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History of cancer chemotherapy

- In 1940s Goodman, Gilman and Linskog found that nitrogen mustard can suppress lymphomas;
- In 1950s it was found that antifolates, e.g. methotrexate, can suppress acute lymphoblastic leukaemia and the solid tumor choriocarcinoma, also national program to develop anticancer drugs were created in the US.
- In 1960 the idea of combination chemotherapy were implemented
- Since 1990s more targeted anticancer drugs appear.

Selection of research subjects
(Eisenhauer, Bonetti, Gelber, 2004)

• Due to high toxicity of volunteers usually do not participate in such studies;
• Cancer patients entering into trials do not have any proven efficient therapy;
• Research subjects should have adequate hepatic, renal, hematologic functions.
Ethical problems with phase I oncological studies

• Tension between scientific and therapeutic objectives;
• Appropriate risk-benefit relationship for participants;
• Validity of consent from terminally ill patients. (Joffe ja Miller, 2006)

In general there are two clearly opposing parties to consider ethical issues of phase I anticancer clinical trials
Phase I: Pure science or rather more complex one?

- “Principal objective of phase I trials is to define a safe dose and schedule suitable for later efficacy testing. Additional objectives of most phase I studies are the gathering of pharmacokinetic data and the preliminary assessment of the effect of the agent.” (Van de Velde, Grochow, 2005)

- At the same time the compound under research has potential to be therapeutically effective for patients/research subjects, but with obvious uncertainty for doctors/researchers.
Informed consent

• Opponents to patient participation in phase I oncological trials have concerns to deficient disclosure in informed consent procedure.
• The number and character of empirical studies on the quality of informed consent has not been sufficient to express good quality opinions on the issue.
• Some empirical studies have shown that majority of research subjects were motivated to participate in trial due to the hope to get better treatment or medical care.
• Different studies showed that 30-80% of participants knew the experimental character of the study.
• Over 90% of research participants were satisfied with informed consent procedure.

Agrawal & Emanuel, 2003
Risk-benefit assessment I

- Risk-benefit analysis is a very common approach to study moral status of situation, incl. scientific research, in utilitarianist tradition.
- Some critics say that phase I oncological trials have little benefit and substantial risks for research subjects;
- Benefits seems to be more collective and risks mainly personal which may have influence on human dignity issue.
Risk-benefit assessment II

- According to several empirical studies the tumor response in phase I nonpediatric single-agent trials occurs in 4-6% of patients and 0.5% patients die due to the toxic effect of research compounds (Horstmann et al., 2005), i.e. both benefit and extreme risk are quite low.
Risk-benefit assessment III

There are scales to differentiate tumour response and levels of toxicity:

- **The WHO and RECIST** (Response evaluation criteria in solid tumours) criteria distinguish complete response (CR), partial response (PR), stable disease (SD), and progressive disease (PD);

- **Common Toxicity Criteria** (CTC) have grades 0-5: 0 = no adverse event or within normal limits; 1 = mild adverse event; 2 = moderate adverse event; 3 = severe and undesirable adverse event; 4 = life-threatening or disabling adverse event; 5 = death related to adverse event
Risk-benefit assessment IV

- 10.6 % of all participants had complete (3.1%) or partial (7.5%) response varying from 3.0% to 19.5% in different studies;
- Among all participants the death rate was 0.49%. In subgroup of 168 studies with 3465 research subjects 14.3% (4.3-34%) had grade 4 toxic events.
Some conclusions

• More exact conceptualizations may help to clarify ethical analysis of phase I studies.

• New trial designs and more targeted research compounds can reduce tensions of classical phase I trials with cytotoxic compounds.

• The topic has practical importance at least in (East) European context to think about creating some common standards or guidelines for such type of studies.
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