GLYCERIN SUPPOSITORIES USED PROPHYLACTICALLY IN PREMATURE INFANTS (SUPP): A PILOT STUDY FOR A MULTICENTRE RANDOMIZED CONTROLLED TRIAL

By MICHAEL LIVINGSTON, B.A.SC., M.D.

A Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Master of Science McMaster University MASTER OF SCIENCE (2015) Hamilton, Ontario (Health Research Methodology)

TITLE: Glycerin Suppositories Used Prophylactically in Premature infants (SUPP): A Pilot Study for a Multicenter Randomized Controlled Trial

AUTHOR: Michael Livingston, B.A.Sc. (McMaster University), M.D. (Western University)

SUPERVISOR: Professor P.L. Rosenbaum

NUMBER OF PAGES: xiii, 120

LAY ABSTRACT

Feeding is a significant challenge for premature babies in the neonatal intensive care unit. These infants have immature digestive tracts and may not have normal bowel movements until a week or more after birth. One way to help premature babies is by giving them a medication called glycerin suppositories. This treatment is already used in many hospitals around the world. Unfortunately, previous studies have not shown for sure that this medication is actually helpful. In fact, there are some signs that using glycerin suppositories in premature infants may be harmful. We conducted a small study involving 22 premature infants randomized to either glycerin suppositories or a placebo. We found that it is safe and practical to do a larger study on this treatment involving multiple hospitals and hundreds of premature babies. The larger study will have enough participants to full show the risks and benefits of using glycerin suppositories to treat these infants.

ABSTRACT

BACKGROUND: Adequate feeding is a significant challenge for premature infants in the neonatal intensive care unit. These patients are often treated with glycerin suppositories to stimulate the passage of meconium and prevent feeding intolerance. Unfortunately, the evidence for this practice is limited and inconclusive.

METHODS: We conducted a systematic review on the use of glycerin suppositories and enemas in premature infants. Following this, we conducted a pilot study for a multicenter randomized controlled trial of premature infants randomized to glycerin suppositories or a placebo procedure once daily. Outcomes included rate of recruitment, rate of reaching the primary endpoint of full enteral feeds, treatment-related adverse events, and cost.

RESULTS: Twenty-two infants were recruited and randomized active treatment or the placebo procedure. Gestational age was 24-32 weeks and birth weight was 500-1500 grams. During the study period, 61 infants were screened, 46 (75%) were eligible and approached for consent, 25 (54%) consented to participate, 22 (48%) were randomized, and 19 reached the primary endpoint of full enteral feeds. Three infants (14%) experienced rectal bleeding 5 to 43 days after completing study treatments. An anal fissure was also noted in two of these patients (9%). There were no cases of rectal perforation or necrotizing enterocolitis. Protocol violations occurred during 14 of 130 (11%) treatment days. The total cost for running this pilot study was estimated to be

iv

\$16,000. A revised sample size calculation for the multicenter study indicated that 72 infants would be required to detect a treatment effect of 2 days faster to full enteral feeds.

CONCLUSIONS: This external pilot study suggested that conducting a multicenter randomized controlled trial of glycerin suppositories in premature infants is feasible and safe. In the multicenter trial, we recommend tolerating a lower platelet count in the exclusion criteria, using a fixed rather than variable treatment duration, conducting follow-up assessments at predefined time points, and conducting an interim analysis to ensure that treatment is not associated with increased risk of necrotizing enterocolitis.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the members of my thesis committee for their advice and support over the past two years: Drs. Peter Rosenbaum, Luis Braga, Sarah Jones, and J. Mark Walton. This period of my life has been an incredible time of growth in research, clinical training, and professional development, and your mentorship has been invaluable.

I would also like to thank the members of the "SUPP Trial Team": Dr. Jorge Zequiera, for his early interest in this project; Dr. Anna Shawyer, for collaborating on the systematic review; Dr. Connie Williams, whose coordination within the Neonatal Intensive Care Unit was essential; Julia Pemberton, who hand-picked the research personnel for this trial; and Stephanie Becker, our nursing liaison and architect of the now famous "poop legend."

Special acknowledgement goes to the members of the McMaster Pediatric Surgery Research Collaborative: Bethany Easterbook, the ever-organized Research Coordinator; Adriana Dekirmendijan, our hard-working research intern, and most importantly, Henrietta Blinder, our dedicated research assistant. Without her, this trial would not have been possible.

I would also like to thank my clinical preceptors from the past two years: Drs. Karen Bailey, Andreana Bütter, Brian Cameron, Peter Fitzgerald, Helene Flageole, Sarah Jones, Neil Merritt, Michael Ott, Leslie Scott, and Mark Walton. Thank-you for all the teaching both in and out of operating room.

Finally, I would like to thank my wife and family for their ongoing support. You keep me grounded in the midst of a busy professional life, and I would not have been able to finish this project without your ongoing encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION	TITLES	PAGES
1.	SYSTEMATIC REVIEW AND META-ANALYSIS	1-51
	Abstract	4-5
	Manuscript	7-25
	References	26-31
	Tables and Figures	32-40
	Appendices	41-43
	Letter to the Editor and Response	44-51
2.	RESULTS FROM THE PILOT STUDY	53-80
	Abstract	54
	Manuscript	55-72
	References	73-76
	Tables and Figures	77-80
Appendix 1	GRANT APPLICATION FOR PILOT STUDY	81-91
Appendix 2	STUDY PROTOCOL FOR PILOT STUDY	92-118
Appendix 3	STOOLING LEGEND	119-120

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES (SECTION 1)

NUMBER	CAPTION	PAGES
Table 1.1	Characteristics of randomized controlled trials of premature	32
	infants treated with glycerin enemas or suppositories	
Table 1.2	Outcomes reported among included trials	33
Table 1.3	Risk of bias of individual studies according to the Cochrane	34
	Collaboration risk of bias tool	
Table 1.4	Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and	35
	Evaluation (GRADE) evidence profile	
Figure 1.1	Search results and study selection as per Preferred Reporting	36
	Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA)	
Figure 1.2	Risk of mortality in premature infants treated with glycerin	37
	enemas or suppositories versus no treatment.	
Figure 1.3	Risk of necrotizing enterocolitis in premature infants treated	38
	with glycerin enemas or suppositories versus no treatment	
Figure 1.4	Transition to enteral feeding (mean difference in days to full	39
	enteral feeding) in premature infants treated with glycerin	
	enemas or suppositories versus no treatment	
Figure 1.5	Mean difference in days to initiation of meconium evacuation in	40
	premature infants treated with glycerin enemas or suppositories	
	versus no treatment	

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES (SECTION 2)

NUMBER	CAPTION	PAGES
Table 2.1	Inclusion and exclusion criteria	77
Table 2.2	Baseline characteristics of premature infants randomized to	78
	glycerin suppositories or placebo procedure	
Table 2.3	Safety and feasibility outcomes of premature infants randomized	79
	to glycerin suppositories or placebo procedure	
Figure 2.1	Recruitment of participants using the Consolidated Standards of	80
	Reporting Trials (CONSORT) flow diagram	

LIST OF ALL ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

- 95% CI 95% confidence interval
- NEC necrotizing enterocolitis,
- NICU neonatal intensive care unit
- MD mean difference
- RR risk ratio
- SD standard deviation

DECLARATION OF ACADEMIC ACHEIVEMENT

The core elements of this Thesis are: (1) The Systematic Review and Meta-analysis and (2) Results from the Pilot Study. For the systematic review, I completed the initial literature search, developed data abstraction forms, reviewed titles and abstracts, completed data abstraction, analyzed data in Review Manager, and wrote the first and final draft of the manuscript. I am indebted to Alla Iansavichene BSc MLIS, who developed and executed the structured search of Medline, Embase, and the Cochrane Library. Dr. Anna Shawyer kindly acted as my co-reviewer, and independently reviewed titles and abstracts and completed data abstraction in duplicate. Drs. Shawyer, Rosenbaum, Jones, Williams, and Walton reviewed the manuscript and provided feedback.

In regards to the pilot study, I designed the study protocol, helped obtain funding, completed the ethics review, assisted with trial management, analyzed data, and wrote the first and final draft of the manuscript. Henrietta Blinder revised the study protocol, created case-report forms, trained the charge nurse nurses, obtained consent from parents or guardians, and collected data. Julia Pemberton assisted with the grant application, ethics review, and trial registration. Dr. Connie Williams assisted with the grant application, ethics application, and trial management. Dr. J. Mark Walton conceived this study, helped complete the grant application, and assisted with trial management. Drs.

xii

Rosenbaum, Jones, and all of the individuals listed above reviewed the manuscript and provided feedback.

For the purposes of transparency, I included the following documents as appendices: (1) grant application for the pilot study (which was initially written and submitted as the course paper for Health Research Methodology 730); (2) pilot study protocol (which underwent several revisions following feedback from the Neonatal Research Committee, Hamilton Integrated Research Ethics Board, Health Canada, and the reviewers and Editorial Board for Pilot and Feasibility Studies); and (3) stooling legend (developed primarily by Stephanie Becker) to help standardize the duration of study treatments during the pilot study. Dr. Jorge Zequiera completed a preliminary literature review on this topic, and is included as an author on the grant application and study protocol. These three appendices are meant to provide context but do not represent credit towards the completion of this Thesis.