

**BUKTI DAN RIWAYAT KORESPONDENSI
JURNAL NASIONAL TERAKREDITAS SINTA 2**

Judul Artikel : The Effectiveness of Chewing Gum versus Cryotherapy on Salivary Volume among Patient with Head and Neck Cancer Undergoing Radiotherapy.
 Jurnal : Jurnal Ners
 Penulis : 1 Dwi Uswatun Sholikhah, 2 Ketut Suidiana, 3 Ninuk Dian Kurniawati., (Coessponding ninuk.dk@fkip.unair.ac.id),

NO	PERIHAL	Tanggal	Lampiran	Keterangan
1	Bukti submit artikel	27 Mei 2020	1	
2	Bukti Masukan Reviewer	Editor: 15 Juni 2020 Reviewer 1 14 Juni 2020 Reviewer 1 17 Juni 2020	2	1. Masukan terkait perbaikan redaksional, tata bahasa 2. Masukan terkait substansi: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Abstrak: mohon diperjelas alasan melakukan penelitian, metode, intervensi yang diberikan, populasi, sample dan sampling, kesimpulan, penjelasan signifikansi penelitian b. Pendahuluan: elaborasi research gap yang ada berdasar literature review yang mendasari penelitian c. Metode: mohon perjelas: alasan pemilihan populasi (mengapa pasien kanker kepala leher), Teknik sampling dan kriteria sampel, penjelasan intervensi yang diberikan sertaantisipasi peneliti untuk mencegah adverse events, teknik pengukuran volume saliva, asumsi yang digunakan untuk memilih uji statistic d. Hasil: elaborasi dan perbaiki penulisan hasil agar menggambarkan time series e. Kesimpulan: simpulkan penelitian berbasis hasil temuan dengan mempertimbangkan berbagai aspek yang mempengaruhi produksi saliva selain intervensi
3	Bukti submit perbaikan	1 Oktober 2018	3	Sudah direvisi sesuai masukan
4	Bukti artikel accepted	19 Juni 2020	4	
5	Bukti copy edit	21 Juni 2020	5	

19444 / **Sholikhah et al.** / The Effectiveness Chewing gum versus Cryotherapy on Salivary Volume among Patient with Head and Neck

[Library](#)

Workflow

Publication

Submission

Review

Copyediting

Production

Submission Files

[Search](#)

 72866	admin, manuscrip JN.docx	May 27, 2020	Article Text
---	--------------------------	--------------	--------------

[Download All Files](#)

Pre-Review Discussions

[Add discussion](#)

Name	From	Last Reply	Replies	Closed
------	------	------------	---------	--------

No Items

Workflow

Publication

Submission

Review


Copyediting

Production

Round 1

Reviewer's Attachments

🔍 Search

 74786	Article Text, 19444-72871-1-RV.docx	June 14, 2020	Article Text
---	---	---------------	--------------

Revisions

🔍 Search

Upload File

▶  75122	Article Text, 19444-74786-1-RV.docx	June 17, 2020	Article Text
---	---	---------------	--------------

Review Discussions

Add discussion

Name	From	Last Reply	Replies	Closed
▶ Editor Decision	ninukdian 2020-06-15 12:22 AM	ninukdian 2020-06-19 04:50 AM	1	<input type="checkbox"/>

The Effectiveness Chewing gum versus Cryotherapy on Salivary Volume among Patient with Head and Neck Cancer undergoing Radiotherapy

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Hyposalivation is a common problem experienced by head and neck (H&N) cancer patients undergoing radiotherapy. Hyposalivation can cause atrophy, oral mucosal erythema and ulceration. Patients will feel uncomfot, pain when eating, speaking and decreased appetite. Many nonpharmacological interventions that can be done for hyposalivation that occur in patients one of which is chewing gum and cryotherapy, but the effectiveness of these interventions is not yet clear. Hence, this study aimed to determine the effectiveness of chewing gum versus cryotherapy to increase salivary volume in H&N cancer patients undergoing radiotherapy.

Method: A quasi-experimental research design (time series group design) was conducted on 36 respondents H&N cancer undergoing radiotherapy through 4 measurements pre-posttest on the third, fifth and seventh day of interventions between February and March 2020. Subjects were chosen using consecutive sampling. The spitting method was used to collect saliva and the data were analyzed using GLMRM.

Results: The GLMRM within subject at 4 times measurement showed a significant difference between chewing gum and cryotherapy group with p value <0.05 was in 7th day. The GLMRM between subjects showed no significant differences between two groups. Subjects at the chewing gum group had better salivary volume increment than cryotherapy group.

Conclusions: This study showed that chewing gum and cryotherapy intervention can affect the production of saliva on patient H&N cancer undergoing radiotherapy. Chewing gum has higher salivary volume increment than cryotherapy groups. So what?

Keywords--- chewing gum, cryotherapy, salivary volume, radiotherapy

INTRODUCTION

Hyposalivation is a common problem experienced by head and neck cancer patients undergoing radiotherapy (Siddiqui & Movsas, 2017). Continuous exposure to radiation and cytotoxic agents have several direct effects on the oral epithelium that can cause damage to the salivary gland duct cells that cause hyposalivation (Eghbali, Aziz, Taherkhanch, Bagheri, 2017). Hyposalivation is defined if salivary flow without stimulation is ≤ 0.2 mL / min (Kaae, Stenfeldt, & Eriksen, 2016). The volume of saliva produced per day ranges between 0.5 and 1.0 L in normal physiological conditions, and the physiological pH range for saliva is 6.5–7.4 (Simões, Campos, Arana-chavez, & Nicolau, 2015). Resting saliva flow rate (volume of saliva/collection time) of 0.1 mL/min or less and/or a stimulated whole saliva flow rate of 0.7 mL/min or less (Ra'abung, Sudiana, & Hidayati, 2019). Saliva has decreased production in patients undergoing radiotherapy compared to normal people (Irna & Subita, 2008) (Surjadi et al., 2012). Hyposalivation could caused atrophy and oral mucosal erythema, ulceration, papilla loss on chapped tongue and lips (Plemons, Al-hashimi, & Marek, 2014) so that it can make patients feel pain when eating, speaking, loss of taste and odor senses and decreased appetite (Traktama & Sufiawati, 2018).

Previous studies do not yet know the effective time to increase saliva volume and effectiveness of nonpharmacological interventions between chewing gum and cryotherapy to stimulate saliva production which reduces because radiation rays. Radiotherapy is one of the three most common treatments for head and neck cancer that requires discipline and a long time (Laursen et al., 2018). Radiotherapy is a cancer treatment that uses high-energy X-rays or other types of radiation to kill cancer cells or keep cancer cells from growing (NIH, 2019). The safe dose of the parotid gland is 26 Gy, the safe dose of the submandibular gland is 39 Gy and the dose 30 Gy for minor salivary glands remains safe (Siddiqui & Movsas, 2017). Radiotherapy doses of 60-70 Gy can cause problems in the mouth prolonged and severe (Villa & Sonis, 2015). Radiotherapy can shrink and kill tumor cells (Santoso, Surarso, & Kentjono, 2009), but it has the most frequent side effects experienced by patients namely

Deleted: Comparison of

Deleted: and

Deleted: in

Commented [LD1]: Combined in one sentence for the negative effect of hyposalivation on physical and psychological aspect

Commented [LD2]: Why this intervention not others. Please give short argument from previous evidences

Deleted: and

Commented [LD3]: Clarify this study design

Deleted: post test

Commented [LD4]: Unclear

Commented [LD5]: Briefly explain protocol intervention. Chewing gum and cryotherapy?

Deleted: The independent variables were chewing gum and cryotherapy while the dependent variable was salivary volume. The instrument in this study used

Commented [LD6]: Full name

Commented [LD7]: Explain major information of your studied participants first
Report volume of saliva before intervention in two group, whether they have similar condition. Report saliva volume at different time measurement their significant test.

Commented [LD8]: ?

Commented [LD9]: Your conclusion is different from your purpose and findings

Commented [LD10]: Still unclear explanation for why this intervention is so important to be conducted?

Commented [LD11]: Please add prevalence or incident of hyposalivation in patients undergoing radiotherapy from previous studies

Commented [LD12]: Correct citation format

Formatted: Font color: Red

Formatted: Font color: Red

Formatted: Font color: Red

Deleted: Saliva is an important component, if there is decreasing saliva production can cause

Commented [LD13]: Please make a clear discrimination for the effect of hyposalivation physically and psychologically or even on activity daily living

Commented [LD14]: Is this main idea of the paragraph? If yes, please re-structure because there is no link between main idea with supporting idea

hyposalivation, thickened saliva, mucosal infections, pain and taste sensory dysfunction (Epstein, Bensadoun, Saunders, & Rajesh, 2017). Study (Epstein et al., 2017) states radiation can cause problems in the mouth.

Given the importance of the role of saliva and the consequences arising from hyposalivation, it is necessary to increase saliva volume in head and neck cancer patients undergoing radiotherapy. Several studies mention chewing gum and cryotherapy can increase salivary volume (Kumar & Indushekar, 2013) (Utami & Hayati, 2018) (Kakoei, Ghassemi, & Nakhaee, 2013). Chewing gum and cryotherapy are easy, inexpensive, safe interventions done by patients to increase the volume of saliva and oral mucositis (Utami & Hayati, 2018) but its effectiveness is unclear. This study aimed was to determine the effectiveness of chewing gum versus cryotherapy to increase the volume of saliva in head and neck cancer patients undergoing radiotherapy.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This research was a quantitative research with a quasi-experimental research design (time series group design). This study involved 36 respondents who were divided into chewing gum groups and cryotherapy groups (18/18) obtained by consecutive sampling. Respondents were taken based on inclusion criteria to reduce the effects of bias. The inclusion criteria in this study were: 1) patients have mucositis oral undergoing radiotherapy head and neck cancer, 2) Type squamous cell carcinoma, 3) Patients can chew gum. Meanwhile, the exclusion criteria in this study are: 1) patients have sensitive tooth, 2) patients have diabetes mellitus, 3) patients have mucositis oral before radiotherapy. The drop out criteria in this study include the patient die and the patient not completing the therapy process. Data collection was carried out at Radiotherapy Instalation Saiful Anwar Hospital Malang between February 2020 and March 2020.

Explain clearly and correctly your intervention protocol

The dependent variable was salivary volume and the independent variable was chewing gum and cryotherapy. Subjects in the chewing gum group were asked to six pieces of chew sugar-free gum xylitol a day (two piece in the morning, afternoon and evening) respectively for a week after radiotherapy session. Subjects in the cryotherapy group were asked to suck ice tube before and after radiotherapy session during 5 minutes for a week. Post-test was held in third day, fifth day and seven day intervention.

Data obtained using spitting method, the instrument in study were observation sheet, beaker glass, syringe 3 ml, gloves, face mask, xylitol sugar free chewing gum, ice tube.

Ethical approval was obtained from Komisi Etik Penelitian Kesehatan (KEPK) Saiful Anwar Hospital Malang with the number 400/017/K.3/302/2020 on January 17, 2020.

Demographic data includes gender, age, education, employment status and marital status, diagnosis of disease, stadium cancer, smoking habit. Descriptive analysis is used for respondent characteristics. Observation data were analyzed using the General Linear Model-Repeated Measure (GLM-RM).

RESULTS

Descriptive statistical analysis of the respondent's characteristics is shown in Table 1. This study was followed by 36 patients head and neck cancer undergoing radiotherapy divided into chewing gum intervention and cryotherapy intervention. Table 2 describes the statistical test GLMRM ANOVA within subject of the effects of treatment on each group. Table 3 describes the statistical test GLMRM ANOVA between subject the effect of treatment.

Table 1 Characteristics of participants

Characteristics of participants	Chewing Gum group (n=24)		Cryotherapy group (n=18)		Total	
	f(x)	%	f(x)	%	f(x)	%
Gender						
Man	15	83,3	16	88,9	31	86,1
Female	3	16,7	2	11,1	5	13,9
Total	18	100	18	100	36	100

Deleted: several

Commented [LD15]: Please add research gap. What has been known from previous studies What are the unknown information that lead to the important of your study

Commented [LD16]: Is there adverse effect have been reported for both intervention? If yes, please added true information and how to deal with or minimize the adverse effect

Deleted: and

Commented [LD17]: Why?

Commented [LD18]: Why?

Commented [LD19]: How to make sure?

Commented [LD20]: Why and how to make sure?

Commented [LD21]: Seem to be redundant/opposite of inclusion criteria

Commented [LD22]: Why should be included in drop out, you can use intention to treat for the analysis

Commented [LD23]: Composition of gun, about taste? Contain xylitol? How if participant doesn't like xylitol? Is there any side effect of consuming xylitol frequently? intensity, how long in the morning, afternoon, and evening. How to make sure their adherence and maintain patients to not drop out? How to handle drop out

Commented [LD24]: What they are doing? Explain detail please

Deleted: Post test

Commented [LD25]: Explain this method and how to come up with saliva volume, who measure this? Researchers or?

Commented [LD26]: Describe from univariate analysis, bivariate and GLM-RM. And how to fulfil all assumption in conducting GLM-RM, what model did you use? Fixed or mixed, and how to decide it?

Commented [LD27]: Check for difference of characteristics participant to see whether chewing group and cryotherapy are in the equal situation to justified fairness of study intervention

Commented [LD28R27]: Check also the table format, as a guideline

Characteristics of participants	Chewing Gum group (n=24)		Cryotherapy group (n=18)		Total	
	f(x)	%	f(x)	%	f(x)	%
Age (year)						
17-25	1	5,6	0	0	1	2,8
26-35	1	5,6	0	0	1	2,8
36-45	4	22,2	3	16,7	7	19,4
46-55	5	27,8	7	38,9	12	33,4
56-65	2	11,1	4	22,2	6	16,7
>65	5	22,2	4	22,2	9	25
Total	18	100	18	100	36	100
Diagnosis of Disease						
Nasopharyngeal cancer	7	38,9	13	72,2	20	59,5
Oropharyngeal cancer	1	5,6	0	0	1	2,8
Larynx cancer	5	27,8	2	11,1	7	19,4
Non-Hodgkin's lymphoma	1	5,6	0	0	1	2,8
Tongue cancer	3	16,7	0	0	3	8,3
Lymphoma cancer	1	5,6	0	0	1	2,8
Mandibula cancer	0	0	3	16,7	3	8,3
Total	18	100	18	100	36	100
Stadium						
Stadium 1	0	0	1	5,6	1	2,8
Stadium 2	10	55,6	9	50	19	52,8
Stadium 3	6	33,3	4	22,2	10	27,8
Stadium 4	2	11,1	4	22,2	6	16,7
Total	18	100	18	100	36	100
Education status						
No school	1	5,6	2	11,1	3	8,3
Elementary school	7	38,9	4	22,2	11	30,6
Middle school	2	11,1	5	27,8	7	19,4
High school	6	33,3	6	33,3	12	33,3
Bachelor	2	11,1	1	5,6	3	8,3
Total	24	100	18	100	42	100
Employment status						
Farmers	4	22,2	5	27,8	9	25
Private job	6	33,3	6	33,3	12	33,3
Trader	3	8,3	5	27,8	8	22,2
Civil servants	3	16,7	1	5,6	4	11,1
Housewife	2	11,1	1	5,6	3	8,3
Total	18	100	18	100	36	100
Marital status						
Married	16	88,9	16	88,9	32	88,9
Not married	2	11,1	1	5,6	3	8,3
Divorced	0	0	1	5,6	1	2,8
Total	18	100	18	100	36	100
Smoking habit						
Not smoking	3	16,7	3	16,7	6	16,7
1 pack/day	12	66,7	10	55,6	22	61,1
2 pack/day	2	11,1	4	22,2	6	16,7
3 pack or more/day	1	5,6	1	5,6	2	5,6
Total	18	100	18	100	36	100
Long time smoking						
Not smoking	3	16,7	3	16,7	6	16,7
1-10 years	9	50	4	22,2	13	36,1
11-20 years	5	27,8	7	38,9	12	33,3
21-30 years	1	5,6	4	22,2	5	13,9

Characteristics of participants	Chewing Gum group (n=24)		Cryotherapy group (n=18)		Total	
	f(x)	%	f(x)	%	f(x)	%
Total	18	100	18	100	36	100

Table 1. shows that in the chewing gum group and cryotherapy group, 31 people in this study were male and 5 were female and had the highest age range distribution of 46-55 years by 12 people. The number of nasopharyngeal cancer is the majority diagnose that 20 people. The most stadium is stadium 2 that 19 people. The education level of as many as 12 people is educated high school with 12 respondents have private job. The marital status majority are married 32 people. Smoking habit as many as 22 respondents smoking 1 pack/day and majority during 1-10 years 13 people.

Table 2 salivary volume in the chewing gum and cryotherapy groups in GLMRM ANOVA within subject test

Group	Time	Mean ± SD	Delta	p-Value
Chewing Gum	3 rd day vs pre-test	0.6444±0.17564	0.1223	0,000
	Day 5 vs pre-test	0.8944±0.14337	0,25	0,000
	7 th day vs pre-test	1.0722±0.18087	0,4278	0,000
	7 th day vs 3 rd day	0.7667±0.16088	0,3055	0,000
	7 th day vs day 5	0.8944±0.14337	0,1778	0,000
Cryotherapy	3 rd day vs pre-test	0.6444±0,22287	0,1112	0,000
	Day 5 vs pre-test	0,8611±0,16852	0,2167	0,000
	7 th day vs pre-test	0,9611±0,15770	0,3167	0,000
	7 th day vs 3 rd day	0,7556±0,15038	0,2055	0,000
	7 th day vs day 5	0,8611±0,16852	0,1	0,001

Commented [LD29]: This should be knowing the p-value of pre-test, 3rd say, 5th day and 7th directly Not separately

Table 2 explains that the results of the GLM-RM ANOVA test showed that there were significant differences in salivary volume before and after the intervention of chewing gum and cryotherapy at the 4th time of measurement with $p = <0.05$. In the chewing gum and cryotherapy, the most delta group were on the 7th day of the intervention compared to the pre, 3rd day and 5th day. Delta value of the chewing gum intervention in 7th day is 0.4278 and delta value in 7th day cryotherapy is 0.3167.

Commented [LD30]: You can make a box plot or line chart to see the trend of saliva volume at follow up time

Table 3 salivary volume in the chewing gum and cryotherapy groups in GLMRM ANOVA between subject test

Saliva (ml/minute)	Chewing Gum Mean ± SD	Cryotherapy Mean ± SD	Delta (confidence interval 95 %)	p-value
Pre-test	0.6444±0.17564	0.6444±0,2228	0 (-0,109-0,145)	1,000
3 rd day	0.7667±0.16088	0,7556±0,15038	0,0111 (-0,72-0,111)	0,832
Day 5	0.8944±0.14337	0,8611±0,16852	0,0333 (0,060-0,138)	0,527
7 th day	1.0722±0.18087	0,9611±0,15770	0,1111 (0,16-0,237)	0.058

Commented [LD31]: The same? How when know pre-test, to 3rd → 5th day → 7 days effect directly

Table 3 explains that the GLMRM test results between subjects showed no significant differences in salivary volume before and after the intervention of chewing gum and cryotherapy. But the chewing gum group had better results than the mean chewing gum which was higher by 1.0722 ± 0.18087 than the smaller cryotherapy 0.9611 ± 0.15770 although the statistical results were p values 0.058 ($p > 0.05$).

DISCUSSION

Chewing muscles that are affected by radiation can be stimulated (Kaae et al., 2016). The main stimulus for increased salivary secretion is through mechanical stimulation (Subramaniam & Muthukrishnan, 2019). Chewing gum is a form of mechanical stimulation that is useful for increasing saliva and pH (Costa, Fernandes, Quinder, De Souza, & Pinto, 2003) (Llop, Jimeno, Acien, R, & Dalmau, 2010). Chewing movements can make changes in the permeability of the plasma membrane, so that calcium

Commented [LD32]: State your major finding first then compared it with previous studies, whether found similar results or different? Explain potential mechanism by which these interventions could increase saliva volume and limitation to achieve maximum effect. Then future implication for practice or future research

can enter the cell, influx cells occur and activate several enzymes, one of which is calcinurin which affects the process of protein production transpisi one of which is saliva (Ambudkar, 2014) thus increasing saliva production (Eghbali, Aziz., Taherkhanch., Bagheri B., 2017). Study (Pereira, Maciel, Jorge, & Monteiro, 2016) chewing gum can increase the rate of salivary flow compared to the control group.

Previous studies do not yet know the effective time to increase saliva volume and effectiveness of nonpharmacological interventions between chewing gum and cryotherapy to stimulate saliva production which reduces because radiation rays. Saliva is a liquid produced from several glands, namely the parotid gland, which is the largest gland, then the submandibular gland that produces serus (thin saliva, low viscosity), and the smallest gland is the sublingual gland that produces mucus (thick saliva, viscosity is higher) (Yunus, 2008). Saliva is very important because it contains antimicrobials such as lysozyme and secretes immunoglobulin A (Subramaniam & Muthukrishnan, 2019).

This research was conducted using time series to get the most effective time effect. In line with opinions (Plemons et al., 2014) that measuring saliva periodically is an effective way to monitor changes in the volume and composition of saliva. Chewing sugar-free gum or sucking sugar-free gum to stimulate saliva flow is an intervention to minimize dry mouth (Dental & Ada, 2015). In this study using xylitol gum because it contains lower sugar and is easy to find on the market. the results of this study are the same as the results (Rodian, Satari, & Rolleta, 2011) xylitol chewing gum showed the highest increase in salivary volume compared to sucrose chewing gum and probiotic gums, but the statistical tests showed no significant difference.

Cryotherapy is applied because it has many advantages that is practical to be applied, economical, easy, has minimal side effects (Utami, 2017). The goals of cold therapy include reducing inflammation, inhibiting pain receptors, reducing edema, controlling bleeding (Rosdahl & Kowalski, 2014).

Symptoms of a dry mouth due to reduced saliva can make a patient feel uncomfortable, disturb the appetite and quality of life of the patient (Plemons et al., 2014). Study (Dental & Ada, 2015) states sucking ice cubes, drinking water while eating to help chew and swallow food, using mouthwash-free mouthwash, avoiding carbonated drinks (such as soda), caffeine, tobacco, and alcohol, using lanolin-based lip balm to comfort cracked lips or dry can reduce dryness in the mouth and stimulate saliva discharge. Increased salivary secretion leads to increased volume and thinning of saliva needed for ingestion and lubrication.

In this study not all of the patients' salivary volumes increased. This is influenced by several factors, according to (Samuels, 2017) drugs, smoking, alcohol consumption will reduce the flow rate of saliva. Most respondents age in the range 46-65 years. Old age will make the function of the salivary glands decrease, because the acinar element turns into fat and fibrous tissue (Baird, Donehower, Stalsbrotten, & Ades, 1991).

The results of this study prove that the chewing gum and cryotherapy affect the stimulus production of saliva. Hopefully this study can increase information about nursing care in head and neck cancer. So that the symptoms caused by radiotherapy of the head neck area can be reduced or avoided.

Add limitation and strength of this study The weakness of this study was the researcher cannot fully control the respondent's intervention because it is done at home or boarding so this can have an impact on the result of the study.

CONCLUSIONS

This study showed a significant difference between chewing gum and cryotherapy in 4 measurements salivary volume. Chewing gum and cryotherapy intervention can affect the production of saliva on patient head and neck cancer undergoing radiotherapy in Saiful Anwar Hospital Malang on 7th day intervention. The results from this recent study hope to be useful in future health therapies to increase the volume of saliva in radiotherapy patients in the head and neck area so that it can reduce side effects and make therapy successful. Add suggestion for future research.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Commented [LD33]: It's too risky to make such of conclusion, since you don't have enough evidence for why 7 days, how about long-term effect? is it still work or no? also rigorous of you study designs probably have some limitation due to the nature of queasy experiment

Then, saliva production is affected by several factors which is in your study did not control it.

Commented [LD34]: Same comment for this

Moved (insertion) [1]

Deleted: that The GLMRM within subject there is

Deleted: group with p value <0.05

Commented [LD35]: Not in line

Deleted: The GLMRM between subject showed that no significant differences in salivary volume before and after the intervention of chewing gum and cryotherapy, chewing gum had better salivary volume increment as compare to subjects at cryotherapy group.

Commented [LD36]: What should be taken into account for clinical practice to try this intervention

Moved up [1]: The weakness of this study was the researcher cannot fully control the respondent's intervention because it is done at home or boarding so this can have an impact on the result of the study.

The author would like to express gratitude to the supervisors for the guidance and the precious suggestions, radiotherapy patients in Saiful Anwar Hospital Malang for participation in this study and the relevant authorities for their permissions to conduct this research.

REFERENCES

- Ambudkar, I. S. (2014). Ca²⁺ signaling and regulation of fluid secretion in salivary gland acinar cells. *Cell Calcium*, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ceca.2014.02.009>
- Baird, S. B., Donehower, M. G., Stalsbroten, V. L., & Ades, T. B. (1991). *A cancer Source Book for Nurses* (6th ed.). USA: American Cancer Society.
- Bungan, N. T. O., Liyah, S. H. A., & Wijayanti, N. (2015). Epidemiologi, Stadium, dan Derajat Diferensiasi Kanker Kepala dan Leher, 3(1), 47–52.
- Costa, E. M., Fernandes, M. Z., Quinder, L. B., De Souza, L. B., & Pinto, L. P. (2003). Evaluation of an oral preventive protocol in children with acute lymphoblastic leukemia. *Pesquisa Odontologica Brasileira*, 17(2), 147–150.
- Dental, A., & Ada, A. (2015). Managing dry mouth. *The Journal of the American Dental Association*, 146(2), A40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adaj.2014.11.019>
- Eghbali, Aziz., Taherkhanch., Bagheri B., S. S. (2017). Effect of Chewing Gum on Oral Mucositis in Children Undergoing Chemotherapy : A Randomized Controlled Study Original Article Effect of Chewing Gum on Oral Mucositis in Children Undergoing Chemotherapy : A Randomized Controlled Study, (March 2016).
- Epstein, J. B., Bensadoun, R., Saunders, D. P., & Rajesh, V. (2017). Common oral complications of head and neck cancer radiation therapy: mucositis, infections, saliva change, fibrosis, sensory dysfunctions, dental caries, periodontal disease, and osteoradionecrosis. *Cancer Medicine*, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cam4.1221>
- Irna, & Subita, G. P. S. (2008). Identifikasi dan Pengendalian Faktor Risiko Mukositis Oral selama Radioterapi Kanker Nasofaring Laporan Kasus. *Indonesian Journal of Dentistry*, 15(4), 155–162.
- Kaae, J. K., Stenfeldt, L., & Eriksen, J. G. (2016). Xerostomia after radiotherapy fo r Oral and Oropharyngeal cancer: increasing salivary Flow with Tasteless sugar-free chewing gum. *Frontiers in Oncology*, 6(May), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fonc.2016.00111>
- Kakoei, S., Ghassemi, A., & Nakhaee, N. (2013). Effect of cryotherapy on oral mucositis in patients with head and neck cancers receiving radiotherapy, 11(2), 0–3.
- Kumar, & Indushekar, K. R. (2013). Comparative evaluation of the effects of xylitol and sugar-free chewing gums on salivary and dental plaque pH in children, 31(4), 1–5. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.4103/0970-4388.121822>
- Laursen, M., Specht, L., Kristensen, C. A., & Gothelf, A. (2018). An Extended Hypofractionated Palliative Radiotherapy Regimen for Head and Neck Carcinomas, 8(June), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fonc.2018.00206>
- Llop, M. R., Jimeno, F. G., Acien, R. M., & Dalmau, L. J. B. (2010). Effect of xylitol chewing gum on salivary flow rate, ph, buffering capacity and presence of Streptococcus mutans in saliva. *European Journal of Paediatric Dentistry*, 11(1), 9–14.
- Mccarter, K., Baker, A. L., Britton, B., Wolfenden, L., Wratten, C., Bauer, J., ... Oldmeadow, C. (2018). Smoking, drinking, and depression: comorbidity in head and neck cancer patients undergoing radiotherapy. *Cancer Medicine*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cam4.1497>
- NIH. (2019). Salivary Gland Cancer Treatment (Adult). Retrieved from <https://www.cancer.gov/types/head-and-neck/patient/adult/salivary-gland-treatment-pdq>
- Pereira, J. V., Maciel, R. P., Jorge, M., & Monteiro, F. (2016). Effect of Chewing Gum Containing CPP-ACP on Salivary Flow and Buffer Capacity : An in vivo Study, 16(1), 425–431.

- Plemons, J. M., Al-hashimi, I., & Marek, C. L. (2014). Managing xerostomia and salivary gland hypofunction Executive. *The Journal of the American Dental Association*, 145(8), 867–873. <https://doi.org/10.14219/jada.2014.44>
- Ra'abung, A. S., Sudiana, I. K., & Hidayati, L. (2019). *Pengaruh mouthwash disertai mengunyah permen karet xylitol terhadap xerostomia, laju aliran saliva, dan pH saliva pada pasien yang menjalani hemodialisis*. Universitas Airlangga.
- Rodian, M., Satari, M. H., & Rolleta, E. (2011). *Efek Mengunyah Permen karet yang Mengandung Sukrosa, Xylitol, Probiotik terhadap Volume, Kecepatan Aliran, Viskositas, pH, dan Jumlah Koloni Streptococcus Mutans Saliva*. Sumedang Jawa Barat.
- Rosdahl, C. B., & Kowalski, M. T. (2014). Text Book of Basic Nursing Edisi 10. In E. A. Mardella (Ed.) (10th ed., p. 871). USA: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins/Wolter Kluwer Health.
- Samuels, M. A. (2017). Radiation-induced Oral Mucositis, 7(May). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fonc.2017.00089>
- Santoso, B. S., Surarso, B., & Kentjono, W. A. (2009). Radioterapi pada Karsinoma Nasofaring. *THT KL*, 2(3), 134–141.
- Siddiqi, F., & Movsas, B. (2017). Management of Radiation Toxicity in Head and Neck Cancer. *Seminars in Radiation Oncology*, 27(4), 340–349. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.semradonc.2017.04.008>
- Simões, A., Campos, L. De, Arana-chavez, V. E., & Nicolau, J. (2015). Low Level Laser Therapy for hyposalivation and xerostomia, 335–339.
- Suardewi, N. L. I., & Winata, A. (2019). Gambaran Komplikasi Pasien Kanker Kepala dan Leher Pasca Radioterapi/Kemoterapi di RSUP Sanglah Tahun 2016. *E-Jurnal Medika*, 8(1), 75–82. Retrieved from <https://ojs.unud.ac.id/index.php/eum>
- Subramaniam, N., & Muthukrishnan, A. (2019). Oral mucositis and microbial colonization in oral cancer patients undergoing radiotherapy and chemotherapy : A prospective analysis in a tertiary care dental hospital. (July), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jicd.12454>
- Surjadi, N., Amtha, R., Edkzd, P., Phpsjqdudkl, U., Klsrvdolydvl, W. D., Phpsjqdudkl, G. D. Q., & Mxpodk, S. (2012). Radiotherapy Reduced Salivary Flow Rate and Might Induced *C. albicans* Infection, 19(1), 1–6.
- Traktama, D. O., & Sufiawati, I. (2018). Keparahan mukositis oral pada pasien kanker kepala leher akibat kemoterapi dan / atau radioterapi, 4(1).
- Utami, K. C. (2017). *Mukositis Oral sebagai Dampak Kemoterapi pada Anak Kanker yang Mendapat Kemoterapi*.
- Utami, K. C., & Hayati, H. (2018). Chewing gum is more effective than saline-solution gargling for reducing oral mucositis. *Enfermeria Clinica*, 28, 5–8. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1130-8621\(18\)30026-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1130-8621(18)30026-3)
- Villa, A., & Sonis, S. T. (2015). Mucositis : pathobiology and management, 159–164. <https://doi.org/10.1097/CCO.0000000000000180>
- Yunus, B. (2008). Efek samping terapi radiasi penderita kanker kepala dan leher pada kelenjar saliva, 7(1), 57–62.

Editor Decision



Participants [Edit](#)

Ferry Efendi, S.Kep., Ns., MSc, PhD (ferryefendi)

Ninuk Dian Kurniawati (ninukdian)

Messages

Note	From
<p>Dear Ninuk Dian Kurniawati:</p> <p>We have reached a decision regarding your submission to Jurnal Ners, "Comparison of The Effectiveness Chewing gum and Cryotherapy on Salivary Volume in Patient Head and Neck Cancer undergoing Radiotherapy".</p> <p>Based on the referees' comments, we will be pleased to publish your article conditional on the following revision as we have sent to you by OJS system. To avoid delay in the publication of your paper, we would greatly appreciate your uploading your revised manuscript as soon as possible. Please let me know urgently if you will not be able to submit your revision within 5 days.</p> <p>When submitting your revised manuscript, you should also respond to the comments made by the reviewer(s). Please add:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. a point-by-point reply to the reviewers' comments 2. and/or a rebuttal against each point that is being raised 	<p>ninukdian 2020-06-15 12:22 AM</p>



Workflow

Submissions

Round 1

Review

74

Revisi

Review

Name

Edit

Search

ad File

ussion

Closed

WORKFLOW

Submissi

Round 1

Review

74

Revisi

▶

Review

Based on the referees' comments, we will be pleased to publish your article conditional on the following revision as we have sent to you by OJS system. To avoid delay in the publication of your paper, we would greatly appreciate your uploading your revised manuscript as soon as possible. Please let me know urgently if you will not be able to submit your revision within 5 days.

When submitting your revised manuscript, you should also respond to the comments made by the reviewer(s). Please add:

1. a point-by-point reply to the reviewers' comments
2. and/or a rebuttal against each point that is being raised

Please use this file to respond to the reviewer(s) comments and upload it along with your revised manuscript:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/19ScnUunKnadIjvY1kNQ64eez5VTMzf7a/view?usp=sharing>

Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to Jurnal Ners and I look forward to receiving your revision.

Sincerely,
Editor in Chief, Jurnal Ners
ners@journal.unair.ac.id

JURNAL NERS
<http://e-journal.unair.ac.id/JNERS>

Search

ad File

ussion

The Effectiveness Chewing gum versus Cryotherapy on Salivary Volume among Patient with Head and Neck Cancer undergoing Radiotherapy

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Hyposalivation is a common problem experienced by head and neck (H&N) cancer patients undergoing radiotherapy. Hyposalivation can cause negative effects on the physical aspects of making oral mucositis, pain during eating and talking as well as psychological effects that make feel uncomfort, sad until depressed. Many nonpharmacological interventions that can be done for hyposalivation that occur in patients one of which are chewing gum and cryotherapy because they are easy to do, easy to find, inexpensive and has minimal side effects, but the effectiveness of these interventions is not yet clear. Hence, this study aimed to determine the effectiveness of chewing gum versus cryotherapy to increase salivary volume in H&N cancer patients undergoing radiotherapy.

Method: A quasi-experimental time series group design is desain to determine the most effective time to influence the increase in salivary volume. this research was conducted on 36 respondents H&N cancer undergoing radiotherapy with 4 times measurement are pretest, posttest on the 3rd, 5th, and 7th day of intervention between February and March 2020. Subjects were chosen using consecutive sampling. Chewing gum group will chew gum 6 pieces/day and cryotherapy group will suck on ice cubes 5 minutes before and after radiotherapy. The spitting method was used to collect saliva and the data were analyzed using General Linear Model-Repeated Measure (GLMRM).

Results: Chewing gum more effective to increase salivary volume than cryotherapy. The GLMRM within subject at 4 times measurement showed a significant difference between chewing gum and cryotherapy group with p value <0.05 was in 7th day. Subjects at the chewing gum group had better salivary volume increment than cryotherapy group.

Conclusions: This study showed that chewing gum more effective to increase salivary volume on patient H&N cancer undergoing radiotherapy because chewing gum has higher salivary volume increment than cryotherapy groups.

Keywords--- chewing gum, cryotherapy, salivary volume, radiotherapy

INTRODUCTION

Head and neck cancer is a tumor that arises in the nasal cavity, mouth, oropharynx, nasopharynx, salivary glands, paranasal sinuses, hypopharynx, larynx (NIH, 2019). Radiotherapy is one of the three most common treatments for head and neck cancer that requires discipline and a long time (Laursen, Specht, Kristensen, & Gothelf, 2018). Radiotherapy is a cancer treatment that uses high-energy X-rays or other types of radiation to kill cancer cells or keep cancer cells from growing (NIH, 2019). The safe dose of the parotid gland is 26 Gy, the safe dose of the submandibular gland is 39 Gy and the dose 30 Gy for minor salivary glands remains safe (Siddiqui & Movsas, 2017). Radiotherapy doses of 60-70 Gy can cause problems in the mouth prolonged and severe (Villa & Sonis, 2015). Radiotherapy can shrink and kill tumor cells (Santoso, Surarso, & Kentjono, 2009), but it has the most frequent side effects experienced by patients namely hyposalivation, thickened saliva, mucosal infections, pain and taste sensory dysfunction (Epstein, Bensadoun, Saunders, & Rajesh, 2017). Study (Epstein et al., 2017) states radiation can cause problems in the mouth.

Hyposalivation is a common problem experienced by head and neck cancer patients undergoing radiotherapy (Siddiqui & Movsas, 2017). The incidence of hyposalivation due to radiation 87.5% -100% experienced by patients undergoing radiotherapy of the head neck area (Marinna & Harijanti, 2017) (Surjadi & Amtha, 2012). Continuous exposure to radiation and cytotoxic agents have several direct effects on the oral epithelium that can cause damage to the salivary gland duct cells that cause hyposalivation (Eghbali, Aziz, Taherkhanch, Bagheri, 2017). Hyposalivation is defined if salivary flow without stimulation is ≤ 0.2 mL / min (Kaae, Stenfeldt, & Eriksen, 2016). The volume of saliva produced per day ranges between 0.5 and 1.0 L in normal physiological conditions, and the physiological pH

range for saliva is 6.5–7.4 (Simões, Campos, Arana-chavez, & Nicolau, 2015). Resting saliva flow rate (volume of saliva/collection time) of 0.1 mL/min or less and/or a stimulated whole saliva flow rate of 0.7 mL/min or less (Ra'abung, Sudiana, & Hidayati, 2019). Saliva has decreased production in patients undergoing radiotherapy compared to normal people (Irna & Subita, 2008) (Surjadi & Amtha, 2012). Hyposalivation could caused negative effects on the physical aspects of making oral mucositis. pain during eating and talking. papilla loss on chapped tongue and lips (Plemons, Al-hashimi, & Marek, 2014) as well as psychological effects that make feel uncomfort. sad until depressed (Traktama & Sufiawati, 2018).

Hyposaliva management in Saiful Anwar Malang hospital has been advised to drink enough water and clean the mouth but hyposalivation is still often experienced to become oral mucositis. Based on observations and interviews with head and neck cancer patients undergoing radiotherapy, there are patients who drink only a little because of pain when swallowing, so that intervention is needed that can stimulate the salivary gland without swallowing. Several methods can be done to reduce the severity of hyposaliva, one of which is by stimulating the salivary glands to keep producing saliva. Some methods used to reduce hyposaliva are chewing gum, sucking ice cubes, increasing the consumption of mineral water and cleaning the mouth (Marinna & Harijanti, 2017). Research (Kaae et al., 2016) shows that chewing gum can stimulate saliva output that is seen at the beginning and at the end of an intervention. And result study from (Epstein et al., 2017) show that cryotherapy can stimulated saliva. Previous studies carried out many studies of chewing gum or cryotherapy in patients undergoing chemotherapy (Didem, Ayfer, & Ferda, 2014) (Utami & Hayati, 2018).

Given the importance of the role of saliva and the consequences arising from hyposalivation, it is necessary for nurses to help increasing salivary volume in head and neck cancer patients undergoing radiotherapy. Chewing gum and cryotherapy are easy, inexpensive, safe interventions done by patients to increase the volume of saliva and oral mucositis (Utami & Hayati, 2018). The use of cold therapy can make patients feel cold, toothache so that it requires criteria, namely the status of teeth in healthy condition (no history of sensitive teeth)(Katranc, Ovayolu, Ovayolu, & Sevinc, 2012) and strong flavors, such as peppermint or lemon, are not favored in the early phase of recovery but it can be minimized by choosing flavors of xylitol gum such as blueberries and strawberries but its effectiveness is unclear. Nurses play an important role in helping patients protect and maintain their oral health. This study aimed was to determine the effectiveness of chewing gum versus cryotherapy to increase the volume of saliva in head and neck cancer patients undergoing radiotherapy.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This research was a quasi-experimental time series group design is desain to determine the most effective time to influence the increase in salivary volume. This study involved 36 respondents who were divided into chewing gum groups and cryotherapy groups (18/18) obtained by consecutive sampling. Respondents were taken based on inclusion criteria to reduce the effects of bias. The inclusion criteria in this study were: 1) patients have mucositis oral undergoing radiotherapy head and neck cancer. 2) Type squamous cell carcinoma because it is the most type of cancer. 3) patients can chew gum or suck ice cubes make sure with interviews. Meanwhile, the exclusion criteria in this study are: 1) patients have sensitive tooth to minimize pain when suck ice cubes. 2) patients have diabetes mellitus. The drop out criteria in this study include the patient die and the patient not completing the therapy process. Data collection was carried out at Radiotherapy Instalation Saiful Anwar Hospital Malang between February 2020 and March 2020.

The dependent variable was salivary volume and the independent variable was chewing gum and cryotherapy. Researchers prepare equipment such as xylitol gum, ice tube, measuring cup, mask, gloves, stationery, 3cc syringe, cellphone stopwatch, observation sheet, informed consent. Prior to the intervention, the respondent obtained an explanation of the purpose of the study and signed an informed consent as a sign of willingness to become a respondent. The researcher measured the patient's saliva volume as pre-intervention data. The researcher divided the respondents into the chewing gum group and the cryotherapy group according to the patient's condition and will be the respondent at the beginning of the study meeting and will be continued for up to 7 days of radiotherapy. The researcher also involved the family who accompanied the respondent to be willing to help in the research especially as the supervisor of the respondent in intervening correctly and routinely. Researchers explained the

interventions to be provided and educated them to keep doing the hospital standard in the form of adequate drinking and cleaning the mouth.

Subjects in the chewing gum group were asked to six pieces of chew sugar-free gum xylitol a day (two piece in the morning, afternoon and evening) each about 10 minutes respectively for a week after radiotherapy session. The ingredients contained in xylitol gum are natural ingredients and artificial flavors (sorbitol, maltitol, syrup, xylitol, aspartame, acesulfame K) rubber-based ingredients, binding agents (E903) and antioxidants (E321) (Leede, Leersum, Kroon, Weel, & Sijp, 2018) (Jernigan, Chiung, Chen, & Sewell, 2014) so they are safe for consumption. Xylitol is anticaries because it is able to suppress the number of *Streptococcus mutans* colonies, inhibits the growth of plaque, suppresses saliva acidity and inhibits inflammation in the mouth because xylitol cannot be metabolized by oral bacteria including *Streptococcus mutans* and if xylitol is in contact with *Streptococcus mutans* and it will form inflammation in the mouth because xylitol cannot be metabolized by oral bacteria including *Streptococcus mutans* work of the substance that plays a role in the process of glycolysis is inhibited (Rodian, Satari, & Rolleta, 2011). To reduce the drop out of this research involving the family and fill out the intervention check list, the family is willing to help be a reminder of respondents in conducting chewing gum interventions, namely chewing xylitol gum 3 times a day in the morning, afternoon and evening for about 10 minutes on the radiotherapy schedule. Subjects in the cryotherapy group were asked to suck ice tube before and after radiotherapy session during 5 minutes for a week. The patients sucks the ice cubes evenly in the mouth area. Ice cubes are provided by small-sized researchers to facilitate patients. Post-test was held in third day, fifth day and seven day intervention.

Saliva volume measurements were carried out by the researchers themselves using the spitting method. The patient bowed his head deeply and the subject allowed the saliva to collect and flow through the lower lip into the tube and spit out the remaining saliva that did not flow. Measurements were taken 5 times in 5 minutes. Ethical approval was obtained from Komisi Etik Penelitian Kesehatan (KEPK) Saiful Anwar Hospital Malang with the number 400/017/K.3/302/2020 on January 17, 2020.

Demographic data includes gender, age, education, employment status and marital status, diagnosis of disease, stadium cancer, smoking habit. Statistical tests using the General Linear Model-Repeated Measured ANOVA within subjects to determine the difference in salivary volume values pre-test and posttest in each group. General Linear Model Repeated Measured ANOVA between subjects was used for showing effect of the chewing gum and cryotherapy on salivary volume between two groups.

RESULTS

Descriptive statistical analysis of the respondent's characteristics is shown in Table 1. This study was followed by 36 patients head and neck cancer undergoing radiotherapy divided into chewing gum intervention and cryotherapy intervention. Table 2 describes the statistical test GLMRM ANOVA within subject of the effects of treatment on each group. Table 3 describes the statistical test GLMRM ANOVA between subject the effect of treatment.

Table 1 Characteristics of participants

Characteristics of participants	Chewing Gum group (n=24)		Cryotherapy group (n=18)		Total	
	f(x)	%	f(x)	%	f(x)	%
Gender						
Man	15	83.3	16	88.9	31	86.1
Female	3	16.7	2	11.1	5	13.9
Total	18	100	18	100	36	100
Age (year)						
17-25	1	5.6	0	0	1	2.8
26-35	1	5.6	0	0	1	2.8
36-45	4	22.2	3	16.7	7	19.4
46-55	5	27.8	7	38.9	12	33.4
56-65	2	11.1	4	22.2	6	16.7
>65	5	22.2	4	22.2	9	25
Total	18	100	18	100	36	100

Characteristics of participants	Chewing Gum group (n=24)		Cryotherapy group (n=18)		Total	
	f(x)	%	f(x)	%	f(x)	%
Diagnosis of Disease						
Nasopharyngeal cancer	7	38.9	13	72.2	20	59.5
Oropharyngeal cancer	1	5.6	0	0	1	2.8
Larynx cancer	5	27.8	2	11.1	7	19.4
Non-Hodgkin's lymphoma	1	5.6	0	0	1	2.8
Tongue cancer	3	16.7	0	0	3	8.3
Lymphoma cancer	1	5.6	0	0	1	2.8
Mandibula cancer	0	0	3	16.7	3	8.3
Total	18	100	18	100	36	100
Stadium						
Stadium 1	0	0	1	5.6	1	2.8
Stadium 2	10	55.6	9	50	19	52.8
Stadium 3	6	33.3	4	22.2	10	27.8
Stadium 4	2	11.1	4	22.2	6	16.7
Total	18	100	18	100	36	100
Education status						
No school	1	5.6	2	11.1	3	8.3
Elementary school	7	38.9	4	22.2	11	30.6
Middle school	2	11.1	5	27.8	7	19.4
High school	6	33.3	6	33.3	12	33.3
Bachelor	2	11.1	1	5.6	3	8.3
Total	24	100	18	100	42	100
Employment status						
Farmers	4	22.2	5	27.8	9	25
Private job	6	33.3	6	33.3	12	33.3
Trader	3	8.3	5	27.8	8	22.2
Civil servants	3	16.7	1	5.6	4	11.1
Housewife	2	11.1	1	5.6	3	8.3
Total	18	100	18	100	36	100
Marital status						
Married	16	88.9	16	88.9	32	88.9
Not married	2	11.1	1	5.6	3	8.3
Divorced	0	0	1	5.6	1	2.8
Total	18	100	18	100	36	100
Smoking habit						
Not smoking	3	16.7	3	16.7	6	16.7
1 pack/day	12	66.7	10	55.6	22	61.1
2 pack/day	2	11.1	4	22.2	6	16.7
3 pack or more/day	1	5.6	1	5.6	2	5.6
Total	18	100	18	100	36	100
Long time smoking						
Not smoking	3	16.7	3	16.7	6	16.7
1-10 years	9	50	4	22.2	13	36.1
11-20 years	5	27.8	7	38.9	12	33.3
21-30 years	1	5.6	4	22.2	5	13.9
Total	18	100	18	100	36	100

Table 1. shows that in the chewing gum group and cryotherapy group. 31 people in this study were male and 5 were female and had the highest age range distribution of 46-55 years by 12 people. The number of nasopharyngeal cancer is the majority diagnose that 20 people. The most stadium is stadium 2 that 19 people. The education level of as many as 12 people is educated high school with 12 respondents have private job. The marital status majority are married 32 people. Smoking habit as many as 22 respondents smoking 1 pack/day and majority during 1-10 years 13 people.

Table 2 salivary volume in the chewing gum and cryotherapy groups in GLMRM ANOVA within subject test


Group	Time	Mean ± SD	Delta	p-Value
Chewing Gum	3 rd day vs pre-test	0.6444±0.17564	0.1223	0.000
	Day 5 vs pre-test	0.8944±0.14337	0.25	0.000
	7 th day vs pre-test	1.0722±0.18087	0.4278	0.000
	7 th day vs 3 rd day	0.7667±0.16088	0.3055	0.000
	7 th day vs day 5	0.8944±0.14337	0.1778	0.000
Cryotherapy	3 rd day vs pre-test	0.6444±0.22287	0.1112	0.000
	Day 5 vs pre-test	0.8611±0.16852	0.2167	0.000
	7 th day vs pre-test	0.9611±0.15770	0.3167	0.000
	7 th day vs 3 rd day	0.7556±0.15038	0.2055	0.000
	7 th day vs day 5	0.8611±0.16852	0.1	0.001

Table 2 explains that the results of the GLM-RM ANOVA test showed that there were significant differences in salivary volume before and after the intervention of chewing gum and cryotherapy at the 4th time of measurement with $p = <0.05$. In the chewing gum and cryotherapy, the most delta group were on the 7th day of the intervention compared to the pre, 3rd day and 5th day. Delta value of the chewing gum intervention in 7th day is 0.4278 and delta value in 7th day cryotherapy is 0.3167.

Table 3 salivary volume in the chewing gum and cryotherapy groups in GLMRM ANOVA between subject test

Saliva (ml/minute)	Chewing Gum Mean ± SD	Cryotherapy Mean ± SD	Delta (confidence interval 95 %)	p-value
Pre-test	0.6444±0.17564	0.6444±0.2228	0 (-0.109-0.145)	1.000
3 rd day	0.7667±0.16088	0.7556±0.15038	0.0111 (-0.72-0.111)	0.832
Day 5	0.8944±0.14337	0.8611±0.16852	0.0333 (0.060-0.138)	0.527
7 th day	1.0722±0.18087	0.9611±0.15770	0.1111 (0.16-0.237)	0.058

Table 3 explains that the GLMRM test results between subjects showed no significant differences in salivary volume before and after the intervention of chewing gum and cryotherapy. But the chewing gum group had better results than the mean chewing gum which was higher by 1.0722 ± 0.18087 than the smaller cryotherapy 0.9611 ± 0.15770 although the statistical results were p values 0.058 ($p > 0.05$).



Picture 1. Graphs of salivary volume interactions (ml/min) between measurement times and between groups

Results of the GLM-RM (General Linear Model-Repeated Measure) ANOVA between subjects between the chewing gum group and the cryotherapy group showed that the effect of chewing gum intervention and cryotherapy on salivary volume is clearly visible after 7 days of treatment.

DISCUSSION

Result of this study is chewing gum more effective to increase salivary volume than cryotherapy. According to research (Pereira, Maciel, Jorge, & Monteiro, 2016) chewing gum can increase the rate of salivary flow compared to the control group. Chewing muscles that are affected by radiation can be stimulated (Kaae et al., 2016). The main stimulus for increased salivary secretion is through mechanical stimulation (Subramaniam & Muthukrishnan, 2019). Chewing gum is a form of mechanical stimulation that is useful for increasing saliva and pH (Costa, Fernandes, Quinder, De Souza, & Pinto, 2003) (Llop, Jimeno, Acien, R. & Dalmau, 2010). Chewing movements can make changes in the permeability of the plasma membrane, so that calcium can enter the cell, influx cells occur and activate several enzymes, one of which is calcinurin which affects the process of protein production transpisi one of which is saliva (Ambudkar, 2014) thus increasing saliva production (Eghbali, Aziz., Taherkhanch., Bagheri B., 2017). Factors that can affect the achievement of saliva that is due to the patient's hydration status (Samuels, 2017), drugs consumed, sleep, fasting, nutrition, food imagination, and psychological factors sad and depression (Plemons et al., 2014).

Previous studies do not yet know the effective of chewing gum versus cryotherapy to increase saliva volume which reduces because radiation rays. Saliva is a liquid produced from several glands, namely the parotid gland, which is the largest gland, then the submandibular gland that produces serus (thin saliva, low viscosity), and the smallest gland is the sublingual gland that produces mucus (thick saliva, viscosity is higher) (Yunus, 2008). Saliva is very important because it contains antimicrobials such as lysozyme and secretes immunoglobulin A (Subramaniam & Muthukrishnan, 2019).

This research was conducted using time series to get the most effective time effect. In line with opinions (Plemons et al., 2014) that measuring saliva periodically is an effective way to monitor changes in the volume and composition of saliva. Chewing sugar-free gum or sucking sugar-free gum to stimulate saliva flow is an intervention to minimize dry mouth (Dental & Ada, 2015). In this study using xylitol gum because it contains lower sugar and is easy to find on the market, the results of this study are the same as the results (Rodian et al., 2011) xylitol chewing gum showed the highest increase in salivary volume compared to sucrose chewing gum and probiotic gums, but the statistical tests showed no significant difference.

Cryotherapy is applied because it has many advantages that is practical to be applied, economical, easy, has minimal side effects (Utami, 2017). The goals of cold therapy include reducing inflammation, inhibiting pain receptors, reducing edema, controlling bleeding (Rosdahl & Kowalski, 2014).

Symptoms of a dry mouth due to reduced saliva can make a patient feel uncomfortable, disturb the appetite and quality of life of the patient (Plemons et al., 2014). Study (Dental & Ada, 2015) states sucking ice cubes, drinking water while eating to help chew and swallow food, using mouthwash-free mouthwash, avoiding carbonated drinks (such as soda), caffeine, tobacco, and alcohol, using lanolin-based lip balm to comfort cracked lips or dry can reduce dryness in the mouth and stimulate saliva discharge. Increased salivary secretion leads to increased volume and thinning of saliva needed for ingestion and lubrication.

In this study not all of the patients' salivary volumes increased. This is influenced by several factors, according to (Samuels, 2017) drugs, smoking, alcohol consumption will reduce the flow rate of saliva. Most respondents age in the range 46-65 years. Old age will make the function of the salivary glands decrease, because the acinar element turns into fat and fibrous tissue (Baird, Donehower, Stalsbrotten, & Ades, 1991).

The results of this study prove that the chewing gum and cryotherapy affect the stimulus production of saliva. Hopefully this study can increase information about nursing care in head and neck cancer. So that the symptoms caused by radiotherapy of the head neck area can be reduced or avoided.

The limitation of this study was the researcher cannot fully control the respondent's intervention because it is done at home or boarding so this can have an impact on the result of the study. And the strength of this study was there is an effective nonpharmacological action nurses can take to increase the volume of saliva in head and neck cancer patients by chewing gum.

CONCLUSIONS

This study showed chewing gum more effective to increase salivary volume than cryotherapy among patient head and neck cancer undergoing radiotherapy in Saiful Anwar Hospital Malang on 7th day intervention. The results from this recent study hope to be useful in future health therapies to increase the volume of saliva in radiotherapy patients in the head and neck area so that it can reduce side effects and make therapy successful. which must be prepared when discussing clinical will apply this application is the suitability of the gum variant. Future research is expected to control the factors that influence saliva production and conduct research by taking patients from the beginning of radiotherapy until radiotherapy is completed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author would like to express gratitude to the supervisors for the guidance and the precious suggestions. radiotherapy patients in Saiful Anwar Hospital Malang for participation in this study and the relevant authorities for their permissions to conduct this research.

REFERENCES

- Ambudkar, I. S. (2014). Ca²⁺ signaling and regulation of fluid secretion in salivary gland acinar cells. *Cell Calcium*. 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ceca.2014.02.009>
- Baird, S. B., Donehower, M. G., Stalsbroten, V. L., & Ades, T. B. (1991). *A cancer Source Book for Nurses* (6th ed.). USA: American Cancer Society.
- Costa, E. M., Fernandes, M. Z., Quinder, L. B., De Souza, L. B., & Pinto, L. P. (2003). Evaluation of an oral preventive protocol in children with acute lymphoblastic leukemia. *Pesquisa Odontologica Brasileira*. 17(2), 147–150.
- Dental, A., & Ada, A. (2015). Managing dry mouth. *The Journal of the American Dental Association*. 146(2), A40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adaj.2014.11.019>
- Didem, A., Ayfer, E., & Ferda, O. A. (2014). The Effect of Chewing Gum on Oral Mucositis in Children Receiving Chemotherapy. *Health Science Journal*. 8(3), 373–382.
- Eghbali, Aziz., Taherkhanch., Bagheri B., S. S. (2017). Effect of Chewing Gum on Oral Mucositis in Children Undergoing Chemotherapy : A Randomized Controlled Study Original Article Effect of Chewing Gum on Oral Mucositis in Children Undergoing Chemotherapy : A Randomized Controlled Study. (March 2016).
- Epstein, J. B., Bensadoun, R., Saunders, D. P., & Rajesh, V. (2017). Common oral complications of head and neck cancer radiation therapy: mucositis, infections, saliva change, fibrosis, sensory dysfunctions, dental caries, periodontal disease, and osteoradionecrosis. *Cancer Medicine*. 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cam4.1221>
- Irna, & Subita, G. P. S. (2008). Identifikasi dan Pengendalian Faktor Risiko Mukositis Oral selama Radioterapi Kanker Nasofaring Laporan Kasus. *Indonesian Journal of Dentistry*. 15(4), 155–162.
- Jernigan, A. M., Chiung, C., Chen, G., & Sewell, C. (2014). International Journal of Gynecology and Obstetrics CLINICAL ARTICLE A randomized trial of chewing gum to prevent postoperative ileus after laparotomy for benign gynecologic surgery ☆. *International Journal of Gynecology and Obstetrics*. 8–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijgo.2014.06.008>
- Kaae, J. K., Stenfeldt, L., & Eriksen, J. G. (2016). Xerostomia after radiotherapy for Oral and Oropharyngeal cancer: increasing salivary Flow with Tasteless sugar-free chewing gum. *Frontiers in Oncology*. 6(May), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fonc.2016.00111>

- Katranc. N., Ovayolu. N., Ovayolu. O., & Sevinc. A. (2012). European Journal of Oncology Nursing Evaluation of the effect of cryotherapy in preventing oral mucositis associated with chemotherapy e A randomized controlled trial. *16*. 339–344. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejon.2011.07.008>
- Laursen. M., Specht. L., Kristensen. C. A., & Gothelf. A. (2018). An Extended Hypofractionated Palliative Radiotherapy Regimen for Head and Neck Carcinomas. *8*(June). 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fonc.2018.00206>
- Leede. E. M. De. Leersum. N. J. Van. Kroon. H. M., Weel. V. Van. & Sijp. J. R. M. Van Der. (2018). Multicentre randomized clinical trial of the effect of chewing gum after abdominal surgery. *BJS*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bjs.10828>
- Llop. M. R., Jimeno. F. G., Acien. R. M., & Dalmau. L. J. B. (2010). Effect of xylitol chewing gum on salivary flow rate. ph. buffering capacity and presence of *Streptococcus mutans* in saliva. *European Journal of Paediatric Dentistry*. *11*(1). 9–14.
- Marinna. A., & Harijanti. K. (2017). *Management of Xerostomia post Radiotherapy Nasopharyngeal Carcinoma: Case Report*. (Y. Septorini, Wimardhani, H. Ruslijanto, H. Djuaeni, I. Sufiyawati, T. Setiani, & A. F. Irawan, Eds.). Bandung.
- NIH. (2019). Salivary Gland Cancer Treatment (Adult). Retrieved from <https://www.cancer.gov/types/head-and-neck/patient/adult/salivary-gland-treatment-pdq>
- Pereira. J. V. Maciel. R. P., Jorge. M., & Monteiro. F. (2016). Effect of Chewing Gum Containing CPP-ACP on Salivary Flow and Buffer Capacity : An in vivo Study. *16*((1)). 425–431.
- Plemons. J. M., Al-hashimi. I., & Marek. C. L. (2014). Managing xerostomia and salivary gland hypofunction Executive. *The Journal of the American Dental Association*. *145*(8). 867–873. <https://doi.org/10.14219/jada.2014.44>
- Ra'abung. A. S., Suidiana. I. K., & Hidayati. L. (2019). *Pengaruh mouthwash disertai mengunyah permen karet xylitol terhadap xerostomia, laju aliran saliva, dan pH saliva pada pasien yang menjalani hemodialisis*. Universitas Airlangga.
- Rodian. M., Satari. M. H., & Rolleta. E. (2011). *Efek Mengunyah Permen karet yang Mengandung Sukrosa, Xylitol, Probiotik terhadap Volume, Kecepatan Aliran, Viskositas, pH, dan Jumlah Koloni Streptococcus Mutans Saliva*. Sumedang Jawa Barat.
- Rosdahl. C. B., & Kowalski. M. T. (2014). Text Book of Basic Nursing Edisi 10. In E. A. Mardella (Ed.) (10th ed., p. 871). USA: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins/Wolter Kluwer Health.
- Samuels. M. A. (2017). Radiation-induced Oral Mucositis. *7*(May). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fonc.2017.00089>
- Santoso. B. S., Surarso. B., & Kentjono. W. A. (2009). Radioterapi pada Karsinoma Nasofaring. *THT KL*. *2*(3). 134–141.
- Siddiqui. F., & Movsas. B. (2017). Management of Radiation Toxicity in Head and Neck Cancer. *Seminars in Radiation Oncology*. *27*(4). 340–349. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.semradonc.2017.04.008>
- Simões. A., Campos. L. De. Arana-chavez. V. E., & Nicolau. J. (2015). Low Level Laser Therapy for hyposalivation and xerostomia. 335–339.
- Subramaniam. N., & Muthukrishnan. A. (2019). Oral mucositis and microbial colonization in oral cancer patients undergoing radiotherapy and chemotherapy : A prospective analysis in a tertiary care dental hospital. (July). 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jicd.12454>
- Surjadi. N., & Amtha. R. (2012). Radiotherapy Reduced Salivary Flow Rate and Might Induced *C. albicans* Infection. *19*(1). 1–6.
- Traktama. D. O., & Sufiawati. I. (2018). Keparahan mukositis oral pada pasien kanker kepala leher akibat kemoterapi dan / atau radioterapi. *4*(1).

- Utami. K. C. (2017). *Mukositis Oral sebagai Dampak Kemoterapi pada Anak Kanker yang Mendapat Kemoterapi*.
- Utami. K. C.. & Hayati. H. (2018). Chewing gum is more effective than saline-solution gargling for reducing oral mucositis. *Enfermería Clínica*. 28. 5–8. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1130-8621\(18\)30026-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1130-8621(18)30026-3)
- Villa. A.. & Sonis. S. T. (2015). Mucositis : pathobiology and management. 159–164. <https://doi.org/10.1097/CCO.000000000000180>
- Yunus. B. (2008). Efek samping terapi radiasi penderita kanker kepala dan leher pada kelenjar saliva. 7(1). 57–62.

WORKFLOW

Submissi

Round 1

Review

74

Revisi

Review

Name

▶ Edit

forward to receiving your response.

Sincerely,
Editor in Chief, Jurnal Ners
ners@journal.unair.ac.id

JURNAL NERS
<http://e-journal.unair.ac.id/JNERS>

▶ Ninuk Dian Kurniawati

ninukdian

2020-06-19 04:50

AM

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to Jurnal Ners, "Comparison of The Effectiveness Chewing gum and Cryotherapy on Salivary Volume in Patient Head and Neck Cancer undergoing Radiotherapy".



Our decision is to ACCEPT your submission.

In order to publish your article, Jurnal Ners requires that you complete an author(s)' declaration and copyright transfer agreement attached below.

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B5ormcRMCTnWNG1IZGdNRGN0SFU/view?usp=sharing>

Thank you for your fine contribution. We look forward to your continued contributions to the Journal.

Sincerely,
Editor in Chief, Jurnal Ners
secretariat_jurnalners@fkip.unair.ac.id

JURNAL NERS
<http://e-journal.unair.ac.id/JNERS>



Search

Upload File

Discussion

Closed




Copyediting



Participants

- Ferry Efendi, S.Kep., Ns., MSc, PhD (ferryefendi)
- Hidayat Arifin, S. Kep., Ns., M. Kep. (ha_arifin)
- Ninuk Dian Kurniawati (ninukdian)

Messages

Note	From
 admin, 19444-75122-1-ED.docx	— 2020-06-21 05:01 AM

[Add Message](#)


Copye

Name

Copyediting

2020-06-21 05:01 AM

Copyedited

 Search

No Files

Library

ussion

Closed



Original Research

The Effectiveness of Chewing Gum versus Cryotherapy on Salivary Volume among Patient with Head and Neck Cancer Undergoing Radiotherapy

Dwi Uswatun Sholikhah, I Ketut Sudiana, Ninuk Dian Kurniawati

Faculty of Nursing, Universitas Airlangga, Surabaya, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Hyposalivation is a common problem experienced by head and neck (H&N) cancer patients undergoing radiotherapy. Hyposalivation can cause negative effects on the physical aspects of making oral mucositis, pain during eating and talking as well as psychological effects that cause feeling of discomfort sadness and, ultimately, depression. Many nonpharmacological interventions can be done for hyposalivation that occur in patients, among which are chewing gum and cryotherapy because they are easy to do, easy to access, inexpensive and have minimal side effects. However, the effectiveness of these interventions is not yet clear. Hence, this study is aimed to determine the effectiveness of chewing gum versus cryotherapy to increase salivary volume in H&N cancer patients undergoing radiotherapy.

Methods: A quasi-experimental time series group design to determine the most effective time to influence the increase in salivary volume. This research was conducted on 36 respondents H&N cancer undergoing radiotherapy with four times measurement are pretest-posttest on the 3rd, 5th, and 7th day of intervention between February and March 2020. Subjects were chosen using consecutive sampling. Chewing gum group will chew gum six (6) pieces/day and cryotherapy group will suck on ice cubes five (5) minutes before and after radiotherapy. The spitting method was used to collect saliva and the data were analyzed using General Linear Model-Repeated Measure (GLMRM).

Results: Chewing gum is more effective to increase salivary volume than cryotherapy. The GLMRM within subjects at four (4) times measurement showed a significant difference between chewing gum and cryotherapy group with p value <0.05 on the 7th day. Subjects in the chewing gum group had better salivary volume increment than cryotherapy group.

Conclusion: This study showed that chewing gum is more effective to increase salivary volume on patient H&N cancer undergoing radiotherapy because chewing gum has higher salivary volume increment than cryotherapy groups.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received: May 27, 2020

Accepted: June 15, 2020

KEYWORDS

chewing gum; cryotherapy;
salivary volume;
radiotherapy

CONTACT

Ninuk Dian Kurniawati

✉ ninuk.dk@fkn.unair.ac.idFaculty of Nursing,
Universitas Airlangga,
Surabaya, Indonesia

Cite this as: Sholikhah, D, U., Sudiana, I, K., & Kurniawati, N, D. (2020). The Effectiveness of Chewing Gum versus Cryotherapy on Salivary Volume among Patient with Head and Neck Cancer Undergoing Radiotherapy. *Jurnal Ners*, 15(1). doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.20473/jn.v15i1.19444>

INTRODUCTION

Head and neck cancer is a tumor that arises in the nasal cavity, mouth, oropharynx, nasopharynx, salivary glands, paranasal sinuses, hypopharynx, and larynx (NIH, 2019). Radiotherapy is one of the three most common treatments for head and neck cancer and requires discipline and a long time (Laursen et al., 2018). Radiotherapy is a cancer treatment that uses high-energy X-rays or other types of radiation to kill cancer cells or keep cancer cells from growing (NIH,

2019). The safe dose of the parotid gland is 26Gy, the safe dose of the submandibular gland is 39Gy and a 30Gy dose for minor salivary glands remains safe (Siddiqui & Movsas, 2017). Radiotherapy doses of 60-70Gy can cause prolonged and severe problems in the mouth (Villa & Sonis, 2015). Radiotherapy can shrink and kill tumor cells (Santoso, Surarso, & Kentjono, 2009). but it has the most frequent side effects experienced by patients, namely hyposalivation, thickened saliva, mucosal infections, pain and taste sensory dysfunction (Epstein et al., 2017). Epstein et

al. (2017) state radiation can cause problems in the mouth.

Hyposalivation is a common problem experienced by head and neck cancer patients undergoing radiotherapy (Siddiqui & Movsas, 2017). The incidence of hyposalivation due to radiation was 87.5% -100% experienced by patients undergoing radiotherapy of the head neck area (Marinna & Harijanti, 2017; Surjadi & Amtha, 2012). Continuous exposure to radiation and cytotoxic agents have several direct effects on the oral epithelium that can cause damage to the salivary gland duct cells and cause hyposalivation (Eghbali, Aziz, Taherkhanch, & Bagheri, 2017). Hyposalivation is defined if salivary flow without stimulation is $\leq 0.2\text{mL} / \text{min}$ (Kaae, Stenfeldt, & Eriksen, 2016). The volume of saliva produced per day ranges between 0.5 and 1.0L in normal physiological conditions, and the physiological pH range for saliva is 6.5–7.4 (Simões, Campos, Arana-Chavez, & Nicolau, 2015). Resting saliva flow rate (volume of saliva/collection time) is of 0.1mL/min or less and/or a stimulated whole saliva flow rate of 0.7mL/min or less (Ra'abung, Sudiana, & Hidayati, 2019). Saliva has decreased production in patients undergoing radiotherapy compared to normal people (Irna & Subita, 2008; Surjadi & Amtha, 2012). Hyposalivation could cause negative effects on the physical aspects of making oral mucositis, pain during eating and talking, papilla loss on chapped tongue and lips (Plemons et al., 2014) as well as psychological effects causing feelings of discomfort, sadness, and, eventually, depression (Traktama & Sufiawati, 2018).

Hyposaliva management in Saiful Anwar Malang hospital advises to drink sufficient water and clean the mouth, but hyposalivation is still often experienced to become oral mucositis. Based on observations and interviews with head and neck cancer patients undergoing radiotherapy, there are patients who drink only a little because of pain when swallowing, so that intervention is needed that can stimulate the salivary gland without swallowing. Several methods can be done to reduce the severity of hyposaliva, one of which is by stimulating the salivary glands to keep producing saliva. Some methods used to reduce hyposaliva are chewing gum, sucking ice cubes, increasing the consumption of mineral water and cleaning the mouth (Marinna & Harijanti, 2017). Research (Kaae et al., 2016) shows that chewing gum can stimulate saliva output that is seen at the beginning and at the end of an intervention. Findings by Epstein et al. (2017) show that cryotherapy can stimulate saliva. Previous research have carried out many studies of chewing gum or cryotherapy in patients undergoing chemotherapy (Didem, Ayfer, & Ferda, 2014; Utami & Hayati, 2018).

Given the importance of the role of saliva and the consequences arising from hyposalivation, it is necessary for nurses to help increasing salivary volume in head and neck cancer patients undergoing radiotherapy. Chewing gum and cryotherapy are easy, inexpensive, safe interventions done by patients

to increase the volume of saliva and oral mucositis (Utami & Hayati, 2018). The use of cold therapy can make patients feel cold and toothache so that it requires criteria. teeth in a healthy condition (no history of sensitive teeth) (Katranc et al., 2012) and strong flavors, such as peppermint or lemon, are not favored in the early phase of recovery; effects can be minimized by choosing flavors of xylitol gum such as blueberries and strawberries, but its effectiveness is unclear. Nurses play an important role in helping patients protect and maintain their oral health. This study aimed was to determine the effectiveness of chewing gum versus cryotherapy to increase the volume of saliva in head and neck cancer patients undergoing radiotherapy.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This research was a quasi-experimental time series group design to determine the most effective time to influence the increase in salivary volume. This study involved 36 respondents who were divided into chewing gum groups and cryotherapy groups (18/18) obtained by consecutive sampling. Respondents were taken based on inclusion criteria to reduce the effects of bias. The inclusion criteria in this study were: 1) patients having mucositis oral undergoing radiotherapy head and neck cancer; 2) Type squamous cell carcinoma because it is the most common type of cancer; 3) patients can chew gum or suck ice cubes, confirmed with interviews. Meanwhile, the exclusion criteria in this study are: 1) patients having sensitive tooth to minimize pain when sucking ice cubes; 2) patients having diabetes mellitus. The drop out criteria in this study include the patient dies and the patient not completing the therapy process. Data collection was carried out at Radiotherapy Installation Saiful Anwar Hospital Malang between February 2020 and March 2020.

The dependent variable was salivary volume and the independent variable was chewing gum and cryotherapy. Researchers prepared equipment such as xylitol gum, ice cube, measuring cup, mask, gloves, stationery, 3cc syringe, cellphone stopwatch, observation sheet and informed consent. Prior to the intervention, the respondent obtained an explanation of the purpose of the study and signed an informed consent as a sign of willingness to become a respondent. The researchers measured the patient's saliva volume as pre-intervention data. The researchers divided the respondents into the chewing gum group and the cryotherapy group according to the patient's condition at the beginning of the study meeting and continued for up to seven (7) days of radiotherapy. The researcher also involved the respondent's family to be willing to help in the research, especially as the supervisor of the respondent in intervening correctly and routinely. Researchers explained the interventions to be provided and educated them to keep doing the hospital standard in the form of adequate drinking and cleaning the mouth.

Table 1. Characteristics of participants

Characteristics of participants	Chewing Gum group (n=24)		Cryotherapy group (n=18)		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Gender						
Male	15	83.3	16	88.9	31	86.1
Female	3	16.7	2	11.1	5	13.9
Age (year)						
17-25	1	5.6	0	0	1	2.8
26-35	1	5.6	0	0	1	2.8
36-45	4	22.2	3	16.7	7	19.4
46-55	5	27.8	7	38.9	12	33.4
56-65	2	11.1	4	22.2	6	16.7
>65	5	22.2	4	22.2	9	25
Diagnosis of Disease						
Nasopharyngeal cancer	7	38.9	13	72.2	20	59.5
Oropharyngeal cancer	1	5.6	0	0	1	2.8
Larynx cancer	5	27.8	2	11.1	7	19.4
Non-Hodgkin's lymphoma	1	5.6	0	0	1	2.8
Tongue cancer	3	16.7	0	0	3	8.3
Lymphoma cancer	1	5.6	0	0	1	2.8
Mandibula cancer	0	0	3	16.7	3	8.3
Stage						
Stage 1	0	0	1	5.6	1	2.8
Stage 2	10	55.6	9	50	19	52.8
Stage 3	6	33.3	4	22.2	10	27.8
Stage 4	2	11.1	4	22.2	6	16.7
Education status						
No school	1	5.6	2	11.1	3	8.3
Elementary school	7	38.9	4	22.2	11	30.6
Middle school	2	11.1	5	27.8	7	19.4
High school	6	33.3	6	33.3	12	33.3
Bachelor	2	11.1	1	5.6	3	8.3
Employment status						
Farmers	4	22.2	5	27.8	9	25
Private job	6	33.3	6	33.3	12	33.3
Trader	3	8.3	5	27.8	8	22.2
Civil servants	3	16.7	1	5.6	4	11.1
Housewife	2	11.1	1	5.6	3	8.3
Marital status						
Married	16	88.9	16	88.9	32	88.9
Not married	2	11.1	1	5.6	3	8.3
Divorced	0	0	1	5.6	1	2.8
Smoking habit						
Not smoking	3	16.7	3	16.7	6	16.7
1 pack/day	12	66.7	10	55.6	22	61.1
2 pack/day	2	11.1	4	22.2	6	16.7
3 pack or more/day	1	5.6	1	5.6	2	5.6
Length of smoking						
Not smoking	3	16.7	3	16.7	6	16.7
1-10 years	9	50	4	22.2	13	36.1
11-20 years	5	27.8	7	38.9	12	33.3
21-30 years	1	5.6	4	22.2	5	13.9

Subjects in the chewing gum group were asked to chew six pieces of sugar-free gum xylitol a day (two pieces in the morning, afternoon and evening) each about 10 minutes respectively for a week after radiotherapy session. The ingredients contained in xylitol gum are natural ingredients and artificial flavors (sorbitol, maltitol, syrup, xylitol, aspartame, acesulfame K), rubber-based ingredients, binding agents (E903) and antioxidants (E321) (Jerniga, Chiung, Chen, & Sewell, 2014; Leede, Leersum, Kroon, Weel, & Sijp, 2018) so they are safe for consumption. Xylitol is anticaries because it is able to

suppress the number of *Streptococcus mutans* colonies, inhibits the growth of plaque, suppresses saliva acidity and inhibits inflammation in the mouth because xylitol cannot be metabolized by oral bacteria, including *Streptococcus mutans*. and is a substance that plays a role in the process of glycolysis inhibition (Rodian et al., 2011). To reduce the drop out of this research involved the family and filling out the intervention check list. The family were willing to help be a reminder of respondents in conducting chewing gum interventions, namely chewing xylitol gum three (3) times a day in the morning, afternoon

Table 2. Salivary volume in the chewing gum and cryotherapy groups in GLMRM ANOVA within subject test

Group	Time	Mean ± SD	Delta	p-Value
Chewing Gum	3 rd day vs pre-test	0.6444±0.17564	0.1223	0.000
	Day 5 vs pre-test	0.8944±0.14337	0.25	0.000
	7 th day vs pre-test	1.0722±0.18087	0.4278	0.000
	7 th day vs 3 rd day	0.7667±0.16088	0.3055	0.000
	7 th day vs day 5	0.8944±0.14337	0.1778	0.000
Cryotherapy	3 rd day vs pre-test	0.6444±0.22287	0.1112	0.000
	Day 5 vs pre-test	0.8611±0.16852	0.2167	0.000
	7 th day vs pre-test	0.9611±0.15770	0.3167	0.000
	7 th day vs 3 rd day	0.7556±0.15038	0.2055	0.000
	7 th day vs day 5	0.8611±0.16852	0.1	0.001

Table 3. Salivary volume in the chewing gum and cryotherapy groups in GLMRM ANOVA between subject test

Saliva (ml/minute)	Chewing Gum Mean ± SD	Cryotherapy Mean ± SD	Delta (confidence interval 95 %)	p-value
Pretest	0.6444±0.17564	0.6444±0.2228	0 (-0.109-0.145)	1.000
3 rd day	0.7667±0.16088	0.7556±0.15038	0.0111 (-0.72-0.111)	0.832
5 th day	0.8944±0.14337	0.8611±0.16852	0.0333 (0.060-0.138)	0.527
7 th day	1.0722±0.18087	0.9611±0.15770	0.1111 (0.16-0.237)	0.058

and evening for about 10 minutes on the radiotherapy schedule. Subjects in the cryotherapy group were asked to suck an ice cube before and after radiotherapy session for five (5) minutes for a week. The patients suck the ice cubes evenly in the mouth area. Ice cubes were provided by researchers to facilitate patients. Posttest was held on third, fifth and seventh day of intervention.

Saliva volume measurements were carried out by the researchers themselves using the spitting method. The patient bowed his head deeply and the subject allowed the saliva to collect and flow through the lower lip into the tube and spit out the remaining saliva that did not flow. Measurements were taken five (5) times in five (5) minutes. Ethical approval was obtained from Komisi Etik Penelitian Kesehatan (KEPK) Saiful Anwar Hospital Malang with the number 400/017/K.3/302/2020 on January 17, 2020.

Demographic data include gender, age, education, employment status and marital status, diagnosis of disease, stage of cancer and smoking habit. Statistical tests using the General Linear Model-Repeated Measured ANOVA within subjects to determine the difference in salivary volume values pretest and posttest in each group. General Linear Model Repeated Measured ANOVA between subjects was used for showing effect of the chewing gum and cryotherapy on salivary volume between two groups.

RESULTS

Descriptive statistical analysis of the respondent's characteristics is shown in Table 1. This study was followed by 36 patients with head and neck cancer undergoing radiotherapy divided into chewing gum intervention and cryotherapy intervention. Table 2 describes the statistical test GLMRM ANOVA within subjects of the effects of treatment on each group.

Table 3 describes the statistical test GLMRM ANOVA between subjects and the effect of treatment.

Table 1. shows that, in the chewing gum group and cryotherapy group, 31 people in this study were male and five were female and had the highest age range distribution of 46-55 years by 12 people. Nasopharyngeal cancer was the majority diagnosis with 20 people. The highest stage was stage 2 with 19 people. The education level of as many as 12 people is educated high school with 12 respondents having private job. The marital status majority are 32 married people. Smoking habit as many as 22 respondents smoking 1 pack/day and the majority over 1-10 years, 13 people.

Table 2 explains that the results of the GLM-RM ANOVA test showed that there were significant differences in salivary volume before and after the intervention of chewing gum and cryotherapy at the 4th time of measurement with $p = <0.05$. In the chewing gum and cryotherapy, the biggest delta group was on the 7th day of the intervention compared to the pretest 3rd day and 5th day. Delta value of the chewing gum intervention on the 7th day is 0.4278 and delta value on 7th day cryotherapy is 0.3167.

Table 3 explains that the GLMRM test results between subjects showed no significant differences in salivary volume before and after the intervention of chewing gum and cryotherapy. But the chewing gum group had better results than the mean chewing gum, which was higher by 1.0722 ± 0.18087 , than the smaller cryotherapy, 0.9611 ± 0.15770 , although the statistical results were p values 0.058 ($p > 0.05$).

Results of the GLM-RM (General Linear Model-Repeated Measure) ANOVA between subjects between the chewing gum group and the cryotherapy group showed that the effect of chewing gum intervention and cryotherapy on salivary volume is clearly visible after seven days of treatment.




Figure 1. Graphs of salivary volume interactions (ml/min) between measurement times and between groups

DISCUSSION

Result of this study is chewing gum is more effective to increase salivary volume than cryotherapy. According to research (Pereira et al., 2016) chewing gum can increase the rate of salivary flow compared to the control group. Chewing muscles that are affected by radiation can be stimulated (Kaae et al., 2016). The main stimulus for increased salivary secretion is through mechanical stimulation (Subramaniam & Muthukrishnan, 2019). Chewing gum is a form of mechanical stimulation that is useful for increasing saliva and pH (Costa, Fernandes, Quinder, De Souza, & Pinto, 2003; Llop, Jimeno, Acien, & Dalmau, 2010). Chewing movements can make changes in the permeability of the plasma membrane, so that calcium can enter the cell. Influx cells occur and activate several enzymes, one of which is calcinurin, which affects the process of protein production transpsi, one of which is saliva (Ambudkar, 2014) thus increasing saliva production (Eghbali et al., 2017). Factors that can affect the achievement of saliva are the patient's hydration status (Samuels, 2017). drugs consumed, sleep, fasting, nutrition and imagining food and psychological factors are sadness and depression (Plemons et al., 2014).

Previous studies do not yet know the effectiveness of chewing gum versus cryotherapy to increase saliva volume which reduces because radiation rays. Saliva is a liquid produced from several glands, namely the parotid gland, which is the largest gland, then the submandibular gland which produces serus (thin saliva, low viscosity), and the smallest gland is the sublingual gland, which produces mucus (thick saliva, viscosity is higher) (Yunus, 2008). Saliva is very important because it contains antimicrobials such as

lysozyme and secretes immunoglobulin A (Subramaniam & Muthukrishnan, 2019).

This research was conducted using time series to obtain the most effective time effect. In line with previous opinions (Plemons et al., 2014), measuring saliva periodically is an effective way to monitor changes in the volume and composition of saliva. Chewing or sucking sugar-free gum to stimulate saliva flow is an intervention to minimize dry mouth (Dental & Ada, 2015). This study used xylitol gum because it contains lower sugar and is easy to find on the market. The results of this study support Rodian et al. (2011) that xylitol chewing gum showed the highest increase in salivary volume compared to sucrose chewing gum and probiotic gums, but the statistical tests showed no significant difference.

Cryotherapy is applied because it has many advantages in that is practical to be applied, economical, easy and has minimal side effects (Utami, 2017). The goals of cold therapy include reducing inflammation, inhibiting pain receptors, reducing edema And controlling bleeding (Rosdahl & Kowalski, 2014).

Symptoms of a dry mouth due to reduced saliva can make a patient feel uncomfortable. disturb the appetite and quality of life (Plemons et al., 2014). Study (Dental & Ada, 2015) states sucking ice cubes, drinking water while eating to help chew and swallow food, using mouthwash-free mouthwash, avoiding carbonated drinks (such as soda), caffeine, tobacco, and alcohol, and using lanolin-based lip balm to comfort cracked or dry lips can reduce dryness in the mouth and stimulate saliva discharge. Increased salivary secretion leads to increased volume and thinning of saliva needed for ingestion and lubrication.

In this study, not all of the patients' salivary volumes increased. This is influenced by several factors. According to Samuels (2017) drugs, smoking, and alcohol consumption will reduce the flow rate of saliva. Most respondents were aged in the range 46-65 years. Old age will make the function of the salivary glands decrease, because the acinar element turns into fat and fibrous tissue (Baird, Donehower, Stalsbrotten, & Ades, 1991).

The results of this study prove that the chewing gum and cryotherapy affect the stimulus production of saliva. Hopefully, this study can increase information about nursing care in head and neck cancer, so that the symptoms caused by radiotherapy of the head and neck area can be reduced or avoided.

The limitation of this study was the researcher cannot fully control the respondent's intervention because it is done at home or boarding so this can have an impact on the result of the study. The strength of this study was there is an effective nonpharmacological action nurses can take to increase the volume of saliva in head and neck cancer patients by chewing gum.

CONCLUSION

This study showed chewing gum is more effective to increase salivary volume than cryotherapy among patient head and neck cancer undergoing radiotherapy in Saiful Anwar Hospital Malang on 7th day intervention. The results from this recent study hope to be useful in future health therapies to increase the volume of saliva in radiotherapy patients in the head and neck area so that it can reduce side effects and make therapy successful. What must be considered when discussing clinical application is the suitability of the gum variant. Future research is expected to control the factors that influence saliva production and conduct research by taking patients from the beginning of radiotherapy until radiotherapy is completed.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author would like to express gratitude to the supervisors for the guidance and the precious suggestions, radiotherapy patients in Saiful Anwar Hospital Malang for participation in this study and the relevant authorities for their permissions to conduct this research.

REFERENCES

- Ambudkar, I. S. (2014). Ca²⁺ signaling and regulation of fluid secretion in salivary gland acinar cells. *Cell Calcium*, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ceca.2014.02.009>
- Baird, S. B., Donehower, M. G., Stalsbrotten, V. L., & Ades, T. B. (1991). *A cancer Source Book for Nurses* (6th ed.). American Cancer Society.
- Costa, E. M., Fernandes, M. Z., Quinder, L. B., De Souza, L. B., & Pinto, L. P. (2003). Evaluation of an oral preventive protocol in children with acute lymphoblastic leukemia. *Pesquisa Odontologica Brasileira*, 17(2), 147–150.
- Dental, A., & Ada, A. (2015). Managing dry mouth. *The Journal of the American Dental Association*, 146(2), A40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adaj.2014.11.019>
- Didem, A., Ayfer, E., & Ferda, O. A. (2014). The Effect of Chewing Gum on Oral Mucositis in Children Receiving Chemotherapy. *Health Science Journal*, 8(3), 373–382.
- Eghbali, Aziz., Taherkhanch., Bagheri B., S. S. (2017). *Effect of Chewing Gum on Oral Mucositis in Children Undergoing Chemotherapy: A Randomized Controlled Study Original Article Effect of Chewing Gum on Oral Mucositis in Children Undergoing Chemotherapy: A Randomized Controlled Study. March 2016.*
- Epstein, J. B., Bensadoun, R., Saunders, D. P., & Rajesh, V. (2017). Common oral complications of head and neck cancer radiation therapy: mucositis, infections, saliva change, fibrosis, sensory dysfunctions, dental caries, periodontal disease, and osteoradionecrosis. *Cancer Medicine*, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cam4.1221>
- Irna, & Subita, G. P. S. (2008). Identifikasi dan Pengendalian Faktor Risiko Mukositis Oral selama Radioterapi Kanker Nasofaring Laporan Kasus. *Indonesian Journal of Dentistry*, 15(4), 155–162.
- Jernigan, A. M., Chiung, C., Chen, G., & Sewell, C. (2014). International Journal of Gynecology and Obstetrics CLINICAL ARTICLE A randomized trial of chewing gum to prevent postoperative ileus after laparotomy for benign gynecologic surgery ☆. *International Journal of Gynecology and Obstetrics*, 8–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijgo.2014.06.008>
- Kaae, J. K., Stenfeldt, L., & Eriksen, J. G. (2016). Xerostomia after radiotherapy for Oral and Oropharyngeal cancer: increasing salivary Flow with Tasteless sugar-free chewing gum. *Frontiers in Oncology*, 6(May), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fonc.2016.00111>
- Katranc, N., Owayolu, N., Owayolu, O., & Sevinc, A. (2012). *European Journal of Oncology Nursing Evaluation of the effect of cryotherapy in preventing oral mucositis associated with chemotherapy e A randomized controlled trial.* 16, 339–344. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejon.2011.07.008>
- Laursen, M., Specht, L., Kristensen, C. A., & Gothelf, A. (2018). *An Extended Hypofractionated Palliative Radiotherapy Regimen for Head and Neck Carcinomas.* 8(June), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fonc.2018.00206>
- Llop, M. R., Jimeno, F. G., Acien, R. M., & Dalmau, L. J. B. (2010). Effect of xylitol chewing gum on salivary flow rate, ph, buffering capacity and presence of Streptococcus mutans in saliva. *European Journal of Paediatric Dentistry*, 11(1), 9–14.
- Marinna, A., & Harijanti, K. (2017). *Management of Xerostomia post Radiotherapy Nasopharyngeal Carcinoma: Case Report* (Y. Septorini, Wimardhani, H. Ruslijanto, H. Djuaeni, I. Sufiyawati, T. Setiani, & A. F. Irawan (eds.)).
- NIH. (2019). *Salivary Gland Cancer Treatment (Adult)*. National Cancer Institute.
- Pereira, J. V., Maciel, R. P., Jorge, M., & Monteiro, F. (2016). *Effect of Chewing Gum Containing CPP-ACP on Salivary Flow and Buffer Capacity: An in vivo Study.* 16((1)), 425–431.
- Plemons, J. M., Al-hashimi, I., & Marek, C. L. (2014). Managing xerostomia and salivary gland hypofunction Executive. *The Journal of the American Dental Association*, 145(8), 867–873. <https://doi.org/10.14219/jada.2014.44>
- Ra'abung, A. S., Suidiana, I. K., & Hidayati, L. (2019). *Pengaruh mouthwash disertai mengunyah permen karet xylitol terhadap xerostomia, laju aliran saliva, dan pH saliva pada pasien yang menjalani hemodialisis.* Universitas Airlangga.
- Rodian, M., Satari, M. H., & Rolleta, E. (2011). *Efek Mengunyah Permen karet yang Mengandung Sukrosa, Xylitol, Probiotik terhadap Volume, Kecepatan Aliran, Viskositas, pH, dan Jumlah Koloni Streptococcus Mutans Saliva.*

- Rosdahl, C. B., & Kowalski, M. T. (2014). *Text Book of Basic Nursing Edisi 10* (E. A. Mardella (ed.); 10th ed., p. 871). Lippincott Williams & Wilkins/Wolter Kluwer Health.
- Samuels, M. A. (2017). *Radiation-induced Oral Mucositis*. 7(May). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fonc.2017.00089>
- Santoso, B. S., Surarso, B., & Kentjono, W. A. (2009). Radioterapi pada Karsinoma Nasofaring. *THT KL*, 2(3), 134–141.
- Siddiqui, F., & Movsas, B. (2017). Management of Radiation Toxicity in Head and Neck Cancer. *Seminars in Radiation Oncology*, 27(4), 340–349. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.semradonc.2017.04.008>
- Simões, A., Campos, L. De, Arana-chavez, V. E., & Nicolau, J. (2015). *Low Level Laser Therapy for hyposalivation and xerostomia*. 335–339.
- Subramaniam, N., & Muthukrishnan, A. (2019). *Oral mucositis and microbial colonization in oral cancer patients undergoing radiotherapy and chemotherapy: A prospective analysis in a tertiary care dental hospital*. July, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jicd.12454>
- Surjadi, N., & Amtha, R. (2012). *Radiotherapy Reduced Salivary Flow Rate and Might Induced C. albicans Infection*. 19(1), 1–6.
- Traktama, D. O., & Sufiawati, I. (2018). *Keparahan mukositis oral pada pasien kanker kepala leher akibat kemoterapi dan / atau radioterapi*. 4(1).
- Utami, K. C. (2017). *Mukositis Oral sebagai Dampak Kemoterapi pada Anak Kanker yang Mendapat Kemoterapi*.
- Utami, K. C., & Hayati, H. (2018). Chewing gum is more effective than saline-solution gargling for reducing oral mucositis. *Enfermería Clínica*, 28, 5–8. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1130-8621\(18\)30026-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1130-8621(18)30026-3)
- Villa, A., & Sonis, S. T. (2015). *Mucositis : pathobiology and management*. 159–164. <https://doi.org/10.1097/CCO.000000000000180>
- Yunus, B. (2008). *Efek samping terapi radiasi penderita kanker kepala dan leher pada kelenjar saliva*. 7(1), 57–62.