



HAL
open science

Low-irradiance red light compared to conventional red light in photodynamic therapy of actinic keratosis: a way to reduce pain during treatment

Serge Mordon, Anne-Sophie Vignion-Dewalle

► To cite this version:

Serge Mordon, Anne-Sophie Vignion-Dewalle. Low-irradiance red light compared to conventional red light in photodynamic therapy of actinic keratosis: a way to reduce pain during treatment. *Dermatologic Therapy*, 2019, 10.1111/dth.12913 . hal-02555761

HAL Id: hal-02555761

<https://hal.science/hal-02555761v1>

Submitted on 27 Apr 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Low-irradiance red light compared to conventional red light in photodynamic therapy of actinic keratosis: a way to reduce pain during treatment

Serge Mordon, PhD. (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1208-7153>)

Anne Sophie Vignion-Dewalle, PhD. (<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0979-3310>)

Address: INSERM, Univ. Lille, CHU Lille, U1189-OncoThAI-Image Assisted Laser Therapy for Oncology, Lille, F-59000, France.

Electronic address: serge.mordon@inserm.fr.

No funding

Conflict of interest: The authors have no conflict of interest to declare

Text word count: 584

Number of references: 9

Tables: 1

Figures: 2

Low-irradiance red light compared to conventional red light in photodynamic therapy of actinic keratosis: a way to reduce pain during treatment

Conventional photodynamic therapy (C-PDT), which requires an irradiation with 37 J/cm^2 of red light after 3 hours of Methyl aminolevulinic acid incubation is an effective protocol, approved in Europe, for thin and non-pigmented AK on the face and scalp (Pariser et al., 2008; Szeimies et al., 2009). However C-PDT is associated with high pain scores (Morton et al., 2006; Rubel et al., 2014; Wiegell et al., 2008). This letter aims to review and discuss clinical studies (Table 1) dealing with PDT involving irradiation with low-irradiance (lower than 20 mW/cm^2) red light (Li-PDT).

In 2012, Ibbotson et al evaluated the Ambulight® device emitting 7 mW/cm^2 red light (Ibbotson & Ferguson, 2012). Twenty three patients received both C-PDT and Ambulight which was programmed to remain switched off for three hours and then to switch on automatically and remain on for a further three hours. The mean pain score for was 1 (minimum: 0; maximum: 7) for PDT using the Ambulight® device and 5 (minimum: 1.5; maximum: 9) for C-PDT. At one year, lesion clearance rate was 84 %.

Gholam et al have also evaluated Li-PDT using the BF-RhodoLED® lamp system with an irradiance of 15.4 mW/cm^2 for 40 minutes in order to achieve a light dose of 37 J/cm^2 . Thirty-one patients were enrolled (Gholam, Bosselmann, Enk, & Dick, 2018). Li-PDT resulted in significant less pain scores than C-PDT (2.8 for Li-PDT vs 7.6 for C-PDT) while maintaining a similar efficacy four weeks after treatment: percentage reduction of 69.9% for Li-PDT vs 74.3% for C-PDT.

Vicentini et al performed a study evaluating PDT using a light-emitting fabric device delivering fractionated red light at a low irradiance of 12 mW/cm^2 (Li-PDT) (Vicentini et al., 2018). After 30 minutes of MAL incubation, the Li-PDT device was switched on and illumination was performed for 2h30 giving a light dose of 37 J/cm^2 . With a mean pain score of 0.4, Li-PDT was found to be almost pain free compared to C-PDT (5.0). Efficacy was 84 % for Li-PDT and 76.8% for C-PDT at 6 month-follow up.

The 3 studies found a significant and clinically relevant reduction in pain for Li-PDT compared to C-PDT at the same light dose. The data reported by these three studies were pooled in order to evaluate the relationship between irradiance (mW/cm^2) and pain (Figure 2). A linear relationship was observed with a coefficient of determination (R-squared) of 0.726.

It is usually admitted that pain is correlated with PpIX production. Regarding daylight-PDT, it is presumed that continuous production and photoactivation of small amounts of PpIX instead of fast photo activation of large amounts decreases pain (Wiegell et al., 2008). This explains that pain score

reported in Study #3 where pain (0.4) is lower than those reported in Studies #1 (7 mW/cm² ; pain: 1.0) and #2 (15 mW/cm² ; pain: 2.8) . In Study #3, illumination was performed after 30minutes of incubation whereas the two others studies uses an incubation time of 3 hours. Martin found that a 15minutes incubation resulted in significantly less pain than a 75minutes incubation time (Martin, 2016).Comparatively, Daylight PDT is associated to pain scores, typically around 2.0(Wiegell et al., 2012).

In conclusion, since pain is always reported as the main drawback of C-PDT, irradiation with low irradiance red light should be considered by dermatologists. The controlled light delivery of Li-PDT is an advantage over daylight-PDT, which has also been explored as a less painful means to deliver PDT. However, the limitation of continuous low irradiance is prolonged treatment times.

Compared to daylight-PDT, Li-PDT consistently delivers the same light dose and can be conducted in all weather conditions, in all geographic locations, all year round.

References

- Gholam, P., Bosselmann, I., Enk, A. H., & Dick, J. (2018). Low irradiance compared with conventional photodynamic therapy in the treatment of actinic keratoses. *Photodermatol Photoimmunol Photomed*. doi:10.1111/phpp.12431
- Ibbotson, S. H., & Ferguson, J. (2012). Ambulatory photodynamic therapy using low irradiance inorganic light-emitting diodes for the treatment of non-melanoma skin cancer: an open study. *Photodermatol Photoimmunol Photomed*, 28(5), 235-239. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0781.2012.00681.x
- Martin, G. M. (2016). In-office Painless Aminolevulinic Acid Photodynamic Therapy: A Proof of Concept Study and Clinical Experience in More Than 100 Patients. *J Clin Aesthet Dermatol*, 9(2), 19-26.
- Morton, C., Campbell, S., Gupta, G., Keohane, S., Lear, J., Zaki, I., . . . Investigators, A. K. (2006). Intraindividual, right-left comparison of topical methyl aminolaevulinate-photodynamic therapy and cryotherapy in subjects with actinic keratoses: a multicentre, randomized controlled study. *Br J Dermatol*, 155(5), 1029-1036. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2133.2006.07470.x
- Pariser, D., Loss, R., Jarratt, M., Abramovits, W., Spencer, J., Geronemus, R., . . . Bruce, S. (2008). Topical methyl-aminolevulinate photodynamic therapy using red light-emitting diode light for treatment of multiple actinic keratoses: A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study. *J Am Acad Dermatol*, 59(4), 569-576. doi:10.1016/j.jaad.2008.05.031
- Rubel, D. M., Spelman, L., Murrell, D. F., See, J. A., Hewitt, D., Foley, P., . . . Shumack, S. (2014). Daylight photodynamic therapy with methyl aminolevulinate cream as a convenient, similarly effective, nearly painless alternative to conventional photodynamic therapy in actinic keratosis treatment: a randomized controlled trial. *Br J Dermatol*, 171(5), 1164-1171. doi:10.1111/bjd.13138
- Szeimies, R. M., Matheson, R. T., Davis, S. A., Bhatia, A. C., Frambach, Y., Klovekorn, W., . . . Thaci, D. (2009). Topical methyl aminolevulinate photodynamic therapy using red light-emitting diode light for multiple actinic keratoses: a randomized study. *Dermatol Surg*, 35(4), 586-592. doi:10.1111/j.1524-4725.2009.01096.x
- Vicentini, C., Vignion-Dewalle, A. S., Thecua, E., Lecomte, F., Maire, C., Deleporte, P., . . . Mortier, L. (2018). Photodynamic therapy for actinic keratosis of the forehead and scalp: a randomized controlled clinical study evaluating the non-inferiority of a new protocol applying irradiation with a light-emitting, fabric-based device (the Flexitheralight protocol) compared to the conventional protocol using the Aktelite CL 128 lamp. *Br J Dermatol*, *Accepted*.
- Wiegell, S. R., Haedersdal, M., Philipsen, P. A., Eriksen, P., Enk, C. D., & Wulf, H. C. (2008). Continuous activation of PpIX by daylight is as effective as and less painful than conventional photodynamic therapy for actinic keratoses; a randomized, controlled, single-blinded study. *Br J Dermatol*, 158(4), 740-746. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2133.2008.08450.x
- Wiegell, S. R., Wulf, H. C., Szeimies, R. M., Basset-Seguin, N., Bissonnette, R., Gerritsen, M. J., . . . Braathen, L. R. (2012). Daylight photodynamic therapy for actinic keratosis: an international consensus: International Society for Photodynamic Therapy in Dermatology. *J Eur Acad Dermatol Venereol*, 26(6), 673-679. doi:10.1111/j.1468-3083.2011.04386.x

Table

Author	Comparative study	Number of patients	Duration illumination	Light dose	Pain	Efficacy (% reduction)
Gholam(Gholam et al., 2018)	RhodoLED 15.4 mW/cm ² vs Aktilite (66.2 mW/cm ²)	31 Actinic Keratosi Grade I - III	40 minutes vs 9min and 19 s	37 J/cm ² vs 37 J/cm ²	2.8 ± 1.5 vs 7.6 ± 1.5	At 1 month FU 67.9 ± 11.8 vs 69.9 ± 2.1
Vicentini (Vicentini et al., 2018)	Flexitheralight 12 mW/cm ² vs Aktilite (65 mW/cm ²)	25 Actinic Keratosi Grade I - II	50 minutes vs 9min and 50 s	37 J/cm ² vs 37 J/cm ²	0.4 ± 0.6 vs. 5.0 ± 2.6	At 6 month FU 84.0% vs 76.8 %
Ibbotson(Ibbotson & Ferguson, 2012)	Ambulight (7 mW/cm ²) Vs Aktilite® (80–90 mW/cm ²)	23 small lesions of Bowen’s disease and superficial BCC	180 minutes vs 20 minutes	75 J/cm ² vs 75 J/cm ²	1.0 (0-7) vs 5.0 (1.5-9)	At 1 year FU 84 % vs ?

Table 1: Data reported for the clinical studies included in the review: from refs: (Vicentini et al., 2018)(Ibbotson & Ferguson, 2012)(Gholam et al., 2018). *Grade I Actinic Keratosis are slightly palpable, grade II are moderately thick, and grade III AK are very thick and/or obvious*

Figures

Figure 1: Light-emitting fabric device (from ref (Vicentini et al., 2018))

Figure 2: Pain scores (0-10) vs Irradiance (mW/cm²). Data were obtained from refs: (Vicentini et al., 2018)(Ibbotson & Ferguson, 2012)(Gholam et al., 2018)