hui D, Nguyen L, Chacko R, Li Z, et al. Association between a name change from palliative to supportive care and the timing of patient referrals at a comprehensive cancer center. *Oncologist.* 2011; 16(1): 105–11. [PubMed: 21212438]

139. Rhondali W, Burt S, Wittenberg-Lyles E, Bruera E, Dalal S. Medical oncologists' perception of palliative care programs and the impact of name change to supportive care on communication with patients during the referral process. A qualitative study. *Palliat Support Care*. 2013: 1–8.
140. Wentlandt K, Krzyzanowska MK, Swami N, Rodin GM, Le LW, Zimmermann C. Referral practices of oncologists to specialized palliative care. *J Clin Oncol*. 2012; 30(35): 4380–6. [PubMed: 23109708]
141. Eniu A, Carlson RW, El Saghir NS, Bines J, Bese NS, Vorobiof D, et al. Guideline implementation for breast healthcare in low- and middle-income countries: treatment resource allocation. *Cancer*. 2008; 113(8 Suppl): 2269–81. [PubMed: 18837019]
142. Lynch T, Connor S, Clark D. Mapping levels of palliative care development: A global update. *J Pain Symptom Manage*. 2013;45(6):1094–1106. [PubMed: 23017628]
143. Casarett D, Johnson M, Smith D, Richardson D. The optimal delivery of palliative care: a national comparison of the outcomes of consultation teams vs inpatient units. *Arch Intern Med*. 2011; 171(7): 649–55. [PubMed: 21482838]
144. Grant L, Brown J, Leng M, Bettega N, Murray SA. Palliative care making a difference in rural Uganda, Kenya and Malawi: three rapid evaluation field studies. *BMC Palliat Care*. 2011; 10: 8. [PubMed: 21569423]
145. Davaasuren O, Stjernsward J, Callaway M, Tsetsegdary G, Hagan R, Govind S, et al. Mongolia: establishing a national palliative care program. *J Pain Symptom Manage*. 2007; 33(5): 568–72. [PubMed: 17482049]
146. Pastrana T, Vallath N, Mastrojohn J, Namukwaya E, Kumar S, Radbruch L, et al. Disparities in the contribution of low- and middle-income countries to palliative care research. *J Pain Symptom Manage*. 2010; 39(1): 54–68. [PubMed: 19892510]

**Table 1.**

Resource allocation levels: basic, limited, enhanced, and maximal

<b>Resource Allocation Level</b>	<b>Description</b>
Basic	Core resources or fundamental services absolutely necessary for any breast health care system to function; basic-level services are typically applied in a single clinical interaction.
Limited	Second-tier resources or services that are intended to produce major improvements in outcome, and are attainable with limited financial means and modest infrastructure; limited-level services may involve single or multiple clinical interactions.
Enhanced	Third-tier resources or services that are optional but important; enhanced-level resources should produce further improvements in outcome and increase the number and quality of therapeutic options and patient choice.
Maximal	High-level resources or services that may be used in some high-income countries, and/or may be recommended by breast care guidelines that do not adapt to resource constraints. They should be considered lower priority than those resources or services listed in the basic, limited, or enhanced categories on the basis of extreme cost and/or impracticality for broad use in resource-limited environments; to be useful, maximal-level resources typically depend on the existence and functionality of all lower-level resources.
Stratification scheme	The table stratification scheme implies incrementally increasing resource allocation at the basic, limited, and enhanced levels. Maximal-level resources should not be targeted for implementation in LMICs, even though they may be used in some higher-resource settings.

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

**Table 2.** Health systems resource allocations: health education, care models, and diagnostic testing for metastatic breast cancer

	Basic	Limited	Enhanced	Maximal
<b>Health Professional Education<sup>a</sup></b>	Appropriate use of CPG Awareness of CAM used by patients PC pain assessment and management; side-effects of pain drugs Skin complications Psychosocial (end-of-life) Spiritual (end-of-life) Health literacy, cultural literacy, communication skills	Appropriate referral to specialists Pain syndromes; referral strategies Emotional / spiritual aspects of death and dying	Palliative care training for nursing staff In-service PC updates	
<b>Patient and Family Education</b>	Late-disease risks, complications of advanced disease, PC/TX Pain self-management Skin care Psychosocial (end-of-life) issues Spiritual (end-of-life) issues	Emotional and spiritual aspects of death and dying Advanced care planning		
<b>Care Models</b>	Patient-centered decision-making Clinician communication with patient and family (eg, conferences) Trained PC volunteers Home-based PC with community and family support Hospital-based PC with community and family support	Home-based PC with trained PC nursing support Hospital-based PC with trained PC nursing support Outpatient PC with trained health professional support PC consulting services (referrals) Multidisciplinary <sup>b</sup> team approach	Home-based PC with clinic and hospital back up Outpatient PC clinics with trained PC physicians PC in-patient unit PC training center Quality assurance system Interdisciplinary <sup>b</sup> team approach	PC specialist services
<b>Diagnostic Testing</b>	Confirmation tests for metastasis in symptomatic patients			

**Note:** The table stratification scheme implies incrementally increasing resource allocation at the basic, limited, and enhanced levels. Maximal-level resources should not be targeted for implementation in LMICs, even though they may be used in some higher-resource settings.

**Abbreviations:** CAM, complementary and alternative medicine; CPG, clinical practice guideline; PC, palliative care; TX, treatment.

<sup>a</sup>Patient, family and/or partner education may be the primary intervention for some supportive care services.

<sup>b</sup>“Multidisciplinary team approach” refers to a patient care model that includes experts from different disciplines, whereas an “interdisciplinary team approach” requires a more integrated and coordinated approach to patient care, where experts from different disciplines establish shared patient care goals.

**Table 3.**

Supportive care resource allocations: organ-based (site-specific) metastatic disease management

	Basic	Limited	Enhanced	Maximal
<b>Bone Metastases</b>	Drug therapy: steroids, NSAIDs, opioids (eg, oral and parenteral morphine), co-analgesics Consider spinal cord compression and fractures	Radiotherapy Surgery Routine evaluation for spinal cord compression and fractures	Radioisotopes Bone-modifying agents	Radiofrequency ablation / cryoablation
<b>Bowel Obstruction</b>	Drug therapy: morphine (oral or parenteral), steroids, laxatives, antiemetics, anticholinergics NG-tube	Non-morphine opioids	Venting G-tube	Somatostatin analogues
<b>Brain Metastases</b>	Drug therapy: analgesics, steroids, anti-emetics, anticonvulsants	Whole brain radiotherapy	Stereotactic radiotherapy Surgery	
<b>Liver Metastases</b>	Drug therapy: analgesics, steroids, anti-emetics, antihistamines		Biliary stents Percutaneous drainage Embolization	Liver resection
<b>Lung Metastases</b>	Drug therapy for breathlessness: opioids, anxiolytics and antipsychotics, steroids Thoracentesis Oxygen therapy for hypoxicemic patients	Pleurodesis: Thoracotomy, VATS Radiotherapy		
<b>Skin Metastases / Complications</b>	Wound and skin assessment Drug therapy: Analgesics; Broad spectrum antibiotics Simple dressings and skin barriers Activated charcoal; metronidazole Teaching wound dressing to patients and family	Silver nitrate Radiotherapy Debridement surgery	More sophisticated dressing material Calcium alginate for hemostasis Stoma/wound therapy Air mattress, egg crate mattress	Plastic surgery Vacuum (negative pressure) wound therapy Mechanical bed

**Note:** The table stratification scheme implies incrementally increasing resource allocation at the basic, limited, and enhanced levels. Maximal-level resources should not be targeted for implementation in LMICs, even though they may be used in some higher-resource settings.

**Abbreviations:** G-tube, gastric tube; NSAIDs, non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs; NG, nasogastric; VATS, video-assisted thoracic surgery.



**Table 4.** Palliative care resource allocations: pain management and end-of-life care with metastatic disease

	Basic	Limited	Enhanced	Maximal
<b>Pain Management<sup>a</sup></b>	Pain consideration <sup>b</sup> (simple assessment) Pain drugs <sup>a</sup> , including morphine (basic) Management of pain-related physical symptoms CAM and non-drug pain management	Other pain drugs <sup>a</sup> Radiotherapy (single and multi-fraction) PT and OT for functional limitations or pain management	Pain screening Pain care plan Opioid pumps, methadone, fentanyl patch Consultation with specialist in pain therapy Surgery (cord compression, fracture, obstruction)	Locoregional anesthesia, spinal analgesia
<b>Psychosocial (End-of-life)</b>	Psychosocial (end-of-life) consideration <sup>b</sup> Patient, family, and caregiver education <sup>c</sup> Psychosocial support: community-based Bereavement support: community based	Patient, family, and caregiver education <sup>c</sup> ; emotional aspects of death Advanced care planning	Screening and referrals for depression / distress by mental health specialist Psychosocial counseling by mental health specialist Antidepressants Social services for financial, legal and family matters	Psychiatrist, psychologist, or social worker coordinated mental health care
<b>Spiritual (End-of-life)</b>	Spiritual consideration <sup>b</sup> Spiritual support: community based		Clinic or hospital associated spiritual support Hospital or hospice spiritual reflection and meditation space	

**Note:** The table stratification scheme implies incrementally increasing resource allocation at the basic, limited, and enhanced levels. Maximal-level resources should not be targeted for implementation in LMICs, even though they may be used in some higher-income settings.

<sup>a</sup>Pain management should follow the WHO pain ladder. Morphine should be available and easily accessible at a basic level of resources.

<sup>b</sup>“Consideration” is a term used in this table to refer to basic patient evaluation through patient-provider interactions, including dialogue, observations, and other appropriate means of evaluation.

<sup>c</sup>Patient, family and caregiver education may be the primary intervention for some supportive care services.