



UCL INSTITUTE OF CHILD HEALTH

**icnarc** | intensive care  
national audit &  
research centre

Great Ormond Street **NHS**  
Hospital for Children

NHS Foundation Trust

Joint Research and Development Office  
Division of Research and Innovation



## **FIRST**-line support for **A**ssistance in **B**reathing in **C**hildren (**FIRST-ABC**):

A master protocol of two randomised trials to evaluate the non-inferiority of high flow nasal cannula (HFNC) versus continuous positive airway pressure (CPAP) for non-invasive respiratory support in paediatric critical care

STUDY SHORT TITLE  
**FIRST-ABC**

FUNDED BY

**NIHR** | National Institute  
for Health Research

This study is funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Health Technology Assessment (HTA) Programme (project number: 17/94/28). The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care.

## Research reference numbers

### Protocol version number and date

v1.10, 242 June~~March~~ 2019

### IRAS Number

260536

### REC Number

Xx/xx/xx19/EE/0185

### NIHR Portfolio CPMS ID

XXXXX42112

### ISRCTN Registry Number

ISRCTN60048867XXXXX

### Sponsor name and reference

Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children NHS Foundation Trust (reference: 17IA05)

### Funder name and reference

National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Health Technology Assessment (HTA)  
Programme (Project number: 17/94/28)

### Chief Investigator

Dr Padmanabhan Ramnarayan

### Sponsor representative

Dr Jenny Rivers

## Signature page

The undersigned confirm that the following protocol has been agreed and accepted and that the Chief Investigator agrees to conduct the trial in compliance with the approved protocol and will adhere to appropriate research governance frameworks and any subsequent amendments of regulations, Good Clinical Practice (GCP) guidelines, the Sponsor's Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), and other regulatory requirements where relevant.

I agree to ensure that the confidential information contained in this document will not be used for any other purpose other than the evaluation or conduct of the clinical investigation without the prior written consent of the Sponsor.

I also confirm that I will make the findings of the trial publicly available through publication or other dissemination tools without any unnecessary delay and that an honest accurate and transparent account of the trial will be given; and that any discrepancies from the trial as planned in this protocol will be explained.

For and on behalf of the Trial Sponsor:

Signature:

Date:

.....

...../...../.....

Name (please print):

Dr Jenny Rivers

Position:

Deputy Director of Research and Innovation

Chief Investigator:

Signature:

Date:

.....

...../...../.....

Name:

Dr Padmanabhan Ramnarayan

Position:

Consultant in Paediatric Intensive Care & Retrieval

## FIRST-ABC contacts

Chief Investigator	Dr Padmanabhan Ramnarayan, Consultant in Paediatric Intensive Care & Retrieval Children's Acute Transport Service (CATS) Heart and Lung Directorate Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children NHS Foundation Trust 26-27 Boswell Street London WC1N 3JZ Tel: 020 7430 5850 Email: <a href="mailto:p.ramnarayan@gosh.nhs.uk">p.ramnarayan@gosh.nhs.uk</a>
Clinical Trials Unit	Mr Alvin Richards-Belle, Trial Manager ICNARC CTU Napier House 24 High Holborn London WC1V 6AZ Tel: 020 7269 9277 Fax: 020 7831 6879 Email: <a href="mailto:firstabc@icnarc.org">firstabc@icnarc.org</a>
Sponsor	Dr Jenny Rivers, Deputy Director of Research and Innovation Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children NHS Foundation Trust Joint R&D Office GOSH/ICH based at UCL Institute of Child Health 30 Guilford Street London WC1N 1EH Tel: 020 7905 2249 Email: <a href="mailto:Research.Governance@gosh.nhs.uk">Research.Governance@gosh.nhs.uk</a>
Funder	National Institute for Health Research Health Technology Assessment Programme Tel: 02380 595 656 Email: <a href="mailto:hta.funding@nihr.ac.uk">hta.funding@nihr.ac.uk</a>

## FIRST-ABC Investigators

Name	Department	Organisation
Dr Padmanabhan Ramnarayan	Children's Acute Transport Service	Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children NHS Foundation Trust
Professor Mark Peters	Paediatric Intensive Care Unit	University College London Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health
Dr Kevin Morris	Paediatric Intensive Care	Birmingham Women's and Children's NHS Foundation Trust
Dr Lyvonne Tume	Critical Care Nursing	University of the West of England
Dr Peter Davis	Paediatric Intensive Care	University Hospitals Bristol NHS Foundation Trust
Dr Richard Feltbower	Leeds Institute of Cardiovascular and Metabolic Medicine	University of Leeds
Dr Zia Sadique	Department of Health Services Research and Policy	London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine
Professor Richard Grieve	Department of Health Services Research and Policy	London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine
Mr Paul Mouncey	Clinical Trials Unit	Intensive Care National Audit & Research Centre
Professor David Harrison	Clinical Trials Unit	Intensive Care National Audit & Research Centre
Professor Kathy Rowan	Clinical Trials Unit	Intensive Care National Audit & Research Centre
<del>Mrs Deborah Onbashi</del>	<del>Parent</del>	<del>Parent representative</del>
Mrs Julie Lester	Parent	Parent representative

## Summary

Data category	Information
Primary registry and trial identifying number	ISRCTN <del>60048867</del>
Date of registration in primary registry	<del>19XX/06XX</del> /2019
Source(s) of monetary or material support	National Institute for Health Research Health Technology Assessment Programme
Primary Sponsor	Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children NHS Foundation Trust
Contact for public queries	Mr Alvin Richards-Belle Tel: 020 7269 9277 Email: <a href="mailto:firstabc@icnarc.org">firstabc@icnarc.org</a>
Contact for scientific queries	Dr Padmanabhan Ramnarayan Tel: 020 7430 5850 Email: <a href="mailto:p.ramnarayan@gosh.nhs.uk">p.ramnarayan@gosh.nhs.uk</a>
Public title	FIRST-line support for Assistance in Breathing in Children (FIRST-ABC)
Scientific title	FIRST-line support for Assistance in Breathing in Children (FIRST-ABC): a master protocol of two randomised trials to evaluate the non-inferiority of high flow nasal cannula (HFNC) versus continuous positive airway pressure (CPAP) for non-invasive respiratory support in paediatric critical care
Countries of recruitment	United Kingdom
Health condition(s) or problem(s) studied	Non-invasive respiratory support
Intervention(s)	Interventions: HFNC vs. CPAP
Key inclusion and exclusion criteria	<p>Ages eligible for study: &gt;36 weeks corrected gestational age and &lt;16 years Sexes eligible for study: both Accepts healthy volunteers: no</p> <p>Inclusion criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <del>Admitted</del>/Accepted for admission to PICU/HDU</li> <li>2. Age &gt;36 weeks corrected gestational age and &lt;16 years</li> <li>3. Assessed by the treating clinician to require non-invasive respiratory support, <b>EITHER</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. for an acute illness (step-up RCT) <b>OR</b></li> </ol> </li> </ol>

Data category	Information
	<p><b>b.</b> within 72 hours of extubation following a period of invasive ventilation (step-down RCT).</p> <p>Exclusion criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Assessed by the treating clinician to require immediate intubation and invasive ventilation due to severe hypoxia, acidosis and/or respiratory distress, upper airway obstruction, inability to manage airway secretions or recurrent apnoeas</li> <li>2) Tracheostomy in place</li> <li>3) Received HFNC/CPAP for &gt;2 hours in the prior 24 hours</li> <li>4) On home non-invasive ventilation prior to <u>PICU/HDU</u><del>critical care unit</del> admission</li> <li>5) Presence of untreated air-leak (pneumothorax/pneumomediastinum)</li> <li>6) Midfacial/craniofacial anomalies (unrepaired cleft palate, choanal atresia) or recent craniofacial surgery</li> <li>7) Agreed 'not for intubation' or other limitation of critical care treatment plan in place.</li> <li>8) Previously recruited to the FIRST-ABC trial</li> </ol>
Study type	<p>Master protocol of two pragmatic, multi-centre, parallel groups, non-inferiority RCTs with shared infrastructure</p> <p>Interventional</p> <p>Allocation: randomised</p> <p>Blinding: cannot be blinded</p> <p>Primary purpose: prevention</p> <p>Phase IV</p>
Date of first enrolment	Anticipated 1 July 2019
Target sample size	1,200 overall; 600 (step-up RCT) and 600 (step-down RCT)
Primary outcomes	Time to liberation from respiratory support, defined as the start of a 48-hour period during which the child was free of all forms of respiratory support
Key secondary outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mortality at PICU/HDU discharge, day 60 and day 180</li> <li>• rate of (re)intubation at 48 hours</li> <li>• duration of PICU/HDU and hospital stay</li> <li>• patient comfort, during randomised treatment, measured using the COMFORT-B score</li> <li>• proportion of patients in whom sedation is used during non-invasive respiratory support</li> </ul>

Data category	Information
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>parental stress, in hospital at the time of consent, measured using the Parental Stressor Scale: PICU (PSS:PICU)</li> <li>Health-related Quality of Life at six months using age-appropriate Pediatric Quality of Life Inventory (Peds-QL) and <del>Health Utilities Index (HUI2)</del> <u>The Child Health Utility 9D (CHU-9D)</u></li> </ul>
Cost effectiveness analysis outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Total costs at six months</li> <li>Quality-Adjusted Life Years (QALYs) at six months</li> <li>Net monetary benefit gained at a willingness-to-pay of £20,000 per QALY at six months associated with HFNC v<u>s.</u><del>ersus</del> CPAP</li> </ul>



## Contents

Research reference numbers .....	2
Signature page .....	3
FIRST-ABC contacts .....	4
FIRST-ABC Investigators .....	5
Summary .....	6
Abbreviations .....	11
1. Background and rationale .....	12
1.1 Pilot and feasibility work .....	13
1.2 Hypothesis .....	13
1.3 Aims and objectives .....	13
1.4 Design .....	14
2. Methods .....	15
2.1 Setting .....	15
2.2 Population .....	16
2.3 Recruitment and consent.....	17
2.4 Outcome measures .....	21
2.5 Procedures .....	22
2.5.1 HFNC .....	22
2.5.2 CPAP.....	24
2.6 Questionnaire follow-up.....	26
2.7 Participant timeline .....	27
2.8 Safety Monitoring and Reporting .....	28
2.9 Data collection .....	33
2.10 Data management .....	33
2.11 Monitoring and auditing .....	34
2.12 Statistical Methods .....	34
3. Ethics, approvals and dissemination .....	37
3.1 Research ethics.....	37
3.2 Protocol amendments.....	37
3.3 Confidentiality .....	37
3.4 Declaration of interests.....	38
3.7 Dissemination policy .....	38
4. Trial closure .....	39

4.1 End of trial .....	39
4.2 Archiving trial documents .....	39
4.3 Early discontinuation of the trial.....	39
5. Trial management and oversight.....	39
5.1 Good research practice .....	39
5.2 Trial Management Group (TMG) .....	40
5.3 Trial Steering Committee (TSC) .....	40
5.4 Data Monitoring and Ethics Committee (DMEC) .....	40
5.5 Patient and Public Involvement (PPI) .....	40
6. Sponsorship and funding .....	40
6.1 Sponsorship and indemnity .....	41
6.2 Funding .....	41
7. References.....	42
8. Appendices .....	45

## Abbreviations

### CHU 9D      The Child Health Utility 9D

CI	Chief Investigator
CPAP	Continuous Positive Airway Pressure
CRF	Case Report Form
CTU	Clinical Trials Unit
GCP	Good Clinical Practice
GOSH	Great Ormond Street Hospital
HDU	high dependency unit
HFNC	High Flow Nasal Cannula
HrQoL	Health-related Quality of Life

### HUI2      Health Utilities Index

ICH	International Conference of Harmonisation
NHS	National Health Service
NRS	Non-invasive Respiratory Support
Peds-QL	Paediatric Quality of Life Inventory
PI	Principal Investigator
PICANet	The Paediatric Intensive Care Audit Network
PICS-SG	Paediatric Intensive Care Society Study Group
PICU	Paediatric Intensive Care Unit
PIS	Participant Information Sheet
PPI	Patient and Public Involvement
PSS:PICU	Parental stressor scale: PICU
QALYs	Quality-Adjusted Life Years
R&D	Research and Development
RCT	Randomised Clinical Trial
REC	Research Ethics Committee
SAE	Serious Adverse Event
SOP	Standard Operating Procedure
UCL	University College London

## 1. Background and rationale

Over 20,000 critically ill children are admitted to paediatric critical care units in the UK and nearly three-quarters of these children receive some form of respiratory support (invasive and/or non-invasive), making it the most common treatment provided in paediatric critical care.<sup>1</sup> Although endotracheal intubation and invasive mechanical ventilation (IMV) can be a life-saving procedure, increasing recognition of its risks, such as ventilator-induced lung injury and nosocomial infections, have prompted greater use of non-invasive respiratory support (NRS) techniques in PICUs worldwide.<sup>1 2</sup>

NRS is currently used in two distinct clinical scenarios: 1) in acutely ill children, to prevent intubation and IMV (step-up treatment), and 2) in children who have just come off IMV, to prevent re-intubation and further IMV (step-down treatment). Continuous positive airway pressure (CPAP), involving the delivery of pressurised air/oxygen through a face mask or nasal prongs, is a mode of NRS that PICU clinicians have been familiar with and have used for over three decades.<sup>3-5</sup> Even though observational data suggest that CPAP is effective (~80% of children started on CPAP do not progress to need IMV), there have been few randomised clinical trials (RCTs) of CPAP in critically ill children.<sup>5 6</sup> CPAP can be uncomfortable and is associated with a small but significant risk of complications such as air-leak and nasal trauma, necessitating the use of sedation, close monitoring and a high level of nursing input.

More recently, an alternate mode of NRS, high-flow nasal cannula therapy (HFNC), has gained popularity since it is easy to use and well tolerated by patients.<sup>7-10</sup> Single-centre studies from the United States and Canada and audit data from the United Kingdom indicate that 16–35% of PICU admissions currently receive HFNC at some point during their stay.<sup>1 11 12</sup> Through diverse mechanisms such as reduction of airway resistance, reduction of dead space by nasopharyngeal washout with fresh gas and delivery of positive airway pressure (“CPAP effect”), HFNC has been shown to reduce the work of breathing and improve oxygenation and ventilation in children. In particular, the benefits of HFNC (improved patient comfort, safety profile and ease of nursing care) must be balanced against its potential risks (serious complications such as air leak, abdominal distension and nosocomial infection as well as excess mortality from delayed intubation and unnecessary prolongation of critical care/hospital stay).

However, there are few RCTs comparing HFNC with CPAP in the paediatric critical care setting.<sup>13-15</sup> The evidence available from RCTs<sup>15 16</sup> does not yet definitively support the effectiveness of either HFNC or CPAP in critically ill children. Importantly, the RCTs did not study the effectiveness of HFNC for step-up as well as step-down (post-extubation) care in children with a range of diagnoses, making it impossible to generalise their findings to contemporary practice in UK paediatric critical care.

Therefore, the FIRST-ABC RCTs address an important clinical dilemma faced daily by paediatric critical care clinicians in the United Kingdom (UK): in a child requiring non-invasive respiratory support, which of the two commonly available modalities, HFNC or CPAP, should they use as first-line therapy to achieve the best patient outcomes?

Our research question was recently prioritised by the multi-disciplinary UK Paediatric Intensive Care Society Study Group (PICS-SG) as an important research topic for the NHS. In addition, as identified in our PPI work, parents/patients have identified this as an important topic for the NHS.

This Protocol has been written in accordance with the Standard Protocol Items: Recommendations for Interventional Trials (SPIRIT) 2013 statement.<sup>17</sup>

## 1.1 Pilot and feasibility work

A multi-centre pilot RCT was conducted to explore the feasibility of performing a pragmatic RCT comparing CPAP and HFNC in critically ill children.<sup>18</sup> The results of the pilot RCT confirmed that it was feasible to conduct a large pragmatic national RCT of non-invasive respiratory support in the paediatric critical care setting in both step-up and step-down NRS. Moreover, it informed the design and conduct of the current RCTs.

## 1.2 Hypothesis

In critically ill children assessed by the treating clinician to require non-invasive respiratory support (NRS), first-line use of high flow nasal cannula (HFNC) is non-inferior to continuous positive airway pressure (CPAP) in time to liberation from respiratory support.

## 1.3 Aims and objectives

### 1.3.1 Aim

The aim of the FIRST-ABC RCTs is to evaluate the clinical and cost effectiveness of the use of HFNC, as compared with CPAP, as the first-line mode of non-invasive respiratory support in critically ill children to (A) prevent progression to intubation/invasive ventilation (step-up RCT) or (B) prevent re-intubation after being extubated following a period of invasive ventilation (step-down RCT).

### 1.3.2 Primary objective

To evaluate the non-inferiority of HFNC, as compared with CPAP, for children requiring NRS both as a step-up and as a step-down treatment on the time to liberation from respiratory support, defined as the start of a 48-hour period during which the child was free of all forms of respiratory support.

### 1.3.3 Secondary objectives

To compare, between the groups:

- mortality at PICU/HDU discharge, day 60 and day 180;

- the rate of (re)intubation at 48 hours;
- the duration of PICU/HDU and hospital stay;
- patient comfort, during randomised treatment, measured using the validated COMFORT-B Score;<sup>19</sup>
- the proportion of patients receiving sedation while on non-invasive respiratory support;
- parental stress, in hospital at the time of consent, measured using the Parental Stressor Scale: PICU (PSS:PICU)<sup>20</sup>
- Health-related Quality of Life (HrQoL) at six months measured using the age-appropriate Paediatric Quality of Life Inventory (Peds-QL)<sup>21</sup> and The Child Health Utility 9D (CHU 9D), ~~Health Utilities Index 2 (HUI2)~~<sup>22</sup>

## 1.4 Design

FIRST-ABC is a master protocol comprising two pragmatic, multi-centre, parallel groups, non-inferiority RCTs (step-up RCT and step-down RCT) with shared infrastructure, including an internal pilot stage and integrated health economic evaluation.

The master protocol design allows the research question to be addressed in each of the two important populations (step-up and step-down NRS) in an efficient way by minimising time and infrastructure costs as compared with conducting two sequential RCTs.<sup>23</sup>

A non-inferiority design was chosen based on previous RCTs on this topic as well as feedback from PICS-SG in July 2017 which indicated that the potential benefits of HFNC in terms of patient comfort and ease of use would mean that it would likely be preferred in usual practice even if it was shown not to be superior to CPAP.

### 1.4.1 Internal pilot

An internal pilot will run from months 7-12 (as per the grant timeline) and use a traffic light system to assess key progression criteria regarding site opening, recruitment and adherence to the study protocol.<sup>24</sup> The internal pilot will follow the same processes as the main trial; participants enrolled in the pilot will be included in the analysis of the main trial.

## 2. Methods

### 2.1 Setting

#### 2.1.1 Trial sites

In this protocol, 'site' refers to the 25 NHS paediatric critical care units (paediatric intensive care units (PICU) and/or high dependency units (HDUs)) where FIRST-ABC will be conducted.

#### 2.1.2 Site requirements

- Able to provide both treatments (HFNC and CPAP) to study participants
- Active participation in the Paediatric Intensive Care Audit Network for the UK and Ireland (PICANet) audit or able to collect detailed data on patient interventions and outcomes
- Compliance with all responsibilities as stated in the FIRST-ABC Clinical Trial Site Agreement (CTSA)
- Compliance with all requirements of the trial protocol including the trial treatments, consent procedures and data collection/follow-up schedules
- Compliance with the UK Policy Framework for Health and Social Care Research and International Conference on Harmonization Guidelines on Good Clinical Practice (ICH-GCP).

#### 2.1.3 Site responsibilities

- Identify a Principal Investigator (PI) to lead the FIRST-ABC RCTs locally
- Identify a FIRST-ABC Research Nurse responsible for day-to-day local trial coordination
- Identify a doctor and nurse/allied health professional champion in each unit
- Agree to incorporate the FIRST-ABC RCTs into routine paediatric critical care clinical practice, highlighting the importance of systematic screening for potential eligible patients and prompt randomisation
- Agree to adhere to individual patient randomisation allocations and ensure adherence with the trial protocol
- Agree to randomise all eligible patients and maintain a Screening Log
- Agree to data collection and safety monitoring requirements.

#### 2.1.4 Site initiation and activation

The following must be in place prior to a site being activated for recruitment:

- a completed site initiation visit
- all relevant institutional approvals (e.g. local confirmation of capacity and capability)
- a fully signed FIRST-ABC Clinical Trial Site Agreement
- a fully signed Delegation Log

Once the ICNARC Clinical Trials Unit (CTU) have confirmed that all necessary documentation is in place, a site activation email will be issued to the site PI, at which point, the site may start to screen for eligible patients. Once the site has been activated, the PI is responsible for ensuring:

- adherence with the most recent approved version of the trial protocol;
- training of relevant site staff in accordance with the trial protocol and, if overseeing the trial or seeking consent, Good Clinical Practice (GCP) requirements;
- appropriate means to identify and randomise eligible patients;
- timely data collection, entry and validation; and
- prompt notification of all adverse events (as specified in Section 2.8).

All local staff (i.e. PI, local investigators, research teams) involved in the conduct of the trial must be trained to carry out their assigned roles. Site research staff should be signed off on the Delegation Log, once trained, and the Delegation Log should be copied and sent to the ICNARC CTU whenever changes are made.

Staff members solely involved in the screening and randomisation of patients should be provided with study-specific training to carry out these tasks and recorded on the Training Log (full GCP training will not be required for these staff members)<sup>25</sup>.

## 2.2 Population

Critically ill children requiring NRS to either (A) prevent progression to intubation/invasive ventilation (step-up RCT) or (B) prevent re-intubation after being extubated following a period of invasive ventilation (step-down RCT).

### 2.2.1 Inclusion criteria

- 1) Admitted/Accepted for admission to PICU/HDU
- 2) Age >36 weeks corrected gestational age and <16 years
- 3) Assessed by the treating clinician to require non-invasive respiratory support, EITHER
  - A. for an acute illness (step-up RCT) OR
  - B. within 72 hours of extubation following a period of invasive ventilation (step-down RCT).



### 2.2.2 Exclusion criteria

1. Assessed by the treating clinician to require immediate intubation and invasive ventilation due to severe hypoxia, acidosis and/or respiratory distress, upper airway obstruction, inability to manage airway secretions or recurrent apnoeas
2. Tracheostomy in place
3. Received HFNC/CPAP for >2 hours in the prior 24 hours
4. On home non-invasive ventilation prior to ~~PICU/HDU~~~~critical care unit~~ admission
5. Presence of untreated air-leak (pneumothorax/pneumomediastinum)
6. Midfacial/craniofacial anomalies (unrepaired cleft palate, choanal atresia) or recent craniofacial surgery
7. Agreed 'not for intubation' or other limitation of critical care treatment plan in place.
8. Previously recruited to the FIRST-ABC trial\*

\*i.e. patients randomised to the step-up RCT will not be eligible for randomisation to the step-down RCT. Similarly, patients once enrolled to the step-up or step-down RCTs and satisfied the primary outcome of being liberated from respiratory support will not be eligible for re-randomisation to the trial even if they require further episode(s) of NRS.

### 2.2.3 Co-enrolment

Co-enrolment with observational studies is permitted without prior agreement. The FIRST-ABC Trial Management Group will consider co-enrolment with other interventional trials on a case by case basis. We will follow previous experience and existing guidelines from the Intensive Care Society regarding co-enrolment to other clinical trials to maximise patient involvement in research.<sup>26 27</sup>

### 2.2.4 Screening

Potentially eligible patients admitted ~~/(or accepted for admission)~~ to the participating unit will be screened against the inclusion/exclusion criteria by the local clinical team, supported by the site research team. Screening and Enrolment Logs will record enrolled patients, reasons for exclusion and the reason eligible patients are not enrolled.

## 2.3 Recruitment and consent

### 2.3.1 Randomisation

Randomisation will be performed as soon as possible after confirming eligibility. In each RCT, eligible patients will be randomised on a 1:1 basis to either CPAP or HFNC using a central telephone/web-based randomisation service available 24 hours/seven days per week. The randomisation sequence will be computer generated and variable block sizes will be used to strengthen allocation concealment. Randomisation will be stratified by site and age (<12 months versus ≥12 months).

The trained staff member who randomised the patient will immediately inform the clinical team responsible for the patient's care who will commence the randomised treatment. In addition, the local site research team will be notified of the randomisation by email. Following enrolment into FIRST-ABC, each participant will be assigned a unique FIRST-ABC Trial Number and a CRF completed by the local research team.

In addition, during the recruitment period a member of the FIRST-ABC study team will be available 24 hours/seven days per week to address emergency recruitment, randomisation or clinical issues that arise.

The health technologies used in this study cannot be blinded, since both devices (CPAP and HFNC) as well as the interface that delivers the treatments are already used in practice and easily recognisable by clinical staff.

### *2.3.2 Consent procedures*

Consent will be sought for the child (patient) from their parent/legal guardian as this is where the responsibility for deciding on medical treatment resides.

Children who are eligible for FIRST-ABC become so during a period of critical illness. This is a profoundly stressful time for children's' parents/legal guardians during which time there are ethical concerns both about the burden of trying to understand the trial and the ability of the parent/legal guardian to provide informed consent during a time of great distress. Furthermore, initiation of NRS is most often during an emergency time-sensitive situation where any delay to commencing treatment could be detrimental to the patient and to the scientific validity of the trial.

Considering these issues, the FIRST-ABC RCTs utilise a deferred consent model ('research without prior consent'). Once a patient is screened and confirmed as eligible for the study (i.e. satisfies inclusion and exclusion criteria), they will be randomised and the randomly assigned treatment (CPAP or HFNC) will be commenced as soon as possible.

This model, developed in line with the CONSeNt methods in paediatric Emergency and urgent Care Trials (CONNECT) study guidance,<sup>28</sup> has been found to be acceptable to parents/guardians, as well as to clinicians, in several recent RCTs conducted in the paediatric critical care setting<sup>18 29-33</sup> and is also informed by experience and feedback gained directly from conducting the FIRST-ABC Pilot Study.<sup>18</sup> As part of the pilot RCT, we asked parents of children who were randomised into the study through 'research without prior consent' methods for their feedback through a survey. This covered feedback on: the timing and content of the approach; the use of 'research without prior consent'; the participant information documentation; the format of the discussions and decision making. Results included: positive feedback was received on all aspects of the consent procedure, especially the patient information documentation and all but one of the responding parents found research without prior consent acceptable in the trial. The

reasons identified for giving deferred consent included to help other children in the future (100%) and that they felt that medical studies like FIRST-ABC are important (95%). These findings have been incorporated into our consent procedures and will be used for training at sites.

#### *2.3.3.1 Consent prior to hospital discharge - Deferred consent*

Once notified of the randomisation of a patient to the study, a trained, delegated member of the site research team will approach the parents/legal guardians of the patient as soon as appropriate and practically possible after randomisation to discuss the study (this will usually occur within 24-48 hours of randomisation). If the participant has died or been discharged from hospital prior to their parents/legal guardians being approached, then the parents/legal guardians will be approached at a later point (see *Discharge prior to consent being sought* and *Death prior to consent being sought*).

Before approaching the parent/legal guardian, the research team member will check with the relevant clinical staff that the participant is stable and that timing is appropriate. If the participant's condition has not stabilised additional time should be allowed before approaching the parent/legal representative. Checks conducted to assess appropriate timing for approach will be recorded in the patients' clinical notes.

Once approached, a Participant Information Sheet (PIS) for parents/legal guardians will be provided. The PIS will identify the title of the study and the Chief Investigator (CI), and include information about: the purpose of the study; the consequences of participating or not; participant confidentiality; use of personal data; data security; and the future availability of the results of the study. A Consent Form will be provided indicating that: the information given, orally and in writing, has been read and understood; participation is voluntary and can be withdrawn at any time without consequence; and that consent is given for access to medical records for data collection, to receive a follow-up questionnaire and for anonymised data to be shared with other researchers in the future. Parents/legal guardians will be given time to read the PIS and have an opportunity to ask any questions they may have about their child's participation in FIRST-ABC and to discuss with other family members or friends before confirming their decision.

After the person seeking consent has checked that the PIS and Consent Form have been understood, they will invite the parent/legal guardians to sign the Consent Form and will then add their own name and countersign it. A copy will be given to the parent/legal guardians to keep, a copy placed in the child's medical notes and the original kept in the Investigator Site File.

Due to age and severity of illness and its impact on the mental state of the target population, it will not be possible to involve study participants in the consenting process. Instead, assent will be obtained prior to hospital discharge if their condition allows (e.g. they regain mental capacity). Study participants will then be provided with an age-appropriate PIS and asked to sign an Assent Form, if appropriate, to confirm they have been informed and understand the study. Parents/legal guardians will be involved in this

discussion. If the participant is likely to regain capacity following hospital discharge, then an age-appropriate PIS will be provided to parents/legal guardians to discuss with the participant following recovery.

#### *2.3.4 Discharge prior to consent being sought*

In the rare situation where the patient is discharged from hospital prior to the parent/legal guardians confirming their consent decision, the most appropriate member of the site research team will attempt at least one phone call to the parents/legal guardians within five working days of hospital discharge to inform them of their involvement in the study and to provide information about the study. Following on from the call, as well as if there is no response to the call, the parents/legal guardians will be sent a covering letter, personalised by the most appropriate member of the site research team or clinical staff member, and a copy of the PIS and Consent Form (postal version) by post. The letter will direct the parents/legal guardians to the PIS for detailed information on the study and provide telephone contact details if the parents/legal guardians wish to discuss the trial with a member of the site research team. The letter will ask the parents/legal guardians to return the Consent Form to confirm whether they would like their child to continue participation in the study (or not).

If there is no response after four weeks of sending the covering letter, a follow-up letter, alongside second copies of the PIS and Consent Form, will be sent to the parent/legal guardians. This second letter will provide the same information as the first letter but will confirm that if no Consent Form is received within four weeks of the second letter being sent, then the participant will be included in the study unless they notify the site research team otherwise. In this event, the site research team should document the non-response on a File Note in the Investigator Site File.

If the participant is transferred to another hospital participating in FIRST-ABC before the consent procedures are complete, then the local research team will contact the research team at the receiving hospital to handover the consenting procedures.

#### *2.3.5 Death prior to consent being sought*

In the rare situation where a participant dies before consent has been obtained, a site research team member will obtain information from colleagues and bereavement counsellors to establish the most appropriate research/clinical team member to notify the parents/legal guardians of the involvement in the study. Deferred consent can be sought from parents/legal guardians following the death of their child and prior to their departure from the hospital; however, it is at the discretion of the site staff to determine if this is appropriate for each individual family. In this situation, the Participant Information Sheet for bereaved parents/legal guardians (B-PIS) and Consent Form (bereaved) would be used.

If deferred consent is not sought prior to the parents'/legal guardians' departure from the hospital, then the parents/legal guardians will be sent a covering letter, personalised by the most appropriate research/clinical team member, and a copy of the B-PIS and

Consent Form (bereaved) by post four weeks after randomisation. Where possible, the clinical or research team member should already be known to the family. The letter will explain how to opt out of the study, direct them to the B-PIS for detailed information on the study and provide telephone contact details if parents/legal guardians wish to discuss the study with a member of the site research team.

If there is no response after four weeks of sending the initial letter, a follow-up letter along with the B-PIS and Consent Form postal version for bereaved parents/legal guardians will be sent to the bereaved family. This second letter will provide the same information as the first letter. In addition, this letter will also confirm that if no Consent Form is received within four weeks of receipt of the letter, then the participant's data will be included in the study.

### *2.3.6 Refusal or withdrawals of consent*

If informed consent is refused or withdrawn, this decision will be respected and abided by, and no further contact made. All data occurring up to the point of this decision will be retained in the trial, unless the parent/legal guardian requests otherwise.

## **2.4 Outcome measures**

### *2.4.1 Internal pilot*

The RCTs will use a traffic light system to assess progression from pilot stage to the full trial as below:

Criterion	Green light (Go)	Amber light (Amend)	Red light (Stop)
Number of sites open to recruitment	Minimum 15 sites	8-14 sites	Less than 8 sites
Overall recruitment rate in open sites	At least 75% of anticipated	Between 50 and 75% of anticipated	Less than 50% of anticipated
Proportion started on randomly allocated treatment (CPAP or HFNC)	Over 90%	Between 75 and 90%	Less than 75%
Changes to another form of NRS, escalation and weaning carried out as per protocol	At least two-thirds of cases	Between one-third and two-thirds of cases	Less than one-third of cases

### *2.4.2 Main trial*

Primary outcome:

- Time to liberation from respiratory support, defined as the start of a 48-hour period during which the child was free of all forms of respiratory support.

#### Secondary outcomes:

- Mortality at PICU/HDU discharge, day 60 and day 180
- Rate of (re)intubation at 48 hours
- Duration of PICU/HDU and hospital stay
- Patient comfort, during randomised treatment, assessed using the validated COMFORT-B score
- Proportion of patients in whom sedation is used during non-invasive respiratory support
- parental stress, in hospital at the time of consent at 24-48 hours, measured using the Parental Stressor Scale: PICU
- HrQoL at six months using age-appropriate Peds-QL<sup>32</sup> and [CHU-9D](#)<sup>22</sup>

#### Cost effectiveness analysis (CEA) outcomes:


- Total costs at six months
- QALYs at six months
- Incremental net monetary benefit gained at a willingness-to-pay of £20,000 per QALY at six months associated with HFNC versus CPAP

## 2.5 Procedures

### 2.5.1 HFNC

A heated, humidified, HFNC device will be used to deliver a prescribed gas flow rate for the duration that the patient needs non-invasive respiratory support. The study protocol specifies clinical criteria and procedures for the initiation, maintenance and weaning of HFNC (see algorithm below).

# HIGH FLOW NASAL CANNULA



\*Titrate FiO<sub>2</sub> while on HFNC to maintain SpO<sub>2</sub> ≥ 92% (or patient-specific target)



Staff in all participating units already use HFNC – therefore, no additional training will be provided for the study. Since the medical device and the nasal interface that delivers HFNC is easily distinguishable from the CPAP device and its interface, it will not be possible to blind the subject or the clinical staff.


As per current practice, clinicians in the study will be able to stop HFNC and switch to CPAP if clinically deemed necessary. Pre-specified objective criteria to identify non-responders to HFNC are provided (see algorithm above) as a guide for clinicians considering switching from HFNC to CPAP. Reasons for switching will be recorded. Patients who switch treatments will remain in the study and continue to be monitored until they are off respiratory support.

### 2.5.2 CPAP

Conventional nasal CPAP will be provided using a set expiratory pressure of 7-8 cm H<sub>2</sub>O for the duration that the child needs non-invasive respiratory support. In order to standardise treatment, the study protocol specifies clinical criteria and procedures for the initiation, maintenance and weaning of CPAP (see algorithm below). Staff in all participating units already use CPAP – therefore, no additional training will be provided for the study.



## CONTINUOUS POSITIVE AIRWAY PRESSURE



\*Titrate FiO<sub>2</sub> while on CPAP to maintain SpO<sub>2</sub> ≥92% (or patient-specific target)

As per current practice, clinicians in the study will be able to stop CPAP and switch to HFNC if clinically deemed necessary. Pre-specified objective criteria to identify non-responders to CPAP will be provided in the study protocol as a guide for clinicians considering switching from CPAP to HFNC. Reasons for switching will be recorded. Patients who switch treatments will remain in the study and continue to be monitored until they are off respiratory support.

### 2.5.3 co-interventions

All other usual care will be provided at the discretion of the treating clinical team, as per local practice. Note that respiratory support, as defined for the purposes of FIRST-ABC, does not include supplemental oxygen.

## 2.6 Questionnaire follow-up


Each participant will be followed up with a questionnaire at six months post-randomisation to assess HrQoL. Prior to the sending of a questionnaire, survival status at six months will be ascertained either through review of medical records by local research teams and via data-linkage with nationally held records (decedents will be logged in the trial records and the follow-up process ended).

At the six-month time point, parents/legal guardians of recruited patients will be emailed or posted (as per their preference indicated at the time of consent) a questionnaire by the ICNARC CTU containing the PEDS-QL, [CHU-9DHU-2](#) and a health services questionnaire. The questionnaires are designed to take no longer than 15 minutes to complete. If a parent requests a questionnaire to be sent via post, then a pen and self-addressed stamped envelope will be provided for ease of return.

If there is no response three weeks later, parents/legal guardians will be telephoned and asked to check whether they have received the questionnaire. If preferable for the parent/legal guardian, they will be offered the option of either being sent another copy of the questionnaire via email, in the post, or to complete the questionnaire over the telephone with a trained member of the FIRST-ABC trial team.

If a patient is an in-patient at a participating site at the follow-up time-point, the site research team will be asked to approach the parent/legal guardian and conduct the questionnaire with the parents/legal guardians in hospital, if willing.

## 2.7 Participant timeline



## 2.8 Safety Monitoring and Reporting

### 2.8.1 Definitions

Adverse Event (AE) reporting will follow the Health Research Authority guidelines on safety reporting in studies which do not use Investigational Medicinal Products (non-CTIMPs).

The following definitions have been adapted from Directive 2001/20/EC of the European Parliament (Clinical Trials Directive) and ICH-GCP guidelines (E6(R1), 1996).

### 2.8.2 Adverse Event

An Adverse Event (AE) is defined as: any untoward medical occurrence or effect in a patient participating in a study.

### 2.8.3 Serious Adverse Event

A serious adverse event (SAE) is defined as an Adverse Event that:

- results in death;
- is life-threatening;
- requires hospitalisation or prolongation of existing hospitalisation;
- results in persistent or significant disability or incapacity;
- consists of a congenital anomaly or birth defect.

“Life-threatening”, in the definition of a Serious Adverse Event, refers to an event in which the subject was at risk of death at the time of the event. It does not refer to an event that hypothetically might have caused death if it were more severe.

“Hospitalisation” refers to inpatient admission, regardless of length of stay. This includes admission for continued observation. Any admission for pre-existing conditions that have not worsened, or elective procedures, do not constitute an SAE.

Important adverse events that are not immediately life-threatening, do not result in death or hospitalisation but may jeopardise the subject or require intervention to prevent one or any of the other outcomes listed in the definition above should also be considered as serious.

### 2.8.4 Unexpected and Related Serious Adverse Event

A suspected Adverse Event related (possibly, probably or definitely) to the trial treatment that is both unexpected (i.e. not consistent with the expected outcomes of the treatment being offered) and serious.

### 2.8.5 Assessment

The PI, or other medically qualified investigator as listed on the Delegation Log, should make an assessment of severity, relatedness and expectedness, categorised as follows:

#### 2.8.5.1 Severity

- **None:** indicates no event or complication.
- **Mild:** complication results in only temporary harm and does not require clinical treatment.
- **Moderate:** complication requires clinical treatment but does not result in significant prolongation of hospital stay. Does not usually result in permanent harm and where this does occur the harm does not cause functional limitation to the participant.
- **Severe:** complication requires clinical treatment and results in significant prolongation of hospital stay, permanent functional limitation.
- **Life-threatening:** complication that may lead to death or where the participant died as a direct result of the complication/adverse event.
- ~~**Fatal:** indicates that the participant died as a direct result of the complication/adverse event.~~

#### 2.8.5.2 Relatedness

- **None:** there is no evidence of any relationship to the study treatment.
- **Unlikely:** There is little evidence to suggest a causal relationship (e.g. because the event did not occur within a reasonable time after administration of the trial treatment). There is another reasonable explanation of the event (e.g. the participant's clinical condition, other concomitant medications).
- **Possibly:** There is some evidence to suggest a causal relationship (e.g. because the event occurs within a reasonable time after administration of the trial procedure). However, the influence of other factors may have contributed to the event (e.g. the participant's clinical condition, other concomitant medications).
- **Probably:** There is evidence to suggest a causal relationship and the influence of other factors is unlikely.
- **Definitely:** There is clear evidence to suggest a causal relationship and other possible contributing factors can be ruled out.

### 2.8.5.3 Expectedness

- **Expected:** the event is listed as an expected AE in Appendix 2.
- **Unexpected:** the event is not listed as an expected AE in Appendix 2.

### 2.8.6 Recording and Reporting procedures

Occurrences of the specified, expected adverse events will be recorded for all randomised patients from the time of randomisation until time of liberation from all forms of respiratory support for 48 hours.

Considering that all children eligible for the FIRST-ABC RCTs are critically ill and, due to the complexity of their condition, are at an increased risk of experiencing AEs – occurrences of non-specified, unexpected adverse events will only be reported if they are considered to be related to the study treatment (possibly, probably or definitely).

The following events will not be reported as AEs or SAEs as they are collected as study outcomes:

- Intubation or re-intubation
- Sedation
- Death (note that death itself should not be reported as an SAE, but the suspected cause of death should be assessed for severity, relatedness and expectedness as above)

All SAEs (other than those defined in the protocol as not requiring reporting) must be reported to ICNARC CTU using the FIRST-ABC SAE Reporting Form within 24 hours of the site research team becoming aware of the event. Staff should not wait until all information about the event is available before sending SAE notification. Information not available at the time of the initial report must be documented and submitted as it becomes available.

SAEs must be recorded in the patients' medical notes, on the FIRST-ABC CRF, and reported to the ICNARC CTU using the FIRST-ABC SAE Reporting Form, by email to [firstabc@icnarc.org](mailto:firstabc@icnarc.org) or by uploading the form into the secure web-based data entry system, within 24 hours of observing or learning of the SAE(s). The process for recording and reporting adverse events and serious adverse events is summarised in Figure 1.

On receipt of an SAE report, a member of the ICNARC CTU will first evaluate the report for completeness and internal consistency. Then, a clinical member of the FIRST-ABC Trial Management Group (TMG) will evaluate the event for severity, relatedness and expectedness to determine whether or not the case qualifies for expedited reporting to the Research Ethics Committee (REC). If the event is evaluated by either the Chief


Investigator or a clinical member of the FIRST-ABC TMG as a related and unexpected SAE, the ICNARC CTU will submit a report to the REC within 15 calendar days.

The ICNARC CTU will provide safety information to the Data Monitoring and Ethics Committee (DMEC) on a basis deemed appropriate by the DMEC.

#### *2.8.7 Notifying the Research Ethics Committee*

Adverse Events that do not require expedited reporting to the REC will be reported annually to the REC. This will commence annually from the date of REC favourable ethical opinion for the trial.

Figure 1: Adverse Event recording and reporting



\*If there is any uncertainty about whether the AE is associated with trial treatment, then it should be reported.



## 2.9 Data collection

To maximise the efficiency of the design, FIRST-ABC will collaborate with PICANet to make best use of the established data collection infrastructure which exists in all PICUs in the UK. All participating PICUs routinely submit clinical data to the national audit of Paediatric Intensive Care. These data are used locally by participating PICUs to monitor activity and performance. They have full access to, and ownership of the data. Data are validated on entry and centrally on the PICANet server. PICANet will produce a download facility that allows participating units to extract data required for the trial, thus reducing the burden of data collection for unit staff.

Examples of data from PICANet used in the trial analysis will include:

- baseline demographics and risk factors, including the Paediatric Index of Mortality score;
- secondary outcomes of PICU/HDU and acute hospital mortality, duration of PICU/HDU and acute hospital stay; and
- critical care daily interventions (and associate costs), based on Healthcare Resource Groups, from the index admission and any subsequent readmissions.

All patients recruited to the trial will be consented for data linkage with routine sources (e.g. NHS Digital or equivalent). Data obtained from routine data sources will include:  
date of death for deaths occurring after discharge from acute hospital, by data linkage with civil registration data

Additional data items collected specifically for the trial will be limited to the minimum required to deliver the trial objectives. These will include:

- parent/legal guardian name, address and telephone number for questionnaire follow-up at six months;
- data items to confirm eligibility;
- data to monitor adherence with the HFNC and CPAP algorithms, including escalation and weaning;
- time on any ventilation;
- secondary outcomes of modified COMFORT-B score, parental stress and sedation use; and
- adverse event reporting.

## 2.10 Data management

All participant data collected will be entered onto a secure electronic data entry system. The option of entry first onto paper CRFs will be available to participating sites. The site PI will oversee and be responsible for data collection, quality and recording. Collection of data can be delegated (as per the Delegation Log) by the site PI to qualified members of the research team, on the understanding that the site PI retains responsibility for the data collection oversight.

Data entered onto the secure electronic data entry system will undergo validation checks for completeness, accuracy and consistency of data. Queries on incomplete, inaccurate or inconsistent data will be sent to the local research team at participating sites for resolution. The local PI will be responsible for ensuring all queries are addressed and for overall quality of their site data.

Security of the electronic data entry system is maintained through user names and individual permissions approved centrally by the ICNARC CTU. Central back-up procedures are in place. Storage and handling of confidential trial data and documents will be in accordance with the Data Protection Act 2018.

## **2.11 Monitoring and auditing**

### *2.11.1 Central monitoring*

The trial team members at the ICNARC CTU will have regular communication with sites via email, telephone, teleconferences and newsletters. Adherence to the protocol will be paramount in the central monitoring plan, including a review of consent forms; eligibility data and adherence to the HFNC and CPAP algorithms.

### *2.11.2 Site monitoring*

The on-site monitoring plan will be developed following a risk-based strategy. Selected sites will be visited at an early stage. The timing and frequency of visits to sites will be based on a risk assessment, including an assessment of the sites and local research team (e.g. experience of multicentre research, involvement in RCTs etc.). It is anticipated that 25% of sites will be visited at least once during the recruitment period to monitor and discuss adherence to the trial protocol and standard operating procedures. Directly following all site visits, the site PI will be verbally advised of the core monitoring findings and this will be followed with a written report to the site summarising the visit, documents reviewed and any findings. Information learnt at site visits will be used to refine standard operating procedures, as required, ensuring clarity and consistency across sites.

## **2.12 Statistical Methods**

### *2.12.1 Sample size*

To achieve 90% power with a type I error rate of 2.5% (one-sided) to exclude the prespecified noninferiority margin of  $HR=0.75$  requires 508 events to be observed. Based on data from the FIRST-ABC pilot RCT, we anticipate 5% censoring due to death or transfer, leading to a required sample size of 268 patients per group in each of the two RCTs. To allow for withdrawal/refusal of deferred consent, and for exclusion due to non-adherence in the PP population, we will recruit a total sample size of 600 patients in each of the two RCTs. A single interim analysis at 50% recruitment in each RCT will test for superiority of either HFNC or CPAP.

### *2.12.2 Internal pilot*

Data will be analysed at the end of the internal pilot trial stage (months 7-12 of the grant timeline) on patients recruited during the first six months of the trial in both the step-up and step-down RCTs. The analysis will take place in month 14 of the grant to allow data to be collected and entered to assess all progression criteria. The objectives of the feasibility analysis will be to assess whether there has been successful site set-up, screening and recruitment, and adherence to both the HFNC and CPAP algorithms. The RCTs will progress from the pilot stage to full trial based on the progression criteria (see section 2.4.1). Where any of the progression criteria are given an 'Amber light', a management plan will be put in place by the TMG and discussed with the Trial Steering Committee (TSC). The final decision on progression from the pilot stage to the full trial will be made by the NIHR HTA programme after recommendation, or not, by the TSC.

### *2.12.3 Clinical effectiveness analysis*

All analyses will be lodged in a statistical analysis plan, a priori, before the investigators are unblinded to any study outcomes. Following best practice for non-inferiority trials, the primary analyses will be undertaken in both intention-to-treat (ITT) and per protocol (PP) populations with robust conclusions possible in the situation where both populations provide concordant results. Results will be reported in accordance with the CONSORT statement extension for non-inferiority and equivalence trials.

Analyses will be undertaken independently for each of the two RCTs. In each RCT, baseline patient characteristics will be compared between the two groups to observe balance and the success of randomisation. These comparisons will not be subjected to statistical testing. The delivery of the intervention will be described for each group in detail, including (but not limited to) number and percentage of patients who commence the randomised treatment, number and percentage who remain on the randomised treatment until liberation from ventilation, and number and percentage of patients who are changed to a different method of respiratory support or treatment escalation.

HFNC will be considered non-inferior to CPAP if the lower bounds of the 95% confidence intervals for the hazard ratio (HR) from Cox regression models on time to liberation from respiratory support fitted in both the ITT and PP populations exclude the pre-specified non-inferiority margin of 0.75 (corresponding to approximately a 16-hour increase in median time to liberation). This margin was considered adequate such that the other potential benefits of HFNC in terms of comfort and tolerability would mean that it would be likely to be preferred in usual practice. The Cox regression models will be adjusted for important baseline characteristics. The covariates for inclusion in the regression models will be selected a priori based on an established relationship with outcome for critically ill children, and not because of observed imbalance, significance in univariable analyses or by a stepwise selection method.

Subgroup analyses will be performed to test for interactions between the effect of allocated treatment group and the following baseline covariates:

- age (<12 months versus ≥12 months)
- severity of respiratory distress (severe versus mild/moderate)
- for the step-up RCT only, clinical indication (obstructive airway disease, e.g. asthma/bronchiolitis, versus parenchymal lung disease, e.g. pneumonia/ARDS, versus cardiac disease)
- for the step-down RCT only, length of prior IMV (<5 days versus ≥5 days).

As a sensitivity analysis, the primary analysis will be repeated using time to start weaning of NRS (i.e. duration of ‘acute’ respiratory support) and time to meeting objective ‘readiness to wean NRS’ criteria.

Secondary analyses of binary outcomes (mortality, reintubation) will be performed by Fisher’s exact test and adjusted logistic regression. Duration of survival to day 180 will be plotted as Kaplan-Meier survival curves, compared unadjusted with the log rank test and adjusted using Cox regression models. Analyses of duration of PICU/HDU and hospital stay will be performed by Wilcoxon rank-sum tests, stratified by survival status. Analyses of COMFORT-B score, sedation use, PSS:PICU and HrQoL will be performed by t-tests and adjusted linear regression.

A single interim analysis will be carried out in each RCT after the recruitment and follow-up to day 60 of 300 patients using a Peto-Haybittle stopping rule to recommend early termination due to superiority of either intervention ( $P < 0.001$ ) in time to liberation from respiratory support or evidence of harm from either intervention ( $P < 0.05$ ) in mortality at day 60. Further interim analyses will be performed only if requested by the Data Monitoring and Ethics Committee.

#### 2.12.4 Integrated health economic evaluation

The cost-effectiveness analysis (CEA) will take an [NHS and Personal Social Services perspective](#)~~health and personal health services perspective~~.<sup>34</sup> Patient-level resource use data will be obtained from trial case report forms (CRFs), PICANet, and health services questionnaire (HSQ). Resource use data from the PICU/HDU stay will be taken from the CRF and linked routine data from PICANet. Information on subsequent PICU/HDU and hospital admissions will be obtained via data linkage with PICANet and through completion of the health services questionnaire. Data on the level of care for PICU bed-days will be gathered through routine collection of the Paediatric Critical Care Minimum Dataset (PCCMDS) in the participating centres via the PICANet database. Information will also be collected on the additional resources (e.g. staff time, medications etc.) required to administer the interventions from site visits. Use of primary care and community health services will be assessed by HSQ at six months. Patient-level resource use data will be combined with appropriate unit costs from the NHS payment by results database and PSSRU to report total costs per patient for up to six months since randomisation. Data from the PedsQL-4.0 and [CHU-9D](#)~~CHU-9D~~ questionnaires at six months will be combined with survival data to report QALYs at six months. The CEA will follow the intention-to-treat principle and report the mean (95% confidence interval) incremental costs, QALYs and net monetary benefit at six months. The CEA will use

multilevel linear regression models that allow for clustering of patients at site. The analysis will adjust for key baseline covariates at both patient and site level.

### 3. Ethics, approvals and dissemination

#### 3.1 Research ethics

The FIRST-ABC RCTs will be conducted in accordance with the approved trial protocol, ICH-GCP guidelines, the UK Data Protection Act 2018, the Mental Capacity Act, as well as the ICNARC CTU research policies and procedures.

##### 3.1.1 Trial registration

This trial has been registered with the ISRCTN Registry (ISRCTN60048867XXXXXX).

##### 3.1.2 Central NHS ethical compliance

The trial has received a favourable ethical opinion from the NHS East of England - Cambridge South Research Ethics Committee (reference number: 19/EE/0185xx/xx/xx) and approval from the Health Research Authority (Integrated Research Application System (IRAS) number: 260536).

##### 3.1.2 Local ethical compliance

It is the responsibility of the site PI to obtain the necessary local approvals for FIRST-ABC, including formal confirmation of capacity and capability. Evidence of confirmation of capacity and capability at each participating site must be provided to the ICNARC CTU prior to site activation (see section 2.1).

### 3.2 Protocol amendments

The study will be conducted in accordance with the current approved version of the Protocol. Any proposed amendments to the research will be considered by the Sponsor in the first instance and then categorised as either substantial or minor (non-substantial) and the research Protocol modified accordingly. Agreed trial/protocol amendments will be submitted for review to NHS ethics and/or HRA dependent on the categorisation and, following the respective favourable opinion/approval, the amendment will be carried out and implemented in accordance with the HRA guidance.

### 3.3 Confidentiality

Identifiable patient data, including full name, contact details, date of birth and NHS number will be required by the ICNARC CTU to successfully follow-up participants. The ICNARC CTU will act to preserve participant confidentiality and will not disclose or

reproduce any information by which participants could be identified. Data will be stored securely.

We will also seek consent to share the patients' anonymised data or to be contacted by the study team for future research.

All data will be securely stored in a locked cabinet or in an encrypted electronic file. ICNARC is registered under the Data Protection Act (Registration number: Z6289325) and will preserve the confidentiality of participants taking part in the study.

### 3.4 Declaration of interests

The FIRST-ABC Investigators report no conflicts of interest.

### 3.7 Dissemination policy

#### 3.7.1 Trial results

The results of the FIRST-ABC RCTs will be disseminated actively and extensively. The research team has strong links with the paediatric critical care community via the Paediatric Intensive Care Society (PICS), PICS Study Group (PICS-SG), and the NIHR CRN: Children Clinical Studies Group (CSG) in Anaesthesia, Intensive Care and Cardiology, and similarly with the nursing community through the British Association of Critical Care Nurses (BACCN), the Royal College of Nursing Critical Care and In-flight Nursing Forum (RCN CCINF) and the European Society of Paediatric and Neonatal Intensive Care (ESPNIC). We also have links with the Healthcare Quality Improvement Partnership national audit programme through the Paediatric Intensive Care Audit Network (PICANet). A study website and links to social media will be created to actively publicise progress with the research and disseminate our findings.

The findings from our work will be presented at national and international conferences. A Study Report to the NIHR HTA Programme will present a detailed description of the project and the results along with recommendations for future policy, practice and research. The study findings will also be published in high-impact, open-access, peer reviewed scientific journals and relevant professional journals.

The results of the study will be disseminated to patients and their families, facilitated by the co-applicants, members of the research team who have links with PICS and the NIHR CSG, and via Family Groups we have liaised with already.

#### 3.7.3 Data sharing

We shall make data available to the scientific community with as few restrictions as feasible, while retaining exclusive use until the publication of major outputs. Once the data from the study are fully analysed and published, the dataset will be made available in line with the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) current recommendations.



## 4. Trial closure

### 4.1 End of trial

The end of the trial will be defined as when the last participant has completed follow-up (last participant, last follow-up). At this point, the ICNARC CTU will submit the 'Declaration of end of trial' to the REC.

### 4.2 Archiving trial documents

At the end of the trial, the ICNARC CTU will securely archive all centrally held trial-related documents for a minimum of 15 years, in accordance with ICH-GCP guidelines. Arrangements for confidential destruction of all documents will then be made. The site PI will be responsible for archiving all trial-related documents (including CRFs and other essential documents) held at the participating site for a minimum of 15 years after the end of the trial. Essential documents are those which enable both the conduct of the study and the quality of the data produced to be evaluated and to show whether the site complied with the principles of ICH-GCP and other applicable regulatory requirements.

Guidance on archiving will be provided to sites in the trial-specific SOP. All archived documents, held centrally and locally, should be available for inspection by appropriate authorities upon request.

### 4.3 Early discontinuation of the trial

A single interim analysis will be carried out in each RCT after the recruitment and follow-up to day 60 of 300 patients using a Peto-Haybittle stopping rule to recommend early termination due to superiority of either intervention ( $P < 0.001$ ) in time to liberation from respiratory support or evidence of harm from either intervention ( $P < 0.05$ ) in mortality at day 60. Further interim analyses will be performed if requested by the Data Monitoring and Ethics Committee.

## 5. Trial management and oversight

As Chief Investigator, PR – supported closely by the ICNARC CTU - will take overall responsibility for delivery of FIRST-ABC RCTs and overseeing progress against timelines/milestones.

### 5.1 Good research practice

FIRST-ABC will be managed by the ICNARC CTU according to the Medical Research Council's Good Research Practice: Principles and Guidelines<sup>35</sup> based on the principles of the International Conference on Harmonisation guidelines on Good Clinical Practice<sup>36</sup> and the UK Department of Health's Policy Framework for Health and Social Care Research.<sup>37</sup> The ICNARC CTU has developed policies and procedures based on these

guidelines, which are adhered to for all research activities at ICNARC. In addition, ICNARC has contractual confidentiality agreements with all members of staff and policies regarding alleged scientific misconduct and breach of confidentiality are reinforced by disciplinary procedures.

## **5.2 Trial Management Group (TMG)**

The TMG comprises the FIRST-ABC Trial Investigators (listed on page 5) – led by the Chief Investigator (PR). The day-to-day trial team will comprise the Chief Investigator, Clinical Trials Unit co-investigators (Professor Kathy Rowan, Professor David Harrison and Mr Paul Mouncey) alongside the Trial Manager (Mr Alvin Richards-Belle), Trial Statisticians (Ms Izabella Orzechowska and Ms Karen Thomas), Research Assistant (Ms Laura Drikite) and Data Manager (Ms Michelle Saull).

Quarterly meetings of the TMG will be held to ensure effective communication. In addition, the day-to-day trial team will meet regularly to discuss the progress of the trial and findings from other related research.

## **5.3 Trial Steering Committee (TSC)**

A Trial Steering Committee (TSC) will be established in line with the latest NIHR HTA guidelines. The TSC will be responsible for overall supervision on behalf of the Sponsor and Funder and will ensure that the trial is conducted in accordance with the rigorous standards set out in the UK Framework for Health and Social Care research and the Guidelines for Good Clinical Practice. The TSC will be comprised by a majority of independent members (including the Chair) and include Patient and Public Involvement (PPI) representatives, in addition to the Chief Investigator.

## **5.4 Data Monitoring and Ethics Committee (DMEC)**

An independent Data Monitoring and Ethics Committee (DMEC) will be set-up to monitor recruitment and retention, adherence with the intervention and patient safety. Meetings will take place immediately prior to TSC meetings.

## **5.5 Patient and Public Involvement (PPI)**

We had considerable PPI input into the FIRST-ABC pilot RCT as well as for this proposal. Two parents of children who received breathing support are co-applicants on this grant application and have actively contributed to the study design and procedures, including the use of deferred consent. In addition, independent PPI representative(s) will be sought for membership of the TSC.

## **6. Sponsorship and funding**



## 6.1 Sponsorship and indemnity

The Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children NHS Foundation Trust are the Sponsor for FIRST-ABC (reference: 17IA05). As the sponsor is an NHS organisation, NHS indemnity will apply for legal liability arising from the design, management and conduct of the research.

## 6.2 Funding

National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) – Health Technology Assessment Programme (HTA) (Project: 17/94/28).

## 7. References

1. Paediatric Intensive Care Network (PICANet). National report of the Paediatric Intensive Care Audit Network, January 2014 - December 2016. Leeds: Universities of Leeds and Leicester, 2017.
2. Wolfler A, Calderini E, Iannella E, et al. Evolution of Noninvasive Mechanical Ventilation Use: A Cohort Study Among Italian PICUs. *Pediatric critical care medicine : a journal of the Society of Critical Care Medicine and the World Federation of Pediatric Intensive and Critical Care Societies* 2015;**16**(5):418-27.
3. Shah PS, Ohlsson A, Shah JP. Continuous negative extrathoracic pressure or continuous positive airway pressure compared to conventional ventilation for acute hypoxaemic respiratory failure in children. *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews* 2013(11):CD003699.
4. Jat KR, Mathew JL. Continuous positive airway pressure (CPAP) for acute bronchiolitis in children. *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews* 2015;**1**:CD010473.
5. Donlan M, Fontela PS, Puligandla PS. Use of continuous positive airway pressure (CPAP) in acute viral bronchiolitis: a systematic review. *Pediatric pulmonology* 2011;**46**(8):736-46.
6. Thia LP, McKenzie SA, Blyth TP, et al. Randomised controlled trial of nasal continuous positive airways pressure (CPAP) in bronchiolitis. *Archives of disease in childhood* 2008;**93**(1):45-7.
7. Lee JH, Rehder KJ, Williford L, et al. Use of high flow nasal cannula in critically ill infants, children, and adults: a critical review of the literature. *Intensive care medicine* 2013;**39**(2):247-57.
8. Spentzas T, Minarik M, Patters AB, et al. Children with respiratory distress treated with high-flow nasal cannula. *Journal of intensive care medicine* 2009;**24**(5):323-8.
9. Ramnarayan P, Schibler A. Glass half empty or half full? The story of high-flow nasal cannula therapy in critically ill children. *Intensive care medicine* 2017;**43**(2):246-49.
10. Morris JV, Kapetanstrataki M, Parslow RC, et al. Patterns of Use of Heated Humidified High-Flow Nasal Cannula Therapy in PICUs in the United Kingdom and Republic of Ireland\*. *Pediatric Critical Care Medicine* 2019;**20**(3):223-32.
11. Coletti KD, Bagdure DN, Walker LK, et al. High-Flow Nasal Cannula Utilization in Pediatric Critical Care. *Respir Care* 2017;**62**(8):1023-29.
12. Baudin F, Gagnon S, Crulli B, et al. Modalities and Complications Associated With the Use of High-Flow Nasal Cannula: Experience in a Pediatric ICU. *Respir Care* 2016;**61**(10):1305-10.
13. Mayfield S, Jauncey-Cooke J, Hough JL, et al. High-flow nasal cannula therapy for respiratory support in children. *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews* 2014(3):Cd009850.
14. Beggs S, Wong ZH, Kaul S, et al. High-flow nasal cannula therapy for infants with bronchiolitis. *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews* 2014;**1**:CD009609.
15. Milesi C, Essouri S, Pouyau R, et al. High flow nasal cannula (HFNC) versus nasal continuous positive airway pressure (nCPAP) for the initial respiratory management of acute viral bronchiolitis in young infants: a multicenter randomized controlled trial (TRAMONTANE study). *Intensive care medicine* 2017;**43**(2):209-16.

16. Chisti MJ, Salam MA, Smith JH, et al. Bubble continuous positive airway pressure for children with severe pneumonia and hypoxaemia in Bangladesh: an open, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2015;**386**(9998):1057-65.
17. Chan AW, Tetzlaff JM, Altman DG, et al. SPIRIT 2013 statement: defining standard protocol items for clinical trials. *Ann Intern Med* 2013;**158**(3):200-7.
18. Ramnarayan P, Lister P, Dominguez T, et al. FIRST-line support for Assistance in Breathing in Children (FIRST-ABC): a multicentre pilot randomised controlled trial of high-flow nasal cannula therapy versus continuous positive airway pressure in paediatric critical care. *Crit Care* 2018;**22**(1):144.
19. van Dijk M, Peters JW, van Deventer P, et al. The COMFORT Behavior Scale: a tool for assessing pain and sedation in infants. *The American journal of nursing* 2005;**105**(1):33-6.
20. Carter MC, Miles MS. The Parental Stressor Scale: Pediatric Intensive Care Unit. *Maternal-child nursing journal* 1989;**18**(3):187-98.
21. Varni JW, Seid M, Rode CA. The PedsQL: measurement model for the pediatric quality of life inventory. *Medical care* 1999;**37**(2):126-39.
22. Stevens K. Valuation of the Child Health Utility 9D Index. *Pharmacoeconomics* 2012;**30**(8):729-47.
23. Woodcock J, LaVange LM. Master Protocols to Study Multiple Therapies, Multiple Diseases, or Both. *N Engl J Med* 2017;**377**(1):62-70.
24. Avery KN, Williamson PR, Gamble C, et al. Informing efficient randomised controlled trials: exploration of challenges in developing progression criteria for internal pilot studies. *BMJ Open* 2017;**7**(2):e013537.
25. Authority HR. Joint Statement on the Application of Good Clinical Practice to Training for Researchers. 2017.
26. Krige A, Pattison N, Booth M, et al. Co-Enrolment to Intensive Care Studies – A UK Perspective. *Journal of the Intensive Care Society* 2013;**14**(2):103-06.
27. Harron K, Lee T, Ball T, et al. Making co-enrolment feasible for randomised controlled trials in paediatric intensive care. *PLoS One* 2012;**7**(8):e41791.
28. CONseNt methods in paediatric Emergency and urgent Care Trials. Secondary CONseNt methods in paediatric Emergency and urgent Care Trials. <https://www.liverpool.ac.uk/psychology-health-and-society/research/connect/>.
29. Harron K, Woolfall K, Dwan K, et al. Deferred Consent for Randomized Controlled Trials in Emergency Care Settings. *Pediatrics* 2015;**136**(5):e1316-22.
30. Woolfall K, Frith L, Gamble C, et al. How parents and practitioners experience research without prior consent (deferred consent) for emergency research involving children with life threatening conditions: a mixed method study. *BMJ Open* 2015;**5**(9):e008522.
31. Woolfall K, Frith L, Gamble C, et al. How experience makes a difference: practitioners' views on the use of deferred consent in paediatric and neonatal emergency care trials. *BMC Med Ethics* 2013;**14**:45.
32. O'Hara CB, Canter RR, Mouncey PR, et al. A qualitative feasibility study to inform a randomised controlled trial of fluid bolus therapy in septic shock. *Archives of disease in childhood* 2018;**103**(1):28-32.
33. Peters MJ, Jones GAL, Wiley D, et al. Conservative versus liberal oxygenation targets in critically ill children: the randomised multiple-centre pilot Oxy-PICU trial. *Intensive care medicine* 2018;**44**(8):1240-48.

34. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Guide to the methods of technology appraisal, 2013.
35. Medical Research Council. Good Research Practice: Principles and Guidelines  
Secondary Good Research Practice: Principles and Guidelines 2012.  
<https://mrc.ukri.org/publications/browse/good-research-practice-principles-and-guidelines/>.
36. INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON HARMONISATION OF TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS FOR REGISTRATION OF PHARMACEUTICALS FOR HUMAN USE. GUIDELINE FOR GOOD CLINICAL PRACTICE. 1996
37. Health Research Authority. UK policy framework for health and social care research. 2017.

## 8. Appendices

### 8.1 Appendix 1 – Protocol version history

Amendment No.	Protocol version no.	Date issued	Author(s) of changes	Details of changes made
-	-	-	-	-

## 8.2 Appendix 2 - Specified, expected Adverse Events (AEs)

Specified, expected AEs that could be observed in participants from the date and time of randomisation until 48 hours of liberation from all forms of respiratory support:

- Nasal trauma
- Facial/neck trauma
- Abdominal distension
- Pneumothorax
- Pneumomediastinum
- Subcutaneous emphysema
- Facial thermal injury
- Respiratory arrest
- Cardiac arrest
- Aspiration

[This list is not exhaustive. If an AE, as defined in Section 2.8, occurs this should be recorded and reported as described in Section 2.8.6]