Author(s): VS/AT **Date:** 2015-03-23

Question: Should vapocoolants before vaccine injections vs placebo/no treatment be used for vaccine injection pain in children >3-17 years?

Settings: hospital and community clinic

Bibliography: Abbott 1995 (1,2), Eland 1981 (3,4), Cohen 2009, Cohen Reis 1997 (1), Luthy 2013 (1)

			Quality asse	essment	No of patients		Effect		Quality	/ Importance		
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Vapocoolants be applied before vaccine injections	Placebo/no treatment	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Pain¹ (m	easured with	: validate	d tool (Visual Ana	log Scale 0-3,	Bieri Faces I	Pain Scale 0-6, Fa	aces Pain Scale-Rev	ised 0-10) ; B	etter indica	ited by lower va	alues)	
	trials		no serious inconsistency ^{3,4,5} th: validated tool	indirectness	serious ⁶ Scale 0-10/0	none	101 ain Scale 0-6) by res	127 earchers/par	- ents; Bette	SMD 0.38 lower (0.89 lower to 0.13 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
2	randomised trials	serious ²	no serious inconsistency ³	no serious indirectness	serious ⁶	none	69	69	-	SMD 0.48 lower (1.57 lower to 0.6 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Distress	Pre-Procedu	ire (meas	ured with: validate	ed tool (1-3 poi	nt scale) by	clinician; Better	indicated by lower v	alues)				
	randomised trials	serious ⁸	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ⁶	none	20	20	-	SMD 0.29 lower (0.33 lower to 0.92 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Parent P	references (r	neasured	with: validated to	ool (questionna	ire); Better i	ndicated by lowe	r values)		1			
1	randomised trials	serious ⁹	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ⁶	none	20	21	-	SMD 0.47 lower (1.09 lower to 0.15 higher) ¹⁰	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT

	rererences ()	/es/110) (a	ssessed with: va	iluateu tool (qt	iestionnaire,	yes/noj)						
	randomised	serious9	no serious	no serious	serious ⁶	none	11/18	16/22	RR 0.84	116 fewer per	$\oplus \oplus OO$	IMPORTAN [*]
	trials		inconsistency	indirectness			(61.1%)	(72.7%)	(0.54 to	1000 (from 335	LOW	
									1.32)	fewer to 233		
										more)		
Safety ¹¹	(assessed wi	ith: inves	tigator report)									
1	randomised	serious ¹²	no serious	no serious	13	none	-	-	-	-		IMPORTANT
	trials		inconsistency	indirectness								
								0%		-		
					•		•	· ·		•		
Parent F	ear (measure	ed with: v	alidated tool (Vis	ual Analog Sca	ile 0-10); Bet	ter indicated by I	ower values)					
Parent F			no serious	no serious	serious ⁶	none	ower values)	21	-	SMD 0.35	⊕⊕00	IMPORTANT
1		serious ⁹		_		_		21	-	SMD 0.35 lower (0.97	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
1	randomised		no serious	no serious		_		21	-			IMPORTANT
1	randomised		no serious	no serious		_		21	-	lower (0.97		IMPORTANT
1	randomised trials	serious ⁹	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ⁶	none	20		- or these im	lower (0.97 lower to 0.27 higher)	LOW	IMPORTANT
1	randomised trials	serious ⁹	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ⁶	none			- or these im	lower (0.97 lower to 0.27 higher)	LOW	IMPORTANT
1	randomised trials	serious ⁹	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ⁶	none	20		or these im	lower (0.97 lower to 0.27 higher)	LOW	IMPORTANT
Fear, Pro	randomised trials	serious ⁹	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ⁶	none tisfaction (assess	20		or these in	lower (0.97 lower to 0.27 higher)	LOW	

In the study by Abbott (1995), the sample size for the intervention (vapocoolant) group was divided by 2

² Immunizers, researchers, children and parents not consistently blinded; outcome assessor not consistently blinded

³ In study by Cohen Reis (1997), vapocoolant + distraction was compared to distraction alone

⁴ In study by Abbott (1995), vapocoolant administration was accompanied by suggestion that the needle would hurt less with cold cotton ball

⁵ In study by Eland (1981), analysis (3) compared intervention (vapocoolant) and no cognitive information to placebo and no cognitive information; analysis (4) compared intervention (vapocoolant) and cognitive information with placebo and cognitive information. The cognitive information consisted of a statement that the needle would hurt less with the spray.

⁶ Confidence interval crosses line of nonsignificance and sample size was below the recommended optimum information size (OIS) of 400 for an effect size of 0.2

⁷ Study by Luthy (2013) includes children 2-12 years (mean age, 5.2 years). Results for children unable to self-report pain not separated from older children. This study is not included in the analysis of vapocoolant effectiveness for children 0-3 years due to the average age of 5.2 years. Of note, children < 3 years would not be expected to be able to provide self-report of pain.

⁸ Immunizer not blinded; unclear if parents and children blinded; outcome assessor not blinded

⁹ Immunizers, children and parents not blinded; outcome assessor not blinded

¹⁰ In included study (Cohen Reis 1997), parents were willing to pay \$8.40 for vapocoolant spray for future injections

¹¹ In one study (Cohen 2009), no adverse events were reported for the 31 children in the vapocoolant group

¹² Immunizer, child, researcher not blinded

¹³ Data not pooled