# High Flow Nasal Cannula therapy for infants with Bronchiolitis: a randomized controlled trial

Published: 10-11-2016 Last updated: 17-04-2024

To evaluate the effect on severity of dyspnoea of administration of oxygen through High Flow Nasal Cannula compared to oxygen delivery through Low Flow Nasal Prongs in children hospitalized for bronchiolitis with moderate to severe dyspnoea.

| Ethical review        | Approved WMO               |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| Status                | Recruitment stopped        |
| Health condition type | Viral infectious disorders |
| Study type            | Interventional             |

# Summary

### ID

NL-OMON42950

**Source** ToetsingOnline

**Brief title** High flow in bronchiolitis

### Condition

- Viral infectious disorders
- Respiratory tract infections

**Synonym** Bronchiolitis, luchtweginfectie

**Research involving** Human

# **Sponsors and support**

#### Primary sponsor: Isala Klinieken Source(s) of monetary or material Support: Isala

### Intervention

Keyword: bronchiolitis, Children, High Flow, Infants

### **Outcome measures**

#### **Primary outcome**

Decrease in dyspnoea severity, depicted by decrease in PEWS with >= 2 points within 24 hours. PEWS will be assessed at t=0, 1, 2 and 3 hours and thereafter at least every three hours during hospitalisation, or more frequent, as indicated.

#### Secondary outcome

Respiratory rate, retractions, heart rate, conscious state, oxygen saturation, FiO2, temperature, Comfort (FLACC), ability to feed, tube feeding, intravenous fluids, bloodgas analysis (in case of PEWS >= 8, or as indicated by the treating physician), mechanical ventilation, referral to PICU, length of hospitalization. By measuring these different variables we are able to compose several composite dyspnoea scores other than the PEWS (i.e. RDAI Respiratory Distress Assessment Instrument, PRAM Pediatric Respiratory Assessment Measurement). None of these scores is sufficiently validated, however by measuring the most frequently used, we will enable comparison of our data with other studies.

# **Study description**

#### **Background summary**

Bronchiolitis is a common respiratory tract illness in young children, usually of viral origin, causing a clinical picture of dyspnoea due to airway obstruction and feeding problems.[Florin 2016] During winter seasons, bronchiolitis is an important reason for hospital admissions in young children.

Since no pharmacological intervention has been proven effective, treatment is supportive, existing of oxygen supplementation and/or administration of fluids.[Ralston 2014] Traditionally, oxygen is given as dry gas through low-flow nasal prongs (LFNP). In the recent years a new method of oxygen supplementation has been used, delivering oxygen through heated humidified, high flow nasal cannula (HFNC). From retrospective studies and descriptive case series it is hypothesized that HFNC leads to better relieve of dyspnoea symptoms, less need for invasive respiratory support and less discomfort. [Hutchings 2015] However no solid evidence for the effect of HFNC has been shown from randomized controlled trials. [Cochrane 2014, Hag 2014] Bronchiolitis is an illness for which there are very limited proven treatment options. To establish HFNC as an effective and safe intervention in bronchiolitis has significant clinical implications. This intervention may provide an effective form of respiratory support that is less invasive and potentially has lower costs and fewer adverse events than conventional non-invasive ventilation therapy.

Several authors, including Cochrane reviewers emphasize the importance and urgent need for randomized controlled trials on this subject. [Cochrane 2014, Korppi 2016]

#### **Study objective**

To evaluate the effect on severity of dyspnoea of administration of oxygen through High Flow Nasal Cannula compared to oxygen delivery through Low Flow Nasal Prongs in children hospitalized for bronchiolitis with moderate to severe dyspnoea.

#### Study design

Multi Centre, Randomized controlled trial comparing oxygen supplementation via High Flow Nasal Cannula with oxygen supplementation via Low Flow Nasal Prongs.

#### Intervention

Standard mode of oxygen delivery (in the control group) is through dry gas at a limited flow rate < 2 L/min using nasal prongs. Higher flow rates of dry gas through nasal prongs are experienced as painful and uncomfortable air streams. The intervention in our study is the use of High Flow Nasal Canula to deliver oxygen to included patients. Through heating (to body temperature) and humidification (>99% relative humidity) of oxygen and air mixtures, comfortable oxygen delivery is allowed at flow rates matching or exceeding the patient\*s inspiratory flow rate, thus limiting entrainment of room air.

#### Study burden and risks

Both intervention require the placement of nasal canula\*s or prongs, which may

cause some inconvenience or discomfort to the child. Potential risks of High Flow may be abdominal distension, infections from the heated humidifying system or pneumothorax. However these risks are estimated to be very low and the use of High Flow has been supposed to be safe till so far. Patients are not exposed to any burden related to the collection of data; no extra blood samples or invasive measurements are performed. Since bronchiolitis is an age specific disease, occurring only - by definition - in children < 2 years of age, this study cannot be done in elder pediatric patients, nor in adults.

# Contacts

**Public** Isala Klinieken

Dr van Heesweg 2 Zwolle 8000 GK NL Scientific Isala Klinieken

Dr van Heesweg 2 Zwolle 8000 GK NL

# **Trial sites**

# **Listed location countries**

Netherlands

# **Eligibility criteria**

**Age** Children (2-11 years)

### **Inclusion criteria**

Patients < 2 years of age, hospitalised for bronchiolitis, with need for oxygensupplementation and moderate to severe dyspnoea.

# **Exclusion criteria**

Bronchopulmonary dysplasia Congenital heart disease Congenital pulmonary abnormalities Syndromal disease (for example trisomie 21)

# Study design

# Design

| Study type:         | Interventional              |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Intervention model: | Parallel                    |
| Allocation:         | Randomized controlled trial |
| Masking:            | Open (masking not used)     |
| Control:            | Active                      |
| Primary purpose:    | Treatment                   |

### Recruitment

. . .

| NL                        |                     |
|---------------------------|---------------------|
| Recruitment status:       | Recruitment stopped |
| Start date (anticipated): | 01-12-2016          |
| Enrollment:               | 118                 |
| Туре:                     | Actual              |

### Medical products/devices used

| Generic name: | High Flow Nasal Cannula therapy |
|---------------|---------------------------------|
| Registration: | Yes - CE intended use           |

# **Ethics review**

Approved WMODate:10-11-2016Application type:First submission

| Review commission:    | METC Isala Klinieken (Zwolle) |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| Approved WMO<br>Date: | 12-12-2016                    |
| Application type:     | Amendment                     |
| Review commission:    | METC Isala Klinieken (Zwolle) |
| Approved WMO<br>Date: | 13-02-2018                    |
| Application type:     | Amendment                     |
| Review commission:    | METC Isala Klinieken (Zwolle) |

# **Study registrations**

### Followed up by the following (possibly more current) registration

No registrations found.

### Other (possibly less up-to-date) registrations in this register

No registrations found.

### In other registers

| Register | ID                               |
|----------|----------------------------------|
| Other    | clinical trial.gov, nummer volgt |
| ССМО     | NL56959.075.16                   |