The Safety of Intralesional Steroid Injections in Young Children and Their Effectiveness in Anastomotic Esophageal Strictures—A Meta-Analysis and Systematic Review
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Objective: Intralesional steroid injections (ISI) are a widely used technique for various pediatric indications and represent a possible adjuvant treatment for anastomotic esophageal strictures. Yet, no consensus has been reached neither on their safety in the pediatric population nor their effectiveness in esophageal atresia patients. This systematic review aimed to assess the safety of ISI in young children through a meta-analysis and to summarize the current knowledge on the effectiveness of ISI in anastomotic esophageal strictures.

Methods: A systematic literature search was performed in Embase, Medline, Web of Science Core Collection, Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials and Google Scholar up to August 16 2021. Studies focusing on ISI and involving children up to 2 years were included in the meta-analysis for the safety assessment. All studies evaluating the use of ISI as adjuvant treatment in anastomotic esophageal strictures in children were included in the systematic review to assess the effectiveness of the intervention.

Results: The literature search yielded 8,253 articles. A total of 57 studies were included, of which 55 for the safety and five for the effectiveness assessment. The overall complication rate was 7%, with a greater incidence of local complications compared to systemic complications. Six studies (with a total of 367 patients) evaluated adrenocorticotropic hormone and cortisol levels, of which four reported hypothalamic-pituitary axis suppression. Two children (0.6%) received replacement therapy and all patients recovered uneventfully. A mean number of 1.67 ISI were performed per esophageal atresia (EA) patient. A reduction of needed dilatations was seen after ISI, compared to the number of dilatations performed before the intervention (5.2 vs. 1.3).

Conclusion: The insufficient data emphasized the need for further prospective and comparative studies. Results from this meta-analysis and systematic review address ISI
as a safe and effective technique. Close clinical follow-up and growth curve evaluation are advisable in patients receiving ISI.

**Systematic Review Registration:** PROSPERO, identifier: CRD42021281584.
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## INTRODUCTION

The prognosis of esophageal atresia (EA) patients has greatly improved over the past decades, due to advances in surgical techniques as well as pre- and postoperative care (1, 2). With the higher survival rate, postoperative morbidity has increasingly become an issue, creating a substantial burden for patients and their families. One of the main short- and long-term complications after EA repair are anastomotic strictures, with an incidence of up to 60% (3). These strictures following EA repair also represent the most common cause of esophageal strictures in the pediatric population (4), exceeding the chemical burns (5).

Several therapeutic options are available for the management of esophageal strictures, yet none have been proven highly effective or risk-free. Non-surgical treatment is commonly preferred over surgical treatment and esophageal dilatations are considered the gold standard (6, 7). In the last decades several endoscopic procedures have been developed as adjuncts to dilatations (4, 8), such as endoscopic incisional therapy (9), placement of externally removable stents (10), mitomycin C injections (11), and intralesional steroid injections (ISI) (12).

Such treatments are usually reserved for recurrent or refractory strictures which respond poorly to dilatations. The ESPGHAN (European Society for Pediatric Gastroenterology Hepatology and Nutrition) refers to recurrent strictures when three or more clinically relevant stricture relapses occur despite dilatations; conversely, a refractory esophageal stricture is defined as an anatomic restriction without endoscopic inflammation that results in dysphagia after a minimum of five dilatation procedures at maximally 4-week intervals (13, 14).

Intralesional steroid injections are gaining popularity for different medical indications, both in adults and in pediatric patients, and tend to show promising results (16, 17). The rationale behind this technique is the capability of steroids to locally inhibit the inflammatory response and to reduce the collagen and fibroblasts deposit during the scar healing process. Less inflammation should result in less scarring and tissue contraction, which in the case of esophageal anastomosis translates into a lower rate of stricture development (18–22). Local side effects of ISI, e.g., perforations, intramural, and candida infections, may possibly negatively influence the scar healing process (8).

The main indications for the use of ISI in children and adolescents are keloids, hemangiomas, and juvenile idiopathic arthritis (17, 23, 24). The application of this technique in the treatment of esophageal strictures was firstly described by Ashcraft et al. (25). Since then, not much scientific progress has been made and the technique is still scarcely used, partly due to the lack of standardized protocols. Additionally, prescription of steroids for the use in esophageal strictures in children is still regarded as “off-label,” raising concerns on the safety.

No recommendations or guidelines for any indication regarding the administration of ISI in children exists, hence the safety is not guaranteed. Moreover, available data on the effectiveness of ISI as adjunct treatment for esophageal strictures are not uniform. The lack of evidence, prompted us to perform a systematic review and meta-analysis on the general use of ISI in the pediatric population. Therefore, the aim of the present meta-analysis and systematic review was to, respectively, assess the safety of ISI for any indication in the pediatric population up to 2 years of age and more specifically assess the effectiveness of ISI in patients with esophageal stricture after esophageal atresia repair.

## METHODS

### Information Sources and Search Strategy

This review was performed according to an a priori designed protocol and recommended for systematic reviews and meta-analysis (26, 27). Additionally, the principles of the “preferred reporting items for systematic reviews” (PRISMA) statement were adhered to (28). This study is registered in the PROSPERO database (registration number CRD42021281584).

A systematic literature search was performed in Embase, Medline, Web of Science Core Collection, Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials, and Google Scholar until August 16 2021. The search strategy is attached in the Supplementary Material. The search and selection criteria were restricted to English language articles and limited to humans. No publication year restriction was considered. Reference lists of relevant articles and reviews were manually searched for additional reports. The results for the meta-analysis and systematic review were retrieved from the same search strategy.

### Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Studies were assessed according to the following criteria: population characteristics, intervention, and reported outcome. Different inclusion criteria were used for each primary aim. In the meta-analysis on the safety of ISI, all studies evaluating ISI in children aged up to 2 years were included. The age cut-off was set to obtain a study population as representative as possible of the average patient receiving ISI as adjuvant treatment for esophageal stenosis. Studies reporting an aggregate age of the patients were
included when the mean age was under 2 years and the age range between 0 and 5 years.

In the systematic literature search concerning the effectiveness of ISI in esophageal strictures, studies evaluating ISI in all children with a history of EA repair were included. Studies comparing ISI and other interventions were included, as were those administering ISI with co-medication (e.g., propranolol, bleomycin). Studies focusing on different types of steroid administration (IV, oral, topical) were manually excluded. Conference abstracts, editorials, letters, short surveys, studies reporting non-original data (systematic reviews, meta-analysis, narrative reviews) and unavailable full-text articles were excluded. Absence of discrete patient-data was an additional exclusion criterion.

**Study Selection**

Two review authors (AH and RP) independently screened titles and abstracts to select eligible studies. Disagreements about study selection were resolved by discussion. AH and RP screened full-texts of the selected studies against the inclusion and exclusion criteria. During all stages of study selection, any uncertainties or discrepancies were discussed until consensus was achieved. If consensus was not reached, disagreements were resolved by discussing them with a senior researcher (JV).

**Methodological Quality**

The included studies were reviewed independently by AH and RP on methodological quality according to the Joanna Briggs institute (JBI) critical appraisal tool for case reports, case series, cohort studies, and quasi-experimental studies; depending on the type of study (29–31). The JBI form contains, respectively, 8, 10, 11, and 9 items, each of which is assessed as "yes," "no," "unclear," or "not applicable." Items scored as a "yes" are assigned a score 1; other assessments are not assigned a score. The obtained scores could not be linked to a standardized judgement tool. For case reports the total range varied between 0 and 8. Within the research team it was concluded that six to eight points were regarded as high quality; 4–5 points moderate quality; and 1–3 points low quality. For case series, with total range between 0–10, 8–10 was defined as high quality; 5–7 moderate quality, and 1–6 low quality. Subsequently, quasi-experimental studies, with total range between 0–9, were divided into the following groups: 7–9 high quality, 4–6 moderate quality, and 1–3 low quality. Finally, for cohort studies with a total range between 0–11 was concluded that 9–11 would be high quality; 5–8 moderate quality and 1–4 low quality. The critical appraisals by AH and RP were crosschecked; any differences were discussed until consensus was achieved. If consensus was not reached, disagreements were resolved by discussing these issues with JV.

**Data Extraction**

The following variables were extracted and entered into a standard data extraction form: author, publication year, country treating hospital, study type, number of included patients, patient's age at time of the injections, intervention description, type of steroid used, dosage, number of injections, time interval between injections, co-medication, length of follow-up, local side effects, systemic side effects, need for treatment of side effects, and whether the adrenocorticotropic hormone (ACTH) or cortisol levels had been measured.

Moreover, regarding the evaluation of the effectiveness, the following information was gathered: type of EA according to Gross (32), stricture length, symptoms, mean number of dilatations prior to and post injection, type of dilatation technique used, need and time for further dilatation, side effects, and possible complications.

**Synthesis**

Triamcinolone is the most commonly used steroid in the treatment of esophageal strictures. Hence, all steroid dosages were converted to triamcinolone-dose equivalents for the comparison of the administered steroid dosages. The safety of corticosteroid injections was assessed by splitting the patients in groups receiving a higher (>80 mg) and lower (<80 mg) first dosage of triamcinolone acetonide (TA). This decision is based on the Dutch (College ter Beoordeling van Geneesmiddelen—06/09/2021) and Italian (Agenzia Italiana del Farmaco—17/01/2018) summary of product characteristics. Both documents state that single injections at multiple sites up to a total amount of 80 mg have been administered without severe side effects. When multiple injections were given, the dosage of the first injection was used to group the patients. In addition, when assessing the dosage, some of the included studies did not show the total amount of received corticosteroid, yet only the amount of milligrams per kilogram body weight administered. In all cases, it could be assumed that the patients did not exceed the dosage of 80 mg as children <2 years will not weigh more than 40 kg.

Statistical analysis was performed with SPSS 25.0 (IBM, Armonk, NY, USA) and R (version 4.01) (33). Aggregated continuous baseline variables were calculated as means or medians of extracted variables from the included studies. Categorical and continuous variables were summarized as numbers with percentages. Using a generalized linear mixed model, pooled proportions of outcomes were calculated. The 95% confidence interval (95% CI) was calculated. Heterogeneity was quantified using the $r^2$-characteristic, which was calculated using the maximum likelihood method. The Knapp-Hartung adjustment was applied. A prediction interval was given, which indicates the interval in which a single future observation will fall, given what has been observed. In order to perform such analysis, studies not stating the mean number of injections or the steroid dosage, were not included. Additionally, all studies involving <three patients were excluded from this meta-analysis. In order to assess potential publication bias, a funnel plot was created. A two sided $p < 0.05$ was considered statistically significant.

A subgroup of studies mentioning systemic complications was evaluated for age, dosage, number of injections, co-medication, and the need for treatment. The same outcome parameters were evaluated for subgroups involving studies referring to ISI-related endocrine complications and studies measuring cortisol and ACTH blood levels.
FIGURE 1 | PRISMA flow diagram of literature search (15). *Science Citation Index Expanded (1975-present); Social Science Citation Index (1975-present); Arts and Humanities Citation Index (1975-present); Conference Proceedings Citation Index-Science (1990-present); Conference Proceedings Citation Index-Social Science and Humanities (1990-present); Emerging Sources Citation Index (2015-present). **Manually deleted abstracts from trial registries.
## Table 1: Characteristics of included studies.

| References                        | Year | Country       | Study type          | Number of included patients | Treatment indication       | JBI critical appraisal score | JBI quality verdict |
|-----------------------------------|------|---------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|
| Abe (61)                          | 1986 | Japan         | Case Report         | 2                           | Cutaneous hemangioma       | 4/8                           | ◦ ◦ ◦               |
| Al-Mahdi (62)                     | 2010 | Qatar         | Case Report         | 1                           | Cutaneous hemangioma       | 5/8                           | ◦ ◦ ◦               |
| Alsman and Mounir (35)            | 2017 | Egypt         | Quasi-experimental  | 33                          | Periocular hemangioma      | 7/9                           | ◦ ◦ ◦               |
| Bonavolontà et al. (36)           | 1985 | Italy         | Case series         | 6                           | Cutaneous hemangioma       | 8/10                          | ◦ ◦ ◦               |
| Bonavolontà et al. (38)           |      |               |                     |                             |                            |                              |                     |
| Buckmiller et al. (37)            | 2008 | USA           | Case series         | 21                          | Parotid hemangioma         | 7/10                          | ◦ ◦ ◦               |
| Couto and Greene (42)             | 2014 | USA           | Case series         | 100                         | Cutaneous hemangioma       | 6/10                          | ◦ ◦ ◦               |
| Chai et al. (39)                  | 2019 | China         | Case series         | 1039                        | Cutaneous hemangioma       | 9/10                          | ◦ ◦ ◦               |
| Chantharatanapiboon (39)          | 2008 | Thailand      | Case series         | 139                         | Cutaneous hemangioma       | 8/10                          | ◦ ◦ ◦               |
| Chen et al. (40)                  | 2000 | Taiwan        | Case series         | 155                         | Cutaneous hemangioma       | 7/10                          | ◦ ◦ ◦               |
| Colberg et al. (41)               | 2008 | Puerto Rico   | Case series         | 6                           | Synovial cyst              | 6/10                          | ◦ ◦ ◦               |
| Droste et al. (63)                | 1998 | USA           | Case report         | 2                           | Periocular hemangioma      | 4/8                           | ◦ ◦ ◦               |
| Edmonson and Bent (64)            | 2010 | USA           | Case report         | 1                           | Subglottic stenosis        | 7/8                           | ◦ ◦ ◦               |
| Emir et al. (43)                  | 2015 | Turkey        | Case series         | 6                           | Cutaneous hemangioma       | 5/10                          | ◦ ◦ ◦               |
| Folia et al. (65)                 | 2007 | France        | Case report         | 1                           | Glottic hemangioma         | 2/8                           | ◦ ◦ ◦               |
| Fonseca et al. (66)               | 2021 | Chile         | Case report         | 1                           | Nodular fasciitis          | 4/8                           | ◦ ◦ ◦               |
| Gandhi et al. (88)                | 1989 | USA           | Quasi-experimental  | 5                           | Esophageal stricture       | 4/8                           | ◦ ◦ ◦               |
| Gangapadhyay et al. (44)          | 1996 | India         | Case series         | 105                         | Periocular hemangiomas     | 4/10                          | ◦ ◦ ◦               |
| Gorst et al. (67)                 | 2001 | UK            | Case report         | 1                           | Periorbital hemangioma     | 2/8                           | ◦ ◦ ◦               |
| Goyal et al. (45)                 | 2004 | UK            | Case series         | 4                           | Periorbital hemangioma     | 8/10                          | ◦ ◦ ◦               |
| Heil and Daboos (46)              | 2019 | Egypt         | Quasi-experimental  | 340                         | Cutaneous hemangioma       | 7/9                           | ◦ ◦ ◦               |
| Hoeve et al. (68)                 | 1997 | The Netherlands| Case series         | 11                          | Subglottic hemangioma      | 5/8                           | ◦ ◦ ◦               |
| Holder et al. (47)                | 1969 | USA           | Quasi-experimental  | 4                           | Esophageal stricture       | 2/9                           | ◦ ◦ ◦               |
| Hoormeg et al. (69)               | 2014 | The Netherlands| Cohort study       | 29                          | Periorbital hemangioma     | 10/11                         | ◦ ◦ ◦               |
| Janmohamed et al. (70)            | 2011 | The Netherlands| Case series         | 34                          | Periocular hemangioma      | 9/10                          | ◦ ◦ ◦               |
| Kang and Kim (71)                 | 2002 | Korea         | Case report         | 1                           | Mastocitoma                | 3/8                           | ◦ ◦ ◦               |
| Khamalrudin and Goh (72)          | 2021 | Malaysia      | Case report         | 1                           | Glottic hemangioma         | 6/8                           | ◦ ◦ ◦               |
| Kushner (48)                      | 1982 | USA           | Case series         | 9                           | Periocular hemangioma      | 8/10                          | ◦ ◦ ◦               |
| Kushner (49)                      | 1985 | USA           | Case series         | 21                          | Periocular hemangioma      | 7/10                          | ◦ ◦ ◦               |
| Kushner* (49)                     |      |               |                     |                             |                            |                              |                     |
| Langmann and Lindner (50)         | 1994 | Austria       | Case series         | 4                           | Periocular hemangioma      | 7/10                          | ◦ ◦ ◦               |
| Mazzola (51)                      | 1977 | Italy         | Case series         | 11                          | Cutaneous hemangioma       | 5/10                          | ◦ ◦ ◦               |
| Meeuwis et al. (52)               | 1990 | The Netherlands| Case series         | 6                           | Subglottic hemangioma      | 7/10                          | ◦ ◦ ◦               |
| Mohamed (73)                      | 2020 | Egypt         | Quasi-experimental  | 26                          | Cutaneous hemangioma       | 8/9                           | ◦ ◦ ◦               |
| Morkane et al. (53)               | 2011 | UK            | Case series         | 15                          | Periocular hemangioma      | 6/10                          | ◦ ◦ ◦               |
TABLE 1 | Continued

| References                  | Year | Country | Study type | Number of included patients | Treatment indication          | JBI critical appraisal score | JBI quality verdict |
|-----------------------------|------|---------|------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|
| Nelson et al. (74)          | 1984 | USA     | Case report| 2                           | Periocular hemangioma        | 4/8                       | ◦ ◦                 |
| Neumann et al. (75)         | 1997 | USA     | Case report| 2                           | Retrobulbar hemangioma       | 5/8                       | ◦ ◦                 |
| Neumann^A et al. (75)       |      |         |            | 1                           |                              |                           |                      |
| Ngo et al. (34)             | 2020 | USA     | Case series| 158                         | Esophageal stricture         | 9/10                      | ○ ○ ◦               |
| Noe (76)                   | 1981 | USA     | Case report| 2                           | Urethral stricture           | 4/8                       | ○ ○ ◦               |
| O’Keefe et al. (54)         | 2003 | Ireland | Case series| 14                          | Periocular hemangioma        | 7/10                      | ○ ○ ◦               |
| Pandey et al. (65)          | 2009 | India   | Quasi-experimental | 886                         | Cutaneous hemangioma        | 9/9                       | ○ ○ ●               |
| Ragab et al. (56)           | 2020 | Egypt   | Case series| 25                          | Cutaneous hemangioma         | 5/10                      | ● ○ ○               |
| Reyes et al. (77)           | 1989 | Puerto Rico | Case Report | 1                           | Cutaneous hemangioma         | 5/8                       | ○ ● ○               |
| Sabry et al. (78)           | 2020 | Egypt   | Quasi-experimental | 15                          | Cutaneous hemangioma         | 9/9                       | ○ ○ ●               |
| Say et al. (79)             | 2011 | USA     | Case Report| 1                           | Periocular hemangioma        | 4/8                       | ○ ● ○               |
| Sekioka et al. (80)         | 2018 | Japan   | Case series| 1                           | Subglottic stenosis          | 10/10                     | ○ ○ ●               |
| Shao et al. (81)            | 2016 | China   | Quasi-experimental | 31                          | Cutaneous hemangioma         | 8/10                      | ○ ○ ●               |
| Simic et al. (57)           | 2009 | Serbia  | Case series| 5                           | Nasal hemangioma             | 6/10                      | ○ ● ○               |
| Sun et al. (82)             | 2020 | China   | Case series| 35                          | Periorbital hemangioma       | 4/10                      | ● ○ ○               |
| Tasca and Williams (83)     | 2004 | UK      | Case report| 1                           | Nasal hemangioma             | 5/8                       | ● ○ ○               |
| Ten Kate et al. (12)        | 2020 | The Netherlands | Case series | 4                           | Esophageal stricture         | 10/10                     | ○ ○ ●               |
| Weiss (84)                 | 1989 | USA     | Case Report| 2                           | Periocular hemangioma        | 4/8                       | ○ ○ ○               |
| Weiss and Kelly (58)        | 2008 | USA     | Case series| 13                          | Periocular hemangioma        | 8/10                      | ○ ○ ●               |
| Wilshaw and Deady (59)      | 1987 | UK      | Quasi-experimental | 15                          | Vascular hamartomas          | 3/10                      | ● ○ ○               |
| Xu et al. (85)              | 2018 | China   | Quasi-experimental | 39                          | Cutaneous hemangioma         | 7/9                       | ○ ○ ●               |
| Yuan et al. (86)            | 2014 | China   | Case series| 16                          | Periocular hemangioma        | 3/10                      | ● ○ ○               |
| Yuan et al. (86)            | 2015 | China   | Quasi-experimental | 57                          | Periocular/nasal ala/ auricular canal hemangioma | 4/9 | ○ ○ ○ |
| Zein et al. (89)            | 1995 | USA     | Quasi-experimental | 1                           | Esophageal stricture         | 3/9                       | ● ○ ○               |
| Zhang et al. (87)           | 2021 | China   | Case series| 36                          | Cutaneous hemangioma         | 8/10                      | ○ ○ ●               |

JBI, Joanna Briggs Institute; USA, United States of America; UK, United Kingdom; Quality verdict: ○ ○ ●, high quality; ○ ○ ○, moderate quality; ○ ○ ●, low quality; A, Patients receiving ≥80 mg Triamcinolone Acetonide.

RESULTS

The systematic search strategy yielded 8,253 articles, of which 244 were further assessed for eligibility. After full-text screening, 53 articles were selected for inclusion. Reference screening of the included studies yielded three additional studies suitable for inclusion. One study, discussing ISI for anastomotic esophageal strictures, was not retrieved from the search strategy, yet included in the systematic review since it complied with all inclusion criteria (34) (Figure 1).

Fifty-five studies, amounting to 3,499 patients who underwent one or several ISI were included for the general safety assessment (12, 34–87). Five studies were included for the effectiveness assessment of ISI in the treatment of esophageal strictures, comprising 173 esophageal atresia patients (12, 34, 47, 88, 89).

Clinical indications for the ISI varied between patients, with cutaneous hemangioma being the most common with a total of 3,078 patients. Characteristics of the included studies are shown in Table 1.
Intralesional Steroid Injections in Children

Study Types and Quality Assessment
A total of sixteen case reports, 28 case series (of which seventeen retrospective), twelve quasi-experimental studies and one cohort study were selected for final inclusion. The quality assessment for case reports provided two high quality, eleven moderate quality and three low quality studies. Eleven high quality, thirteen moderate quality and four low quality case series were assessed. With regard to quasi-experimental studies, seven studies were of high quality, two of moderate quality and three of low quality. The included cohort study was classified as high quality. A summary of the quality assessments for the included studies and their reported outcomes can be found in the Supplementary Material.

A funnel plot was used in order to assess potential publication bias (Figure 2). The x-axis displays the observed incidence of any complication for each of the included studies, normalized by log-transformation in order to be comparable across studies. The y-axis displays the standard error. The outcome considered was the occurrence of any complication, regardless of dosage. There is clear asymmetry, which could indicate potential publication bias, as studies mainly seem to be missing areas of low statistical significance.

Safety of ISI
Patients Characteristics and Therapeutic Approach
The aggregated mean age at time of first ISI, based on data from 52 studies, was 6.91 months (12, 34–38, 40–68, 71–87). Forty-nine studies provided information on the mean number of injections, resulting in 2.9 injections per patient (12, 34–67, 70–72, 74–77, 79, 80, 83–87). The type of steroid injected, mean number of injections and time interval between injections greatly varied among the included studies. Details can be found in the Supplementary Material.

Adverse events following ISI were evaluated. The overall rate for side effects, based on 48 studies and 3,352 patients, was 7.1% (12, 34–67, 70–72, 74–77, 79, 80, 83–87). Six studies mentioned the need for additional treatment (local or systemic) for adverse events (38, 40, 45, 52, 54, 69). The aggregated mean and median follow-up lengths were 17.09 and 12 months, respectively.

Systemic vs. Local Side Effects
The pooled rates of local and systemic side effects were determined. A total of 730 side effects were seen, consisting of 139 systemic and 591 local effects. As indicated in Figure 3, the pooled local complication rate was estimated at 10% (95% CI 0.004–0.025), whereas the pooled systemic complication rate was estimated at 0.7% (95% CI 0.001–0.039). Further complication analysis, comparing the high and low dose groups, was not performed as the data retrieved in this systematic review did not allow further statistical analysis.

Systemic Complications
Eighteen studies reported systemic complications, of which sixteen referred to endocrinological side effects (see Figure 4) (34, 36–40, 43, 45, 46, 52, 53, 55, 58–61, 81, 82, 84, 86). A total of 139 systemic complications were described in 3,499 patients at risk, with 106 being related to adrenal insufficiency, Cushingoid syndrome or growth retardation. Among patients experiencing systemic complications, the indications for treatment were...
FIGURE 3 | Pooled proportions for systemic (A) and local (B) complications (12, 34–60). Total, total number of injections. *Patients receiving ≥80 mg Triamcinolone Acetonide.

FIGURE 4 | Summary of the systemic complications. N, number of patients; n, number of complications.
mostly periorbital or cutaneous hemangiomas, with only one study using ISI for the management of esophageal strictures.

The assessment of complications varied between studies. Forty-four studies only provided general clinical information, five studies evaluated patients’ growth curves and six studies performed blood test analysis before and after the injection to rule out the development of adrenal insufficiency.

Among the six studies assessing cortisol and ACTH levels (367 patients), four found adrenal suppression following ISI (351 patients), mainly associated to weight loss or growth retardation (43, 45, 46, 53, 59, 84). One study reported the development of Cushingoid syndrome in seven patients (46). Only two out of 351 patients received replacement therapy (being oral hydrocortisone). All patients underwent strict clinical and laboratory follow-up. In all cases, height and weight percentiles returned to pre-treatment levels after pituitary-adrenal axis recovery. The time needed for hypothalamic-pituitary axis (HPA) recovery after ISI ranged between 4 and 65 weeks in the included studies. One study assessed HPA functioning in only one patient, who was re-admitted 3 weeks after the ISI due to a bronchopneumonia. The blood levels of ACTH and cortisol resulted within the normal range, the patient died due to non ISI-related complications (59).

**Effectiveness of ISI**

The mean age of the patients included in the effectiveness analysis was 13.72 months. Only one study specified the type of esophageal atresia, with five patients being affected by type C and one patient by type D (12).

The indication for dilatation plus ISI was dysphagia in three studies (12, 34, 89) and failure to thrive in one study (88). One study did not explicitly mention the reason for dilatation (47). All patients but one had a history of dilatations and/or refractory stricture. Mean stricture length, based on data from three studies, was < 1.5 cm (47, 88, 89). All patients received one or multiple injections of 40 mg of triamcinolone acetonide or less (range 8–40 mg).

The injections were performed within four quadrants at the level of the esophageal stricture in all studies. In two studies, more than one injection was scheduled independently from the patients’ symptoms (12, 89), while in the remaining studies the number of injections was individualized. The mean number of injections per patient was 2.1. In all studies ISI were performed directly before an endoscopic dilatation, carried out either with balloon or bougie. There was a minimum interval of 1 week between one ISI and the following one (88).

Referring to side effects, only one patient (0.58%) experienced transient adrenal insufficiency after the steroid injection, yet no additional treatment was required (34). No local side effects were defined. The follow-up length was mentioned in two studies, respectively, being 22.5 and 36 months (88, 89).

Four studies stated the number of ISI required or planned and the number of dilatations needed for each patient before and after the first injection, as shown in Table 2 (12, 47, 88, 89). The mean and median number of dilatations needed before ISI were 5.2 and 3, respectively. After ISI the mean and median number of further dilatations required were, respectively, 1.13 and 0. Overall, a mean of 7.53 dilatations and 1.67 ISI per patient were performed.

One study was not included in the analysis due to the lack of data referring to the number of dilatations prior to ISI (34). This study does show a significant difference in the esophageal diameter between patients receiving dilatation plus ISI and those receiving dilatations only, with the former group achieving a bigger diameter after treatment. Nevertheless, this difference was not sustained after three injections.

**DISCUSSION**

**Summary of Main Results**

This systematic review aimed to determine the safety of ISI in young children and their effectiveness in anastomotic strictures after EA repair. The studies included in this systematic review and meta-analysis widely varied in terms of study design, population, and outcome. Different therapeutic approaches were used, with no standardized protocols neither for different treatment indications nor within the same disease group. As a consequence, a wide range of dosages and mean number of injections have been reported.

The literature review shows that the reported side effects following ISI are mostly local and do not require additional treatment. Furthermore, the correlation between side effects and ISI was difficult to properly evaluate, as for some cases the adverse
event could also be a possible evolution of the disease itself (e.g., ulceration for cutaneous hemangiomas).

The meta-analysis, performed to define the safety of ISI, demonstrated a trend toward a higher rate of local complications (10%) compared to systemic complications (0.7%). Regrettably, available data did not allow to determine whether complications were dose-dependent.

Referring to the systematic review on the ISI as adjuvant treatment for esophageal strictures, only limited data on the outcome was available. Among the included studies, differences were found in the timing of the first injection, with great variation in the number of dilatations prior to the intervention. Moreover, the steroid dosage and the number of further injections or dilatations widely varied. The mean number of esophageal dilatations prior to ISI was found to be remarkably higher than the mean number of dilatations needed after the first steroid injection (5.2 vs. 1.13).

Potential Biases in the Review Process
The quality of the available evidence, both on safety and effectiveness of ISI in the pediatric population is poor. Intralesional steroid injections are not yet a routine clinical application and the incidence of the treated diseases is low. In order to incorporate a large group of patients for this systematic review, studies with wide variance in terms of methodology were included and no limitation on publication date was defined. Additionally, all studies describing original patient data were included with no restriction on the study type. As a consequence, the overall quality of the studies might have been negatively influenced.

Comparison between studies was hampered by the fact that the majority aimed to assess effectiveness of ISI and therefore did not evaluate safety as primary outcome. Subsequently, modalities for safety assessment varied greatly between the studies.

Agreements and Disagreements With Other Studies or Reviews

Safety of ISI
The lack of standardized protocols for ISI plays a key role in their limited use in the pediatric population. Many research questions are still to be addressed, including the timing, dosage, and maximum number of injections.

Current therapeutic indications involving the use of intralesional steroids often require more than one injection to achieve clinical improvement. The existing literature on esophageal strictures describes a mean of 2.5 ± 1.1 injections per patient (90). In line with available evidence, in this systematic review patients received a mean of 2.9 injections, however with some of them reaching over 10 local steroids injections. Since there is no clear safety assessment for ISI, multiple injections raise concerns on the potential cumulative effect. HPA suppression, Cushingoid syndrome and growth retardation are the main clinical manifestations potentially resulting from steroid administration (91).

With the data obtained in this systematic review it was not possible to properly evaluate the correlation between the steroid dosage or the number of injections and the development of side effects. Existing literature on this topic provides conflicting results. Complicating furthermore, steroid dosage, type of steroid injected and number of injection sites have been proven to influence the time needed for recovery when systemic clinical symptoms occur (92, 93).

One study did not describe an association between steroid dosage and the development of adrenal suppression, but a longer recovery time when two or more injections were administered (53). On the other hand, Potter et al. found that the duration of adverse events seem to be dose-dependent (94).

Triamcinolone is a lipophilic steroid, biologically inactive until it is deacetonized and rendered hydrophilic. On this basis, a local long-lasting effect and a lower concentration of systemic dissemination can be hypothesized when compared to other steroids (91).

Additionally, studies based on salivary cortisol levels' evaluation suggest that TA exhibits an exponential clearance, resulting in transient and short-lasting complications even for higher dosages. Available evidence on older children and adults describe a time range of 1–4 weeks before symptom regression or HPA function normalization takes place (91, 92, 94). In the literature included in this systematic review, a wider range has been found (53).

Despite a longer time for HPA-recovery, only seven out of 367 patients tested for adrenal suppression experienced Cushingoid syndrome, while the majority developed growth retardation. One study reports a 100% rate of adrenal suppression but only 50% of the patients received replacement therapy (45). After adrenal recovery, no differences were found between patients receiving supplementary treatment and those being strictly monitored. All other studies in this review, assessing adrenal insufficiency, did not provide any replacement therapy. The adrenal function recovered in all patients during the follow-up period and no differences were found in weight and height percentiles compared to pre-treatment levels (43, 45, 46, 53, 84).

One study found ACTH and cortisol concentrations to be within normal ranges for all patients, showing no adrenal suppression (46). A difference seen in the ISI technique compared to other studies, measuring ACTH and cortisol levels, was the application of local pressure for 5 min after the injection, but the exact role and influence of this maneuver cannot be assessed.

Effectiveness of ISI for Anastomotic Esophageal Strictures
The mean age of the EA patients was remarkably higher in comparison with other therapeutic indications (13.72 vs. 6.9 months). This can be explained by the fact that ISI are widely used in diseases like hemangiomas and most of the times represent the first therapeutic option. Esophageal atresia patients, on the contrary, usually undergo several dilatations before an adjunct endoscopic treatment is considered, as ISI are being reserved for complex (refractory or >2 cm) or recurrent anastomotic strictures (4, 8).

Whether the combination of ISI and dilatations improve the outcome, compared to dilatations alone, is still not clear. Different parameters are used to define the effectiveness, such as the need for further dilatation, the number of further dilatations,
the frequency of further dilatation, the re-stricture-free survival, the mean time required to solve the stricture and the length of the dysphagia-free period. These endpoints are mainly derived from studies on esophageal strictures in adult patients (95–97). Main benchmarks for anastomotic esophageal strictures in EA patients are the need for further dilatations after ISI, their number and their frequency. Kochhar et al. defined a periodic dilatation index (PDI), evaluating the number of dilatations over time and demonstrating a lower need for dilatations over the months following ISI (20). Also, a lower PDI score reflected an increased interval between further dilatations, independently from the number of dilatations prior to the steroid injection.

This systematic review shows a decrease in the number of dilatations after ISI compared to the number of dilatations prior to the first injection. Nevertheless, defining a causative relationship from available data is difficult, mainly due to the small sample size, study methodology and to multiple confounding factors. Studies involved in the analysis describe symptom improvement after ISI and the reaching of a long-lasting dysphagia-free period after one or more injections. This finding is in line with other studies on esophageal strictures with different etiologies (21), but no score for dysphagia classification has been used in the included studies (98).

Apart from the small sample size, differences in inclusion criteria and study heterogeneity are primary limiting factors. Wide variation in the use of ISI can be found, especially referring to dosage, number of dilatations prior to the injections and number of injections. Some authors scheduled more than one injection independently from the patient symptoms, whereas others scheduled further injections only if additional dilatations were necessary while others preferred a single-time injection. Existing literature on this aspect is ambiguous, as some studies report high effectiveness even for low steroid dosages and single injection (20, 95, 99), while others did not see any symptom improvement, even with higher dosages (19, 100). Overall, the average dosage of steroids, both for single and recurrent injections, was found to be much lower for esophageal strictures compared to other indications (max. 40 mg vs. max. 400 mg).

Another possible confounding factor in the effectiveness assessment is the esophageal dilatation technique, since the use of either balloon or bougie might influence the outcome after dilatation (101). Due to the limited sample size, no comparative meta-analysis could be performed in the present review. For the same reason no correlation with antacid treatment, known to influence the stricture development or the recurrence rate, has been evaluated (101).

Lastly, it is worth considering that the number of dilatations for anastomotic esophageal strictures generally follow an hyperbolic course. Patients with refractory strictures will likely need further, recurrent dilatations to keep symptoms under control (3). This systematic review highlights a change of this trend in patients receiving ISI, which might suggest the effectiveness of the technique.

Consensus was found on the technique used for injection, with all studies dividing the amount of steroid into four quadrants at the level of the stricture, as proposed by Ramage et al. (18).

For esophageal strictures, no patient received more than 3 injections, in accordance with the safety cut-off described in the literature for both systemic and local effects (101).

### Implication for Practice

One of the primary aims of this meta-analysis and systematic review was to assess the safety of ISI. Due to the heterogeneity of the included studies, defining the real impact of this treatment on young children’s health is difficult. Even though the retrieved data belong to studies with high variance in dosages, clinical practices, and time-ranges, the low occurrence of side effects is encouraging and does not compellingly show clinical complications. Based on the current data analysis, administration of less than three injections with a total steroid dosage under 80 mg is suggested to be safe for all indications.

Results from this systematic review show a reduction in the need for dilatations and therefore address ISI as effective (adjuvant) treatment for esophageal strictures.

### Implication for Research

This systematic review highlights the lack of sufficient data on the safety and effectiveness of ISI in young children. The potential benefit of this treatment for esophageal stenosis plays a key role in reducing the burden of disease. Well-designed prospective studies aiming to specifically assess the safety and the effectiveness of ISI in EA are needed in order to implement this technique in the daily clinical practice.

### CONCLUSION

Based on the present systematic review and meta-analysis, including over 3,000 patients, we can assume that ISI are safe in young children under the age of 2 years and effective in the treatment of anastomotic esophageal strictures. Nevertheless, healthcare providers need to be aware of the possible adrenal suppression, although based on current data most side effects are local and self-limiting. Close clinical follow-up with at least growth curve evaluation is warranted in patients undergoing this therapeutic intervention. Caregivers should always be informed about possible signs of acute adrenal dysfunction.

In anastomotic strictures after EA repair, intrallesional steroid injections seem to reduce the number of esophageal dilatations needed and their frequency, without the occurrence of local or systemic side effects. Their systematic use in anastomotic esophageal strictures has great potential to reduce the burden of disease. Prospective, comparative studies are needed before ISI can be defined as a safe and effective technique.
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