

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<u>http://bmjopen.bmj.com</u>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email <u>info.bmjopen@bmj.com</u>

BMJ Open

A multicentre, randomised trial of stabilisation with nasal high flow during neonatal endotracheal intubation (the SHINE trial): a study protocol

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2020-039230
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	08-Apr-2020
Complete List of Authors:	Hodgson, Kate; The Royal Women's Hospital, Newborn Research Centre; The University of Melbourne, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology Owen, Louise; The Royal Women's Hospital, Newborn Research Centre; The University of Melbourne, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology Kamlin, Camille; The Royal Women's Hospital, Newborn Research Centre; The University of Melbourne, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology Roberts, Calum; Monash Children's Hospital, Monash Newborn; Monash University, Department of Paediatrics Donath, Susan; Murdoch Childrens Research Institute, Clinical Epidemiology and Biostatistics Unit Davis, Peter; The Royal Women's Hospital, Newborn Research Manley, Brett; The Royal Women's Hospital, Newborn Research Centre
Keywords:	Neonatal intensive & critical care < INTENSIVE & CRITICAL CARE, INTENSIVE & CRITICAL CARE, NEONATOLOGY
	·

SCHOLARONE[™] Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our <u>licence</u>.

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which <u>Creative Commons</u> licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

reliez oni

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Title Page

Title:

A multicentre, randomised trial of stabilisation with nasal high flow during neonatal endotracheal intubation (the SHINE trial): a study protocol.

Authors:

Hodgson KA^{1,2}, Owen LS^{1,2,3}, Kamlin CO^{1,2,3}, Roberts CT^{4,5}, Donath S^{3,6}, Davis PG^{1,2,3}, Manley BJ^{1,2,3}.

Affiliations:

- 1 Newborn Research Centre, Royal Women's Hospital, Melbourne, Australia
- 2 Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, University of Melbourne, Parkville, Victoria, Australia
- 3 Murdoch Children's Research Institute, Parkville, Victoria, Australia
- 4 Monash Newborn, Monash Children's Hospital, Melbourne, Australia
- 5 Department of Paediatrics, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia
- 6 Department of Paediatrics, University of Melbourne, Parkville, Victoria, Australia

Contact details:

Kate.Hodgson@thewomens.org.au Louise.Owen@thewomens.org.au Omar.Kamlin@thewomens.org.au Calum.Roberts@monash.edu Susan.Donath@mcri.edu.au Pgd@unimelb.edu.au Brett.Manley@thewomens.org.au

Trial registration:

Australia and New Zealand Clinical Trial Registry: ACTRN12618001498280.

Keywords:

Infant, Preterm, Endotracheal Intubation, Nasal High Flow Therapy, Apnoeic Oxygenation

Abstract

Introduction

Neonatal endotracheal intubation is an essential but potentially destabilising procedure. With an increased focus on avoiding mechanical ventilation, particularly in preterm infants, there are fewer opportunities for clinicians to gain proficiency in this important emergency skill. Rates of successful intubation at the first attempt are relatively low, and adverse event rates are high, when compared with intubations in paediatric and adult populations. Interventions to improve operator success and patient stability during neonatal endotracheal intubations are needed. Using nasal high flow therapy extends the safe apnoea time of adults undergoing upper airway surgery and during endotracheal intubation. This technique is untested in neonates.

Methods and analysis

The SHINE (Stabilisation with nasal High flow during Intubation of NEonates) trial is a multicentre, randomised controlled trial comparing the use of nasal high flow during neonatal intubation with standard care (no nasal high flow). Intubations are randomised individually, and stratified by site, use of premedications, and postmenstrual age (<28 weeks' gestation; \geq 28 weeks' gestation). The primary outcome is the incidence of successful intubation on the first attempt without physiological instability of the infant. Physiological instability is defined as an absolute decrease in peripheral oxygen saturation >20% from pre-intubation baseline, and/or bradycardia (<100 beats per minute).

Ethics and dissemination

The SHINE trial received ethical approval from the Human Research Ethics Committees of The Royal Women's Hospital, Melbourne, Australia and Monash Health, Melbourne, Australia. The trial is currently recruiting in these two sites. The findings of this study will be disseminated via peer-reviewed journals and presented at national and international conferences. The trial was prospectively registered with the Australian and New Zealand Clinical Trials Registry (ACTRN12618001498280).

Strengths and limitations of the study

• Strength: The first randomised controlled trial of nasal high flow to improve procedure success and physiologic stability during neonatal intubation

• Strength: A low risk, easily generalisable intervention to assist with a difficult, life saving procedure

• Strength: Interventions are video recorded to enable accurate and objective data collection

• Limitation: Likelihood of intubation success may be affected by operator experience and the use of videolaryngoscopy; these factors will be addressed in a sensitivity analysis

Limitation: Due to the nature of the intervention, blinding is not possible

Introduction

Opportunities for clinicians to acquire proficiency in neonatal endotracheal intubation have decreased over time [1, 2]. The increased use of 'non-invasive' respiratory support (without an endotracheal tube), less-invasive surfactant administration techniques, and the move away from routine endotracheal suctioning of babies born through meconium-stained amniotic fluid have contributed to this trend. In extremely preterm infants, the use of nasal continuous positive airway pressure (CPAP) for primary respiratory support results in fewer days of mechanical ventilation, less surfactant administration and a lower risk of bronchopulmonary dysplasia, compared with intubation and mechanical ventilation [3, 4]. Nasal high flow therapy (nHF) is a newer mode of non-invasive respiratory support that delivers heated, humidified gas via two small nasal prongs. In preterm infants, nHF has been evaluated for the management of early respiratory distress and post extubation support, leading to widespread use in neonatal intensive care units [5, 6]. Nasal HF is commonly used in preterm and term newborn infants [5, 6], as well as in children [7] and adults [8]. Current clinical applications of nasal HF in neonates include primary support of respiratory distress syndrome, and post-extubation support in preterm infants [9].

Whilst non-invasive modes of respiratory support are utilised whenever possible for neonates, endotracheal intubation is still sometimes required, particularly for the most immature infants [10]. With decreasing clinical experience in this procedure, neonatal intubation success rates at the first attempt are low but increase with

Page 5 of 20

BMJ Open

increasing operator experience. In a large international registry study of adverse events associated with endotracheal intubation, Foglia *et al.* demonstrated that overall first attempt intubation success was 49% for intubations in the neonatal intensive care unit (NICU) [11]. O'Donnell *et al.* reviewed 60 intubation attempts and reported success rates of 24% for residents (junior trainees), 78% for fellows (senior trainees) and 86% for consultants [12]. Furthermore, the duration of neonatal intubation attempts is often longer than the international guidelines recommend [13] and varies with the experience of the operator [12]. Neonates are often clinically unstable during endotracheal intubation, due to a lower functional residual capacity and greater metabolic demand than older children and adults [14]. In one study, severe hypoxaemia (defined as peripheral oxygen saturation [SpO₂] <60%) was reported in 44% of neonatal intubations, and bradycardia (heart rate <60 beats per minute [bpm] for at least 5 seconds) in 24% [15].

Transnasal Humidified Rapid Insufflation Ventilatory Exchange (THRIVE) is the use of nHF during apnoea for laryngoscopy and endotracheal intubation. Nasal HF provides heated, humidified air and oxygen via small nasal cannulae during a period of apnoea. There is evidence that nHF use during apnoea may improve both oxygenation and carbon dioxide clearance, compared with 'low flow' oxygen or jaw support only [16, 17]. Proposed mechanisms include removal of carbon dioxide through enhanced dead space washout and supraglottic flow changes due to cardiogenic oscillations [18, 19]. THRIVE has been shown to prolong the safe apnoeic time (time prior to desaturation) in adults [17] and in healthy infants and children undergoing general anaesthesia and elective intubation [20]. In a randomised controlled trial of THRIVE for apnoeic oxygenation during general anaesthesia of 48 children aged <10 years, THRIVE significantly prolonged the approved time (time prior to $SpO_2 < 92\%$) in all age groups [20]. All but one patient in the control group desaturated to <92% within the anticipated time frame, which was predefined as twice the length of previously published age-related values [21]. In contrast, the THRIVE group had no desaturations and a mean SpO₂ of 99.6% (range 97-100%).

There are currently no published studies of the use of THRIVE during neonatal intubation, nor in emergency settings in older patients with respiratory distress. The aim of the SHINE (Stabilisation with nasal High flow during Intubation of NEonates) randomised controlled trial is to investigate whether nHF during neonatal endotracheal intubation after (1) birth in the delivery room and (2) in the neonatal intensive care unit improves the likelihood of successful intubation on the first attempt without physiological instability of the infant.

Methods and analysis

Study design

A multicentre, unblinded, randomised controlled trial investigating the efficacy of nHF to improve success and stability during neonatal endotracheal intubation. Intubations performed in the delivery room or NICU will be randomised, with a 1:1 ratio. Infants will either receive nHF during the endotracheal intubation attempt, or standard care (no nHF). Intervention will be applied for the first intubation attempt of the episode only.

Sample size

The sample size of 246 infants is based on a study of videolaryngoscope use for teaching neonatal intubation [22], which examined 206 intubations by junior medical staff. This study reported a 29% successful intubation rate at the first attempt without desaturation >20% or bradycardia <100 bpm. With a power of 90% to detect an increase in the incidence of successful intubation without physiological instability from 30% to 50%, 123 infants in each group (246 total) are required.

Patient population

Any neonate undergoing endotracheal intubation in the delivery room or NICU is eligible for inclusion. In participating centres, all infants who undergo endotracheal intubation will be screened for study eligibility. Infants already studied can have subsequent intubation episodes randomised again if 1) the premedication randomisation stratum differs between intubations, or 2) there is at least one week between the studied intubations for intubations using premedications.

Inclusion criteria

Infants undergoing endotracheal intubation in the delivery room or NICU are eligible for inclusion.

Exclusion criteria

Exclusion criteria are:

- planned nasal intubation
- a requirement for immediate endotracheal intubation as determined by the treating clinician (insufficient time for researcher to randomise and set up study equipment)
- heart rate <120 bpm prior to randomisation (as at higher risk of bradycardia as defined in the trial)
- contraindications to nHF use, e.g. congenital nasal anomaly, congenital diaphragmatic hernia or abdominal wall defect
- cyanotic congenital heart disease.

Randomisation

Each intubation episode is randomised to one of the two groups using random permuted blocks with varying block sizes. Pre-randomisation stratification is by centre, post-menstrual age (<28 weeks; ≥28 weeks) and use of premedication for intubation. To enable rapid randomisation following the decision to intubate by the clinical team, the randomisation is performed at the cotside using a smartphone or computer with online access to the REDCap [23] randomisation tool.

Clinical management

Nasal HF group (intervention)

The intervention is performed by a trial investigator, for the first intubation attempt only. Immediately prior to intubation, infants will be receiving either CPAP via nasal prongs, nasal mask or a facemask, or positive pressure ventilation via a facemask. The Precision Flow ® device (Exeter, New Hampshire) and weight-appropriate binasal cannulae will be used to provide nHF. The cannulae will be sized to occupy approximately 50% of the nares and enable leak. At the time of the face mask, nasal mask or nasal prongs being removed for laryngoscopy, the investigator will apply the

nHF prongs, with gas flow set to and fixed at 8 Litres per minute (L/min) for the duration of the study intervention. The fraction of inspired oxygen (FiO₂) prior to the intubation attempt, including the use of any pre-oxygenation (an increase in FiO₂ prior to the intubation attempt), will be at the discretion of the clinical team. The trial investigator will set the nHF FiO₂ to the same amount the infant was receiving prior to laryngoscopy, and if the infant desaturates to <90% during the intubation attempt, the investigator will increase the nHF FiO₂ to 1.0 (100% supplemental oxygen) until the end of the intubation attempt. The nHF prongs will be secured only by tightening the cannula tubing behind the infant's head; no adhesive tapes will be applied to the face. Nasal HF will continue during laryngoscopy, and the nHF prongs will be removed by the investigator when the first intubation attempt is either ceased, or successfully completed (see definition below). The commencement, duration and termination of an intubation attempt will be at the discretion of the most senior clinician caring for the infant.

Standard care group (control)

Patients in the control arm will receive standard care. The intubation attempt (laryngoscopy) will proceed without the application of nHF or the use of supplemental oxygen. In the event that an infant in the NICU is already receiving respiratory support from nHF prior to intubation being planned, this may continue up until the time of induction medications being administered (if applicable). The commencement, duration and termination of an intubation attempt will be at the discretion of the most senior clinician caring for the infant.

Outcomes

Primary outcome

The primary outcome is the incidence of successful intubation at the first attempt without physiological instability.

Definitions:

Intubation attempt: the insertion of the laryngoscope blade beyond the infant's lips

- Intubation duration: the time from the insertion of the laryngoscope blade beyond the infant's lips until the removal of the laryngoscope blade from the infant's mouth
- Successful intubation: the completion of the intubation attempt with correct positioning of the endotracheal tube confirmed by detection of expired carbon dioxide on a colorimetric detector.
- Physiological instability: the incidence (any duration) of an absolute decrease in SpO₂ >20% from baseline (immediately prior to the intubation attempt), and/or bradycardia (heart rate <100 bpm), during the first intubation attempt

Secondary outcomes

- 1. Incidence of successful intubation on the first intubation attempt
- Incidence of desaturation (absolute decrease in SpO₂ >20% from baseline) or bradycardia (heart rate <100 bpm) during the first intubation attempt
- 3. Time to desaturation (absolute decrease in SpO₂>20% from baseline) during the first intubation attempt in seconds
- 4. Time to bradycardia (heart rate <100 bpm) during the first intubation attempt in seconds
- Duration of desaturation (absolute decrease in SpO₂>20% from baseline) during first intubation attempt in seconds
- 6. Duration of bradycardia (heart rate <100 bpm) during first intubation attempt in seconds
- 7. Number of intubation attempts
- 8. Duration of all intubation attempts (successful and unsuccessful), in seconds
- 9. Incidence of cardiac compressions and/or adrenaline administration within one hour after the first intubation attempt
- 10. Incidence of pneumothorax within 72 hours after randomisation, diagnosed either by transillumination of the chest and/or by chest X-ray
- 11. Incidence of pneumothorax requiring drainage (via needle thoracocentesis or insertion of an intercostal catheter) within 72 hours after randomisation
- 12. Death within 72 hours after randomisation

Data analysis plan

The incidence of the primary outcome will be compared using risk difference and two-sided 95% confidence interval (CI). Secondary outcomes will be compared using risk difference (with 95% CI) (outcomes 1, 2, and 9 to 12), and difference of means or medians with 95% CI (outcomes 3 to 8). Planned subgroup analyses by each of the pre-randomisation strata will be performed for the primary outcome and selected secondary outcomes. Analyses will be by intention-to-treat, with an additional *per-protocol* analysis for the primary outcome. The primary analysis will be adjusted for stratification factors. Regression models with the stratification factors used in randomisation included as covariates will be used for all analyses. A sensitivity analysis will be conducted to account for repeated randomisation events within individual subjects. If an imbalance in demographics known to affect intubation success (e.g. postmenstrual age, weight, videolaryngoscope use, operator experience) is detected, a further sensitivity analysis adjusting for the relevant demographics will be conducted. Data will be exported from an electronic database to an electronic statistical package for analysis.

Ethics and Dissemination

Prospective consent will be sought from a parent for inclusion of their infant in the study, whenever possible. Prospective consent will be obtained for all eligible intubation episodes through the course of the infant's stay in NICU, in the event that multiple intubations are required for the same patient. In the event of emergent intubation in the delivery room or within the first 24 hours after admission to NICU, it may not be practical to obtain prospective informed consent. In these situations, the study has approval to use a retrospective consent process at both study sites. The infant will be included in the study, then consent to continue (retrospective consent) will be sought from a parent or guardian as soon as possible after the procedure. This consent process was pursued due to the known safety and efficacy of nHF use in neonates, and the lack of any anticipated risk compared with standard clinical practice. Furthermore, it is not always practical to obtain prospective written consent from parents or guardians of infants undergoing intubation in the delivery room or the NICU, as they may require intubation quickly and unpredictably.

Video recording

The intubation will be video-recorded in order to optimise the quality of data collection. A GoPro ® (GoPro Inc, San Mateo, California) video camera will be placed in a location that provides a clear overhead view of the intubation procedure, the infant's face, and the Masimo ® pulse oximeter displaying real time SpO₂ and heart rate data, with averaging time of 2 seconds and set at maximum sensitivity. Data will be recorded by the study investigator on a Case Report Form and verified against the video recording and corrections made where errors are identified. The observed primary outcome will also be recorded in real time by the study investigator present, to be used in the case of video failure. The observed primary outcome will be recorded by a third assessor from the trial steering committee. Additional consent to use the video for the purposes of the study and for educational or research purposes will be obtained from the parent or guardian. Consent will also be obtained from the staff member performing the intubation for the video to be used.

Patient and public involvement

The study was discussed with parents of infants who had undergone endotracheal intubation in the neonatal unit during a pilot phase, prior to commencement of the trial, in order to assist with study design and to determine the acceptability of the intervention and trial procedures.

Adverse events

Adverse events (AEs) will be captured from the time of randomisation until the time the infant is successfully intubated. AEs are recorded as part of the study design, and AEs are components of the primary and secondary outcomes of the study. The investigator will be responsible for recording all Aes, regardless of their relationship to the intervention. Conditions that are present at screening and do not deteriorate will not be considered Aes.

The following Aes will be collected and recorded on the CRF:

- 1. Desaturation: Absolute decrease in oxygen saturation >20% from baseline
- 2. Bradycardia: Heart rate falling below 100 beats per minute

- 3. Oesophageal intubation: Misplacement of endotracheal tube
- 4. Difficult intubation: defined as intubation requiring two or more intubation attempts

Serious adverse events

Serious adverse events (SAEs) will be captured from the time of randomisation until 72 hours after randomisation. All SAEs will be reported to the Ethics Committee within 24 hours of occurring.

SAEs are defined as:

- 1. Death within 72 hours after the randomised intubation attempt
- 2. Cardiopulmonary resuscitation and/or adrenaline administration within one hour of the randomised intubation attempt
- 3. Newly-diagnosed pneumothorax requiring drainage within 72 hours of the randomised intubation attempt

Study oversight

A Data Safety Monitoring Board (DSMB) was established prior to the commencement of the trial and consists of two independent neonatologists and an independent statistician. The DSMB will review the safety of the trial at interim analyses after the primary outcome is known for 60, 125 and 180 patients (~25%, ~50% and ~75% recruitment). An additional efficacy analysis of the primary outcome only will be conducted after the primary outcome is known for 125 patients (~50% recruitment). The DSMB may recommend ceasing the trial if there is a highly statistically significant difference (p<0.001) in the incidence of the primary outcome between the groups, or an important difference in the incidence of Aes or SAEs. The DSMB will also consider any new evidence that may make continuing the trial unethical.

Clinical significance

Endotracheal intubation is a life sustaining intervention. However, acquiring this skill is becoming increasingly difficult as the learning opportunities for an individual trainee decline. Many attempts are curtailed because of patient instability leading to loss of confidence amongst neonatal trainees. Improving the success rates of

 neonatal endotracheal intubation *and* maintaining cardiorespiratory stability during the attempt is important to minimise morbidity for all, but especially for preterm newborn infants. If effective and safe, nHF use during neonatal intubation can be rapidly translated into clinical practice as it is simple to use and readily generalisable to units with access to this equipment. Results from this study will be disseminated via peer-reviewed journals and presented at national and international scientific conferences.

Authors' Contributions: KH conceptualised and designed the trial protocol, and drafted and revised the manuscript. LO, COK, CTR, PGD and BJM contributed to study design and revised the protocol manuscript. SD designed the statistical analysis and revised the manuscript. All authors have read and approved the final manuscript and are accountable for its accuracy.

Funding Statement: This work was supported by National Health and Medical Research Council program grant #1113902. Nasal high flow equipment and consumables have been supplied by Vapotherm.

Competing Interests Statement: No competing interests.

References

- 1. Downes KJ, Narendran V, Meinzen-Derr J, McClanahan S, Akinbi HT: **The lost art of intubation: assessing opportunities for residents to perform neonatal intubation**. *J Perinatol* 2012, **32**(12):927-932.
- 2. Leone TA, Rich W, Finer NN: **Neonatal intubation: success of pediatric trainees**. *J Pediatr* 2005, **146**(5):638-641.
- 3. Schmolzer GM, Kumar M, Pichler G, Aziz K, O'Reilly M, Cheung PY: Non-invasive versus invasive respiratory support in preterm infants at birth: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ* 2013, **347**.
- 4. Morley CJ, Davis PG, Doyle LW, Brion LP, Hascoet JM, Carlin JB: Nasal CPAP or intubation at birth for very preterm infants. *NEJM* 2008, **358**(7):700-708.
- Manley BJ, Arnolda GRB, Wright IMR, Owen LS, Foster JP, Huang L, Roberts CT, Clark TL, Fan WQ, Fang AYW *et al*: Nasal High-Flow Therapy for Newborn Infants in Special Care Nurseries. N Engl J Med 2019, 380(21):2031-2040.
- 6. Roberts CT, Owen LS, Manley BJ, Froisland DH, Donath SM, Dalziel KM, Pritchard MA, Cartwright DW, Collins CL, Malhotra A *et al*: Nasal High-Flow Therapy for Primary Respiratory Support in Preterm Infants. *N Engl J Med* 2016, **375**(12):1142-1151.
- Franklin D, Babl FE, Schlapbach LJ, Oakley E, Craig S, Neutze J, Furyk J, Fraser JF, Jones M, Whitty JA *et al*: A Randomized Trial of High-Flow Oxygen Therapy in Infants with Bronchiolitis. *N Engl J Med* 2018, 378(12):1121-1131.
- 8. Papazian L, Corley A, Hess D, Fraser JF, Frat JP, Guitton C, Jaber S, Maggiore SM, Nava S, Rello J *et al*: **Use of high-flow nasal cannula oxygenation in ICU adults: a narrative review**. *Intensive Care Med* 2016, **42**(9):1336-1349.
- Wilkinson D, Andersen C, O'Donnell CP, De Paoli AG, Manley BJ: High flow nasal cannula for respiratory support in preterm infants. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2016, 2:CD006405.
- 10. Stoll BJ, Hansen NI, Bell EF, Shankaran S, Laptook AR, Walsh MC, Hale EC, Newman NS, Schibler K, Carlo WA *et al*: **Neonatal outcomes of extremely preterm infants** from the NICHD Neonatal Research Network. *Pediatrics* 2010, **126**(3):443-456.
- Foglia EE, Ades A, Sawyer T, Glass KM, Singh N, Jung P, Quek BH, Johnston LC, Barry J, Zenge J *et al*: Neonatal Intubation Practice and Outcomes: An International Registry Study. *Pediatrics* 2019, 143.
- 12. O'Donnell CP, Kamlin CO, Davis PG, Morley CJ: Endotracheal intubation attempts during neonatal resuscitation: success rates, duration, and adverse effects. *Pediatrics* 2006, **117**(1):e16-21.
- 13. Textbook of Neonatal Resuscitation (NRP), 7th Ed; 2016.
- 14. Gerhardt T, Reifenberg L, Hehre D, Feller R, Bancalari E: Functional residual capacity in normal neonates and children up to 5 years of age determined by a N2 washout method. *Pediatr Res* 1986, **20**(7):668-671.
- Hatch LD, Grubb PH, Lea AS, Walsh WF, Markham MH, Whitney GM, Slaughter JC, Stark AR, Ely EW: Endotracheal Intubation in Neonates: A Prospective Study of Adverse Safety Events in 162 Infants. J Pediatr 2016, 168:62-66 e66.
- Gustafsson IM, Lodenius A, Tunelli J, Ullman J, Jonsson Fagerlund M: Apnoeic oxygenation in adults under general anaesthesia using Transnasal Humidified Rapid-Insufflation Ventilatory Exchange (THRIVE) - a physiological study. Br J Anaesth 2017, 118(4):610-617.

60

2		
3	17.	Patel A, Nouraei SA: Transnasal Humidified Rapid-Insufflation Ventilatory Exchange
4	17.	
5		(THRIVE): a physiological method of increasing apnoea time in patients with
6		difficult airways. Anaesthesia 2015, 70 (3):323-329.
7	18.	Hermez LA, Spence CJ, Payton MJ, Nouraei SAR, Patel A, Barnes TH: A physiological
8		study to determine the mechanism of carbon dioxide clearance during apnoea
9		when using transnasal humidified rapid insufflation ventilatory exchange (THRIVE).
10		
11		Anaesthesia 2019, 74 (4):441-449.
12	19.	Lyons C, Callaghan M: Uses and mechanisms of apnoeic oxygenation: a narrative
13		review . Anaesthesia 2019, 74 (4):497-507.
14	20.	Humphreys S, Lee-Archer P, Reyne G, Long D, Williams T, Schibler A: Transnasal
15		humidified rapid-insufflation ventilatory exchange (THRIVE) in children: a
16		randomized controlled trial. Br J Anaesth 2017, 118 (2):232-238.
17	24	
18	21.	Patel R, Lenczyk M, Hannallah RS, McGill WA: Age and the onset of desaturation in
19		apnoeic children . Can J Anaesth 1994, 41 (9):771-774.
20	22.	O'Shea JE, Thio M, Kamlin CO, McGrory L, Wong C, John J, Roberts C, Kuschel C, Davis
21		PG: Videolaryngoscopy to Teach Neonatal Intubation: A Randomized Trial.
22 23		Pediatrics 2015, 136 (5):912-919.
23 24	22	
24 25	23.	Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG: Research electronic
25		data capture (REDCap)a metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for
20		providing translational research informatics support. J Biomed Inform 2009,
28		42 (2):377-381.
29		
30		42(2):377-381.
31		
32		
33		
34		
35		
36		
37		
38		
39		
40		
41		
42		
43		
44		
45		
46		
47		
48 49		
49 50		
50 51		
52		
53		
55 54		
55		
56		
57		
58		
59		

Reporting checklist for protocol of a clinical trial.

Based on the SPIRIT guidelines.

Instructions to authors

Complete this checklist by entering the page numbers from your manuscript where readers will find each of the items listed below.

Your article may not currently address all the items on the checklist. Please modify your text to include the missing information. If you are certain that an item does not apply, please write "n/a" and provide a short explanation.

Upload your completed checklist as an extra file when you submit to a journal.

In your methods section, say that you used the SPIRITreporting guidelines, and cite them as:

Chan A-W, Tetzlaff JM, Altman DG, Laupacis A, Gøtzsche PC, Krleža-Jerić K, Hróbjartsson A, Mann H, Dickersin K, Berlin J, Doré C, Parulekar W, Summerskill W, Groves T, Schulz K, Sox H, Rockhold FW, Rennie D, Moher D. SPIRIT 2013 Statement: Defining standard protocol items for clinical trials. Ann Intern Med. 2013;158(3):200-207

30				
31 22				Page
32 33			Reporting Item	Number
34 35	Administrative			
36 37	information			
38 39 40	Title	<u>#1</u>	Descriptive title identifying the study design, population, interventions, and, if applicable, trial acronym	1
41 42 43 44	Trial registration	<u>#2a</u>	Trial identifier and registry name. If not yet registered, name of	2
45 46 47	Trial registration: data	<u>#2b</u>	intended registry All items from the World Health Organization Trial Registration	2
48 49	set		Data Set	
50 51	Protocol version	<u>#3</u>	Date and version identifier	2
52 53 54	Funding	<u>#4</u>	Sources and types of financial, material, and other support	13
55	Roles and	<u>#5a</u>	Names, affiliations, and roles of protocol contributors	13
56 57	responsibilities:			
58 59	contributorship			
60	F	or peer r	eview only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	

1	Roles and	<u>#5b</u>	Name and contact information for the trial sponsor	1
2 3	responsibilities:			
4	sponsor contact			
5 6	information			
7 8	Roles and	<u>#5c</u>	Role of study sponsor and funders, if any, in study design;	13
9 10	responsibilities:		collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of data;	
11	sponsor and funder		writing of the report; and the decision to submit the report for	
12 13			publication, including whether they will have ultimate authority	
14			over any of these activities	
15 16	Roles and	#5d	Composition, roles, and responsibilities of the coordinating centre,	12
17 18	responsibilities:	<u></u>	steering committee, endpoint adjudication committee, data	
19	committees		management team, and other individuals or groups overseeing the	
20 21			trial, if applicable (see Item 21a for data monitoring committee)	
21 22	T / T /•			
23 24	Introduction			
25 26	Background and	<u>#6a</u>	Description of research question and justification for undertaking	4
27	rationale		the trial, including summary of relevant studies (published and	
28 29			unpublished) examining benefits and harms for each intervention	
30 31	Background and	#6b	Explanation for choice of comparators	4
31 32	rationale: choice of	<u></u>		
33 34	comparators			
35	1			-
36 37	Objectives	<u>#7</u>	Specific objectives or hypotheses	5
38 39	Trial design	<u>#8</u>	Description of trial design including type of trial (eg, parallel	6
39 40			group, crossover, factorial, single group), allocation ratio, and	
41 42			framework (eg, superiority, equivalence, non-inferiority,	
43			exploratory)	
44 45	Methods:			
46	Participants,			
47 48	interventions, and			
49 50	outcomes			
51				
52 53	Study setting	<u>#9</u>	Description of study settings (eg, community clinic, academic	6
54			hospital) and list of countries where data will be collected.	
55 56			Reference to where list of study sites can be obtained	
57 58	Eligibility criteria	<u>#10</u>	Inclusion and exclusion criteria for participants. If applicable,	6
59		Ecrocor	eligibility criteria for study centres and individuals who will eview only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	
60		roi peer r	eview only - http://binjopen.binj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	

1			perform the interventions (eg, surgeons, psychotherapists)	
2 3 4 5	Interventions: description	<u>#11a</u>	Interventions for each group with sufficient detail to allow replication, including how and when they will be administered	7
6 7 8 9 10	Interventions: modifications	<u>#11b</u>	Criteria for discontinuing or modifying allocated interventions for a given trial participant (eg, drug dose change in response to harms, participant request, or improving / worsening disease)	7
11 12 13 14 15 16	Interventions: adherance	<u>#11c</u>	Strategies to improve adherence to intervention protocols, and any procedures for monitoring adherence (eg, drug tablet return; laboratory tests)	7
17 18 19	Interventions: concomitant care	<u>#11d</u>	Relevant concomitant care and interventions that are permitted or prohibited during the trial	7
20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29	Outcomes	<u>#12</u>	Primary, secondary, and other outcomes, including the specific measurement variable (eg, systolic blood pressure), analysis metric (eg, change from baseline, final value, time to event), method of aggregation (eg, median, proportion), and time point for each outcome. Explanation of the clinical relevance of chosen efficacy and harm outcomes is strongly recommended	8
30 31 32 33 34	Participant timeline	<u>#13</u>	Time schedule of enrolment, interventions (including any run-ins and washouts), assessments, and visits for participants. A schematic diagram is highly recommended (see Figure)	7
35 36 37 38 39 40	Sample size	<u>#14</u>	Estimated number of participants needed to achieve study objectives and how it was determined, including clinical and statistical assumptions supporting any sample size calculations	6
40 41 42 43	Recruitment	<u>#15</u>	Strategies for achieving adequate participant enrolment to reach target sample size	6
44 45 46 47 48 49	Methods: Assignment of interventions (for controlled trials)			
50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60	Allocation: sequence generation	<u>#16a</u> For peer re	Method of generating the allocation sequence (eg, computer- generated random numbers), and list of any factors for stratification. To reduce predictability of a random sequence, details of any planned restriction (eg, blocking) should be provided in a separate document that is unavailable to those who enrol participants or assign interventions eview only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	7

Allocation concealment mechanism	nt <u>#16b</u>	Mechanism of implementing the allocation sequence (eg, central telephone; sequentially numbered, opaque, sealed envelopes), describing any steps to conceal the sequence until interventions are assigned	7
Allocation: implementation	<u>#16c</u>	Who will generate the allocation sequence, who will enrol participants, and who will assign participants to interventions	7
Blinding (masking)	<u>#17a</u>	Who will be blinded after assignment to interventions (eg, trial participants, care providers, outcome assessors, data analysts), and how	N/A
Blinding (masking): emergency unblinding	<u>#17b</u>	If blinded, circumstances under which unblinding is permissible, and procedure for revealing a participant's allocated intervention during the trial	N/A
Methods: Data collection,			
management, and analysis			
Data collection plan	<u>#18a</u>	Plans for assessment and collection of outcome, baseline, and other trial data, including any related processes to promote data quality (eg, duplicate measurements, training of assessors) and a description of study instruments (eg, questionnaires, laboratory tests) along with their reliability and validity, if known. Reference to where data collection forms can be found, if not in the protocol	9
Data collection plan: retention	<u>#18b</u>	Plans to promote participant retention and complete follow-up, including list of any outcome data to be collected for participants who discontinue or deviate from intervention protocols	9
Data management	<u>#19</u>	Plans for data entry, coding, security, and storage, including any related processes to promote data quality (eg, double data entry; range checks for data values). Reference to where details of data management procedures can be found, if not in the protocol	9
Statistics: outcomes	<u>#20a</u>	Statistical methods for analysing primary and secondary outcomes. Reference to where other details of the statistical analysis plan can be found, if not in the protocol	9
Statistics: additional analyses	<u>#20b</u> For peer re	Methods for any additional analyses (eg, subgroup and adjusted analyses) eview only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	9
	mechanism Allocation: implementation Blinding (masking): emergency unblinding Methods: Data collection, management, and analysis Data collection plan Data collection plan: etention Data management Statistics: outcomes	mechanism #16c implementation #117a Blinding (masking) #117a Blinding (masking): #117b Blinding (masking): #117b Blinding (masking): #117b Collection, management, and analysis Data collection plan #118a Data collection plan #118b Collection plan #118b Statistics: outcomes #119 Statistics: additional #120b	mechanismtelephone; sequentially numbered, opaque, sealed envelopes), describing any steps to conceal the sequence until interventions are assignedAllocation:#16cWho will generate the allocation sequence, who will enrol participants, and who will assign participants to interventionsBlinding (masking)#17aWho will be blinded after assignment to interventions (eg, trial participants, care providers, outcome assessors, data analysts), and howBlinding (masking):#17bIf blinded, eircumstances under which unblinding is permissible, and procedure for revealing a participant's allocated intervention during the trialMethods: Data collection, management, and analysis#18aPlans for assessment and collection of outcome, baseline, and other trial data, including any related processes to promote data quality (eg, duplicate measurements, training of assessors) and a description of study instruments (eg. questionnaires, laboratory tests) along with their reliability and validity, if known. Reference to where data collection forms can be found, if not in the protocolData collection plan:#18b Plans to promote participant retention and complete follow-up, including list of any outcome data to be collected for participants who discontinue or deviate from intervention protocolsData management#19Plans for data entry, coding, security, and storage, including any related processes to promote data quality (eg, double data entry; range checks for data values). Reference to where details of data management procedures can be found, if not in the protocolStatistics: outcomes#20bStatistical methods for analysing primary and secondary outcomes. Reference to where other details of the statistical

1 2 3 4 5	Statistics: analysis population and missing data	<u>#20c</u>	Definition of analysis population relating to protocol non- adherence (eg, as randomised analysis), and any statistical methods to handle missing data (eg, multiple imputation)	N/A
6 7	Methods: Monitoring			
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Data monitoring: formal committee	<u>#21a</u>	Composition of data monitoring committee (DMC); summary of its role and reporting structure; statement of whether it is independent from the sponsor and competing interests; and reference to where further details about its charter can be found, if not in the protocol. Alternatively, an explanation of why a DMC is not needed	12
17 18 19 20 21	Data monitoring: interim analysis	<u>#21b</u>	Description of any interim analyses and stopping guidelines, including who will have access to these interim results and make the final decision to terminate the trial	12
22 23 24 25 26	Harms	<u>#22</u>	Plans for collecting, assessing, reporting, and managing solicited and spontaneously reported adverse events and other unintended effects of trial interventions or trial conduct	11
27 28 29 30 31	Auditing	<u>#23</u>	Frequency and procedures for auditing trial conduct, if any, and whether the process will be independent from investigators and the sponsor	N/A
32 33	Ethics and			
34 35	dissemination			
36 37 38 39	Research ethics approval	<u>#24</u>	Plans for seeking research ethics committee / institutional review board (REC / IRB) approval	3
40 41 42 43 44 45 46	Protocol amendments	<u>#25</u>	Plans for communicating important protocol modifications (eg, changes to eligibility criteria, outcomes, analyses) to relevant parties (eg, investigators, REC / IRBs, trial participants, trial registries, journals, regulators)	2
47 48 49 50	Consent or assent	<u>#26a</u>	Who will obtain informed consent or assent from potential trial participants or authorised surrogates, and how (see Item 32)	10
51 52 53 54	Consent or assent: ancillary studies	<u>#26b</u>	Additional consent provisions for collection and use of participant data and biological specimens in ancillary studies, if applicable	N/A
55 56 57 58 59 60	Confidentiality	<u>#27</u> For peer re	How personal information about potential and enrolled participants will be collected, shared, and maintained in order to protect confidentiality before, during, and after the trial eview only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	9

Page 21 of 20

1 2 3	Declaration of interests	<u>#28</u>	Financial and other competing interests for principal investigators for the overall trial and each study site	13
4 5 6 7 8 9	Data access	ta access <u>#29</u> Statement of who will have access to the final trial dataset, and disclosure of contractual agreements that limit such access for investigators		9
10 11 12	care compensation to those wh		Provisions, if any, for ancillary and post-trial care, and for compensation to those who suffer harm from trial participation	N/A
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Dissemination policy: trial results	<u>#31a</u>	Plans for investigators and sponsor to communicate trial results to participants, healthcare professionals, the public, and other relevant groups (eg, via publication, reporting in results databases, or other data sharing arrangements), including any publication restrictions	10
20 21 22 23	Dissemination policy: authorship	<u>#31b</u>	Authorship eligibility guidelines and any intended use of professional writers	N/A
24 25 26 27	Dissemination policy: reproducible research	<u>#31c</u>	Plans, if any, for granting public access to the full protocol, participant-level dataset, and statistical code	N/A
28 29	Appendices			
30 31 32 33	Informed consent materials	<u>#32</u>	Model consent form and other related documentation given to participants and authorised surrogates	N/A
34 35 36 37 38	Biological specimens	<u>#33</u>	Plans for collection, laboratory evaluation, and storage of biological specimens for genetic or molecular analysis in the current trial and for future use in ancillary studies, if applicable	N/A
39 40	The SPIRIT checklist is	distribu	ted under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License CC-BY	-ND
41 42			d on 08. April 2020 using <u>https://www.goodreports.org/</u> , a tool made by t	the
43 44	EQUATOR Network in	collabor	ration with <u>Penelope.ai</u>	
45 46				
47 48				
49 50				
51 52				
53				
54 55				
56 57				
58 59				
60	F	or peer re	view only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	

BMJ Open

A multicentre, randomised trial of stabilisation with nasal high flow during neonatal endotracheal intubation (the SHINE trial): a study protocol

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2020-039230.R1
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	31-Jul-2020
Complete List of Authors:	Hodgson, Kate; The Royal Women's Hospital, Newborn Research Centre; The University of Melbourne, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology Owen, Louise; The Royal Women's Hospital, Newborn Research Centre; The University of Melbourne, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology Kamlin, Camille; The Royal Women's Hospital, Newborn Research Centre; The University of Melbourne, Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology Roberts, Calum; Monash Children's Hospital, Monash Newborn; Monash University, Department of Paediatrics Donath, Susan; Murdoch Childrens Research Institute, Clinical Epidemiology and Biostatistics Unit Davis, Peter; The Royal Women's Hospital, Newborn Research Manley, Brett; The Royal Women's Hospital, Newborn Research Centre
Primary Subject Heading :	Paediatrics
Secondary Subject Heading:	Intensive care
Keywords:	Neonatal intensive & critical care < INTENSIVE & CRITICAL CARE, INTENSIVE & CRITICAL CARE, NEONATOLOGY

SCHOLARONE[™] Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our <u>licence</u>.

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which <u>Creative Commons</u> licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

reliez oni

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

2 3 4	1	Title Page
4 5	2	
6 7	3	Title:
8 9	4	A multicentre, randomised trial of stabilisation with nasal high flow during
10	5	neonatal endotracheal intubation (the SHINE trial): a study protocol.
11 12	6	
13 14	7	Authors:
15 16	8	Hodgson KA ^{1,2} , Owen LS ^{1,2,3} , Kamlin CO ^{1,2,3} , Roberts CT ^{4,5} , Donath S ^{3,6} , Davis
17	9	PG ^{1,2,3} , Manley BJ ^{1,2,3} .
18 19	10	Corresponding author: Dr Kate Hodgson, Newborn Research Precinct, 7th Floor,
20 21	11	20 Flemington Rd Parkville VIC 3052 Australia, Kate.Hodgson@thewomens.org.au,
22 23	12	+61 3 8345 2000
24	13	Affiliations:
25 26	14	1 Newborn Research Centre, Royal Women's Hospital, Melbourne, Australia
27 28	15	2 Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, University of Melbourne,
29 30	16	Parkville, Victoria, Australia
31	17	3 Murdoch Children's Research Institute, Parkville, Victoria, Australia
32 33	18	4 Monash Newborn, Monash Children's Hospital, Melbourne, Australia
34 35	19	5 Department of Paediatrics, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia
36	20	6 Department of Paediatrics, University of Melbourne, Parkville, Victoria,
37 38	21	Australia
39 40	22	Contact details:
41 42	23	Kate.Hodgson@thewomens.org.au Louise.Owen@thewomens.org.au Omar Kamlin@thewomens.org.au
43	24	Louise.Owen@thewomens.org.au
44 45	25	Omar.Kamlin@thewomens.org.au
46 47	26	Calum.Roberts@monash.edu
48 49	27	Susan.Donath@mcri.edu.au
50	28	pgd@unimelb.edu.au
51 52	29	Brett.Manley@thewomens.org.au
53 54	30	
55 56	31	Trial registration:
57	32	Australia and New Zealand Clinical Trial Registry: ACTRN12618001498280.
58 59 60	33	Keywords:

BMJ Open

 Infant, Preterm, Endotracheal Intubation, Nasal High Flow Therapy, Apnoeic Oxygenation 	
6	
7 3 8 4 Detechering statement	
9 4 Data sharing statement:	
¹⁰ 5 The protocol will be published and publicly available, and the deidentified individual	lual
12 6 patient datasets and statistical code will be available on reasonable request.	
13 14 7	
15 8 Abstract	
¹⁷ 9 Introduction	
 18 19 10 Neonatal endotracheal intubation is an essential but potentially destabilising 	
$\frac{20}{21}$ 11 procedure. With an increased focus on avoiding mechanical ventilation, particul	arly
$\frac{22}{23}$ 12 in preterm infants, there are fewer opportunities for clinicians to gain proficiency	in
13 this important emergency skill. Rates of successful intubation at the first attemp	are
25 26 14 relatively low, and adverse event rates are high, when compared with intubation	s in
$\frac{27}{28}$ 15 paediatric and adult populations. Interventions to improve operator success and	
²⁹ 16 patient stability during neonatal endotracheal intubations are needed. Using nat	al
³⁰ ³¹ 17 high flow therapy extends the safe appoend time of adults undergoing upper airw	ay
32 33 18 surgery and during endotracheal intubation. This technique is untested in neona	tes.
³⁴ 19 Methods and analysis	
³⁵ 20 The SHINE (Stabilisation with nasal High flow during Intubation of NE onates) tr	al is
³⁷ ₃₈ 21 a multicentre, randomised controlled trial comparing the use of nasal high flow of	
³⁹ 22 neopatal intubation with standard care (no pasal high flow). Intubations are	Ũ
 randomised individually, and stratified by site, use of premedications, and 	
42 43 24 postmenstrual age (<28 weeks' gestation; \geq 28 weeks' gestation). The primary	
 44 45 25 outcome is the incidence of successful intubation on the first attempt without 	
⁴⁶ 26 physiological instability of the infant. Physiological instability is defined as an	
$\frac{47}{48}$ 27 absolute decrease in peripheral oxygen saturation >20% from pre-intubation	
 49 50 28 baseline, and/or bradycardia (<100 beats per minute). 	
51	
52	
 30 The SHINE trial received ethical approval from the Human Research Ethics 31 Committees of The Royal Women's Hospital Melbourne Australia and Monash 	
56	
⁵⁷ 32 Health, Melbourne, Australia. The trial is currently recruiting in these two sites.	
 findings of this study will be disseminated via peer-reviewed journals and prese findings of this study will be disseminated via peer-reviewed journals and prese 	ited

at national and international conferences. The trial was prospectively registered with the Australian and New Zealand Clinical Trials Registry (ACTRN12618001498280). Strengths and limitations of the study Strength: The first randomised controlled trial of nasal high flow to improve • procedure success and physiologic stability during neonatal intubation Strength: A low risk, easily generalisable intervention to assist with a difficult, life saving procedure Strength: Interventions are video recorded to enable accurate and objective • data collection Limitation: Likelihood of intubation success may be affected by operator experience and the use of videolaryngoscopy; these factors will be addressed in a sensitivity analysis Limitation: Due to the nature of the intervention, blinding is not possible • Introduction Opportunities for clinicians to acquire proficiency in neonatal endotracheal intubation have decreased over time [1, 2]. The increased use of 'non-invasive' respiratory support (without an endotracheal tube), less-invasive surfactant administration techniques, and the move away from routine endotracheal suctioning of babies born through meconium-stained amniotic fluid have contributed to this trend. In extremely preterm infants, the use of nasal continuous positive airway pressure (CPAP) for primary respiratory support results in fewer days of mechanical ventilation, less surfactant administration and a lower risk of bronchopulmonary dysplasia, compared with intubation and mechanical ventilation [3, 4]. Nasal high flow therapy (nHF) is a newer mode of non-invasive respiratory support that delivers heated, humidified gas via two small nasal prongs. In preterm infants, nHF has been evaluated for the management of early respiratory distress and post extubation support, leading to widespread use in neonatal intensive care units [5, 6]. Nasal HF is commonly used in preterm and term newborn infants [5, 6], as well as in children [7] and adults [8]. Current clinical applications of nasal HF in neonates include primary support of respiratory distress syndrome, and post-extubation support in preterm infants [9].

Page 5 of 21

BMJ Open

Whilst non-invasive modes of respiratory support are utilised whenever possible for neonates, endotracheal intubation is still sometimes required, particularly for the most immature infants [10]. With decreasing clinical experience in this procedure, neonatal intubation success rates at the first attempt are low but increase with increasing operator experience. In a large international registry study of adverse events associated with endotracheal intubation, Foglia et al. demonstrated that overall first attempt intubation success was 49% for intubations in the neonatal intensive care unit (NICU) [11]. O'Donnell et al. reviewed 60 intubation attempts and reported success rates of 24% for residents (junior trainees), 78% for fellows (senior trainees) and 86% for consultants [12]. Furthermore, the duration of neonatal intubation attempts is often longer than the international guidelines recommend [13] and varies with the experience of the operator [12]. Neonates are often clinically unstable during endotracheal intubation, due to a lower functional residual capacity and greater metabolic demand than older children and adults [14]. In one study, severe hypoxaemia (defined as peripheral oxygen saturation $[SpO_2] < 60\%$) was reported in 44% of neonatal intubations, and bradycardia (heart rate <60 beats per minute [bpm] for at least 5 seconds) in 24% [15].

Approved a straight of the str respiration or positive pressure ventilation [16]. The physiological principle underlying apnoeic oxygenation is aventilatory mass flow: in the apnoeic patient, as oxygen moves from the alveoli into the bloodstream, alveolar pressure becomes subatmospheric [17]. This in turn facilitates movement of oxygen (applied via nasal prongs) down a pressure gradient from the atmosphere into the alveoli. Apnoeic oxygenation is used as an adjunct to preoxygenation in anaesthesia, to prolong the period of time prior to desaturation in patients in whom definitive securing of the airway is expected to be difficult (due to anatomy) [17], impossible (due to airway surgery) [18], or the time to desaturation short (due to patient comorbidities) [17].

Traditionally apnoeic oxygenation was provided via 'low flow' nasal cannulae. More
recently, the concept of Transnasal Humidified Rapid Insufflation Ventilatory
Exchange (THRIVE) has arisen. THRIVE is the use of nHF (heated, humidified air
and oxygen via nasal cannulae) during apnoea. There is evidence that nHF use
during apnoea may improve oxygenation and also carbon dioxide clearance,

compared with 'low flow' oxygen or jaw support only [17, 18]. Proposed mechanisms include removal of carbon dioxide through enhanced dead space washout and continuous distending pressure, which increases the pressure gradient for oxygen to move down. Furthermore, apnoeic ventilation may be facilitated by cardiogenic oscillations, whereby variations of heart volume during the cardiac cycle promote gas exchange by altering intrathoracic pressure [19, 20]. Turbulent gas flow from nHF, combined with compression and expansion of the alveoli due to blood flow in the pulmonary vasculature, may allow some gas exchange during apnoea [19].

THRIVE has been shown to prolong the safe approved time (time prior to desaturation) in adults [17] and in healthy infants and children undergoing general anaesthesia and elective intubation [21]. Two randomised controlled trials have examined THRIVE in the paediatric population. Humphreys et al. randomised 48 children aged <10 years undergoing general anaesthesia to THRIVE (nHF at 2L/kg/min for patients up to 15kg), or to control (jaw support only). THRIVE significantly prolonged the apnoea time (time prior to $SpO_2 < 92\%$) in all age groups [21]. All but one patient in the control group desaturated to <92% within the anticipated time frame, which was predefined as twice the length of previously published age-related values [22]. In contrast, the THRIVE group had no desaturations and a mean SpO₂ of 99.6% (range 97-100%). Riva et al. randomised 60 patients aged 1-6 years undergoing general anaesthesia to receive one of three methods of apnoeic oxygenation: low flow oxygen ($0.2L/kg/min FiO_2 1.0$), THRIVE 100% (nHF at 2L/kg/min FiO₂ 1.0) or THRIVE 30% (nHF at 2L/kg/min FiO₂ 0.3). The primary outcome was approved time (time prior to $SpO_2 < 95\%$). Additional reasons for termination of the intervention were appoea time of 10 minutes or hypercarbia (partial pressure of carbon dioxide > 65mmHg). Apnoea time was longer in low flow and THRIVE 100% groups, compared with the THRIVE 30% group. Whilst there was no statistically significant difference between the THRIVE 100% and the low flow groups, the reason for termination of apnoea was time or hypercarbia in all THRIVE 100% oxygen patients, not the primary outcome of apnoea time.

There are currently no published studies of the use of THRIVE during neonatal intubation, nor in emergency settings in older patients with respiratory distress. The

Page 7 of 21

1

1	aim of the SHINE (<u>S</u> tabilisation with nasal <u>H</u> igh flow during <u>I</u> ntubation of <u>NE</u> onates)
2	randomised controlled trial is to investigate whether the use of nHF during neonatal
3	endotracheal intubation (1) after birth in the delivery room and (2) in the neonatal
4	intensive care unit improves the likelihood of successful intubation on the first
5	attempt without physiological instability of the infant.
6	
7	Methods and analysis
8	Study design
9	A multicentre, unblinded, randomised controlled trial investigating the efficacy of nHF
10	to improve success and stability during neonatal endotracheal intubation. Intubations
11	performed in the delivery room or NICU will be randomised, with a 1:1 ratio. Infants
12	will either receive nHF during the endotracheal intubation attempt, or standard care
13	(no nHF). Intervention will be applied for the first intubation attempt of the episode
14	only.
15	
16	Sample size
17	The sample size of 246 infants is based on a study of videolaryngoscope use for
18	teaching neonatal intubation [23], which examined 206 intubations by junior medical
19	staff. This study reported a 29% successful intubation rate at the first attempt without
20	desaturation >20% or bradycardia <100 bpm. With a power of 90% to detect an
21	increase in the incidence of successful intubation without physiological instability
22	from 30% to 50%, 123 infants in each group (246 total) are required.
23	
24	There is some variability in the reporting of success rates for neonatal intubation,
25	depending on level of operator experience [12] and use of videolaryngoscopy [23].
26	The uncertainty surrounding the baseline rate of the primary outcome may present a
27	limitation in this study.
28	
29	Patient population
30	Any neonate undergoing endotracheal intubation in the delivery room or NICU is
31	eligible for inclusion. In participating centres, all infants who undergo endotracheal
32	intubation will be screened for study eligibility. Infants already studied can have
33	subsequent intubation episodes randomised again if 1) the premedication
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32

2 3		
4	1	randomisation stratum differs between intubations, or 2) there is at least one week
5 6	2	between the studied intubations for intubations using premedications.
7 8	3	
9	4	Inclusion criteria
10 11	5	Infants undergoing endotracheal intubation in the delivery room or NICU are eligible
12 13	6	for inclusion.
14	7	
15 16	8	Exclusion criteria
17 18	9	Exclusion criteria are:
19	10	planned nasal intubation
20 21	11	 a requirement for immediate endotracheal intubation as determined by the
22 23 24	12 13	treating clinician (insufficient time for researcher to randomise and set up study equipment)
25	13	 heart rate <120 bpm prior to randomisation (as at higher risk of bradycardia as
26 27 28 29	15	defined in the trial)
	16	 contraindications to nHF use, e.g. congenital nasal anomaly, congenital
30 31	10	diaphragmatic hernia or abdominal wall defect
32		
33 34	18	cyanotic congenital heart disease
35 36	19 20	• infant with suspected or proven COVID-19, or born to a mother with suspected or
37 38	20	proven COVID-19
39	21	Devidencia effect
40 41	22	Randomisation
42 43	23	Each intubation episode is randomised to one of the two groups using random
44 45	24	permuted blocks with varying block sizes. Pre-randomisation stratification is by
46	25	centre, post-menstrual age (<28 weeks; \geq 28 weeks) and use of premedication for
47 48	26	intubation. To enable rapid randomisation following the decision to intubate by the
49 50	27	clinical team, the randomisation is performed at the cotside using a smartphone or
51	28	computer with online access to the REDCap [24] randomisation tool.
52 53	29	
54 55	30	Clinical management
56 57	31	Nasal HF group (intervention)
58	32	A trial investigator will perform the intervention. Immediately prior to intubation,
59 60	33	infants will be receiving either CPAP via nasal prongs, nasal mask or a facemask, or

Page 9 of 21

BMJ Open

1 2		
3	1	positive pressure ventilation via a facemask. The Precision Flow ® device (Exeter,
4 5	2	New Hampshire) and weight-appropriate binasal cannulae will be used to provide
6 7	3	nHF. The cannulae will occupy approximately 50% of the nares and enable leak. The
8 9	4	investigator will apply the nHF prongs at the time of the face mask, nasal mask or
10	5	nasal prongs being removed for laryngoscopy. Gas flow will be set to 8 Litres per
11 12	6	minute (L/min) for the duration of the study intervention. The fraction of inspired
13 14	7	oxygen (FiO ₂) prior to the intubation attempt, including the use of any pre-
15 16	8	oxygenation (an increase in FiO_2 prior to the intubation attempt), will be at the
17	9	discretion of the clinical team. The trial investigator will set the nHF FiO_2 to the same
18 19	10	amount the infant was receiving prior to laryngoscopy, and if the infant desaturates
20 21	11	to <90% during the intubation attempt, the investigator will increase the nHF FiO $_2$ to
22 23	12	1.0 (100% supplemental oxygen) until the end of the intubation attempt. The nHF
24 25	13	prongs will be secured only by tightening the cannula tubing behind the infant's
26	14	head; no adhesive tapes will be applied to the face. Nasal HF will continue during
27 28	15	laryngoscopy, and the investigator will remove the nHF prongs when the first
29 30	16	intubation attempt is either ceased, or successfully completed (see definition below).
31 32	17	The commencement, duration and termination of an intubation attempt will be at the
33	18	discretion of the most senior clinician caring for the infant.
34 35	19	
36 37	20	Standard care group (control)
38 39	21	Patients in the control arm will receive standard care. The intubation attempt
40	22	(laryngoscopy) will proceed without the application of nHF or the use of
41 42	23	supplemental oxygen. In the event that an infant in the NICU is already receiving
43 44	24	respiratory support from nHF prior to intubation being planned, this may continue up
45 46	25	until the time of induction medications being administered (if applicable). The
47	26	commencement, duration and termination of an intubation attempt will be at the
48 49	27	discretion of the most senior clinician caring for the infant.
50 51	28	
52	29	Outcomes
53 54	30	Primary outcome
55 56	31	The primary outcome is the incidence of successful intubation at the first attempt
57 58	32	without physiological instability.
58 59 60	33	
00		

1 2									
3 4	1	Definitions:							
5	2	 Intubation attempt: the insertion of the laryngoscope blade beyond the infant's 							
6 7	3	lips							
8 9	4	Intubation duration: the time from the insertion of the laryngoscope blade beyond							
10 11	5	the infant's lips until the removal of the laryngoscope blade from the infant's							
12	6	mouth							
13 14	7	Successful intubation: the completion of the intubation attempt with correct							
15 16	8	positioning of the endotracheal tube confirmed by detection of expired carbon							
17 18	9	dioxide on a colorimetric detector.							
19	10	Physiological instability: the incidence (any duration) of an absolute decrease in							
20 21	11	SpO ₂ >20% from baseline (immediately prior to the intubation attempt), and/or							
22 23	12	bradycardia (heart rate <100 bpm), during the first intubation attempt							
24 25	13								
26	14	Secondary outcomes							
27 28	15	1. Incidence of successful intubation on the first intubation attempt							
29 30 31 32 33	16	2. Incidence of desaturation (absolute decrease in $SpO_2 > 20\%$ from baseline) or							
	17	bradycardia (heart rate <100 bpm) during the first intubation attempt							
	18	3. Time to desaturation (absolute decrease in $SpO_2 > 20\%$ from baseline) during the							
34 35	19	first intubation attempt in seconds							
36 37	20	4. Time to bradycardia (heart rate <100 bpm) during the first intubation attempt in							
38 39	21	seconds							
40	22	5. Duration of desaturation (absolute decrease in SpO ₂ >20% from baseline) during							
41 42	23	first intubation attempt in seconds							
43 44	24	6. Duration of bradycardia (heart rate <100 bpm) during first intubation attempt in							
45 46	25	seconds							
47	26	 Median SpO₂ during intubation attempt 							
48 49	27	8. Median heart rate during intubation attempt							
50 51	28	9. Duration of SpO ₂ \geq 97% during intubation attempt, in seconds							
52 53	29	10. Number of intubation attempts							
54	30	11. Duration of all intubation attempts (successful and unsuccessful), in seconds							
55 56	31	12. Incidence of cardiac compressions and/or adrenaline administration within one							
57 58 59 60	32	hour after the first intubation attempt							

BMJ Open

2		
3 4	1	13. Incidence of pneumothorax within 72 hours after randomisation, diagnosed either
5	2	by transillumination of the chest and/or by chest X-ray
6 7	3	14. Incidence of pneumothorax requiring drainage (via needle thoracocentesis or
8 9	4	insertion of an intercostal catheter) within 72 hours after randomisation
10	5	15. Death within 72 hours after randomisation
11 12	6	
13 14	7	Data analysis plan
15 16	8	The incidence of the primary outcome will be compared using risk difference and
17	9	two-sided 95% confidence interval (CI). Secondary outcomes will be compared using
18 19	10	risk difference (with 95% CI) (outcomes 1, 2, and 9 to 12), and difference of means
20 21	11	or medians with 95% CI (outcomes 3 to 8). Planned subgroup analyses by each of
22	12	the pre-randomisation strata will be performed for the primary outcome and selected
23 24	13	secondary outcomes. Analyses will be by intention-to-treat, with an additional per-
25 26	14	protocol analysis for the primary outcome. The primary analysis will be adjusted for
27 28	15	stratification factors. Regression models with the stratification factors used in
29	16	randomisation included as covariates will be used for all analyses. A sensitivity
30 31	17	analysis will be conducted to account for repeated randomisation events within
32 33	18	individual subjects. If an imbalance in demographics known to affect intubation
34 35	19	success (e.g. postmenstrual age, weight, videolaryngoscope use, operator
36	20	experience) is detected, a further sensitivity analysis adjusting for the relevant
37 38	21	demographics will be conducted. Data will be exported from an electronic database
39 40	22	to an electronic statistical package for analysis.
41	23	Ethics and Dissemination
42 43	24	Ethics and Dissemination
44 45	25	Prospective consent will be sought from a parent for inclusion of their infant in the
46 47	26	study, whenever possible. Prospective consent will be obtained for all eligible
48	27	intubation episodes through the course of the infant's stay in NICU, in the event that
49 50	28	multiple intubations are required for the same patient. In the event of emergent
51 52	29	intubation in the delivery room or within the first 24 hours after admission to NICU, it
53	30	may not be practical to obtain prospective informed consent. In these situations, the
54 55	31	study has approval to use a retrospective consent process at both study sites. The
56 57	32	infant will be included in the study, then consent to continue (retrospective consent)
58 59	33	will be sought from a parent or guardian as soon as possible after the procedure.
60	34	This consent process was pursued due to the known safety and efficacy of nHF use

in neonates, and the lack of any anticipated risk compared with standard clinical
practice. Furthermore, obtaining prospective written consent from parents or
guardians of infants undergoing intubation in the delivery room or the NICU is not
always practical, as they may require intubation quickly and unpredictably. The
SHINE trial received ethical approval from the Human Research Ethics Committees
of The Royal Women's Hospital, Melbourne, Australia and Monash Health,
Melbourne, Australia.

9 Video recording

The intubation will be video-recorded in order to optimise the quality of data collection. A GoPro ® (GoPro Inc, San Mateo, California) video camera will be placed in a location that provides a clear overhead view of the intubation procedure, the infant's face, and the Masimo ® pulse oximeter displaying real time SpO₂ and heart rate data, with averaging time of 2 seconds and set at maximum sensitivity. The study investigator will record data on a Case Report Form and verify this against the video recording. Corrections will be made where errors are identified. The study investigator will also record the observed primary outcome in real time by, in case of video failure. An independent assessor will also review the video footage to verify the primary outcome. Any discrepancies or disagreements will be resolved by a third assessor from the trial steering committee. Additional consent will be obtained from the parent or guardian to use the video for the purposes of the study and for educational or research purposes. Consent will also be obtained from the staff member performing the intubation for the video to be used.

25 Patient and public involvement

The study was discussed with parents of infants who had undergone endotracheal intubation in the neonatal unit during a pilot phase, prior to commencement of the trial, in order to assist with study design and to determine the acceptability of the intervention and trial procedures.

⁵³ 30

31 Adverse events

Adverse events (AEs) will be captured from the time of randomisation until the time the infant is successfully intubated. AEs are recorded as part of the study design, and AEs are components of the primary and secondary outcomes of the study. The

1 2							
3	1	investigator will be responsible for recording all AEs, regardless of their relationship					
4 5	2	to the intervention. Conditions that are present at screening and do not deteriorate					
6 7	3	will not be considered AEs.					
8 9	4						
10	5	The following AEs will be collected and recorded on the CRF:					
11 12	6	1. Desaturation: Absolute decrease in oxygen saturation >20% from baseline					
13 14	7	2. Bradycardia: Heart rate falling below 100 beats per minute					
15 16	8	3. Oesophageal intubation: Misplacement of endotracheal tube					
17	9	4. Difficult intubation: defined as intubation requiring two or more intubation					
18 19	10	attempts					
20 21	11						
22 23	12	Serious adverse events					
24	13	Serious adverse events (SAEs) will be captured from the time of randomisation until					
25 26	14	72 hours after randomisation. All SAEs will be reported to the Ethics Committee					
27 28 29 30 31	15	within 24 hours of occurring.					
	16						
	17	SAEs are defined as:					
32 33	18	1. Death within 72 hours after the randomised intubation attempt					
34 35	19	2. Cardiopulmonary resuscitation and/or adrenaline administration within one hour					
36 37	20	of the randomised intubation attempt					
38	21	3. Newly-diagnosed pneumothorax requiring drainage within 72 hours of the					
39 40	22	randomised intubation attempt					
41 42	23	Study oversight					
43 44	24	Study oversight					
45	25	A Data Safety Monitoring Board (DSMB) was established prior to the					
46 47	26	commencement of the trial and consists of two independent neonatologists and an					
48 49	27	independent statistician. The DSMB will review the safety of the trial at interim					
50 51	28	analyses after the primary outcome is known for 60, 125 and 180 patients (~25%,					
52	29	~50% and ~75% recruitment). An additional efficacy analysis of the primary outcome					
53 54	30	only will be conducted after the primary outcome is known for 125 patients					
55 56	31	(~50% recruitment). The DSMB may recommend ceasing the trial if there is a highly					
57	32	statistically significant difference (p<0.001) in the incidence of the primary outcome					
58 59 60	33	between the groups, or an important difference in the incidence of AEs or SAEs. The					

DSMB will also consider any new evidence that may make continuing the trial
 unethical.

4 Clinical significance

Endotracheal intubation is a life sustaining intervention. However, acquiring this skill is becoming increasingly difficult as the learning opportunities for an individual trainee decline. Many attempts are curtailed because of patient instability leading to loss of confidence amongst neonatal trainees. Improving the success rates of neonatal endotracheal intubation and maintaining cardiorespiratory stability during the attempt is important to minimise morbidity for all, but especially for preterm newborn infants. If effective and safe, nHF use during neonatal intubation can be rapidly translated into clinical practice as it is simple to use and readily generalisable to units with access to this equipment. Results from this study will be disseminated via peer-reviewed journals and presented at national and international scientific conferences.

 Authors' Contributions: KH conceptualised and designed the trial protocol, and drafted and revised the manuscript. LO, COK, CTR, PGD and BJM contributed to study design and revised the protocol manuscript. SD designed the statistical analysis and revised the manuscript. All authors have read and approved the final manuscript and are accountable for its accuracy.

Funding Statement: This work was supported by National Health and Medical
 Research Council program grant #1113902. Nasal high flow equipment and

25 consumables have been supplied by Vapotherm.

Competing Interests Statement: No competing interests.

2			
3 4	1	Refe	rences
4 5	2	1.	Downes KJ, Narendran V, Meinzen-Derr J, McClanahan S, Akinbi HT: The lost art of
6	3	<u> </u>	intubation: assessing opportunities for residents to perform neonatal intubation. J
7	4		Perinatol 2012, 32 (12):927-932.
8 9	5	2.	Leone TA, Rich W, Finer NN: Neonatal intubation: success of pediatric trainees . <i>The</i>
9 10	6	2.	Journal of pediatrics 2005, 146 (5):638-641.
11	7	3.	Schmolzer GM, Kumar M, Pichler G, Aziz K, O'Reilly M, Cheung PY: Non-invasive
12	8	5.	versus invasive respiratory support in preterm infants at birth: systematic review
13	9		and meta-analysis. BMJ 2013, 347.
14 15	10	4.	Morley CJ, Davis PG, Doyle LW, Brion LP, Hascoet JM, Carlin JB: Nasal CPAP or
16	11		intubation at birth for very preterm infants. <i>NEJM</i> 2008, 358 (7):700-708.
17	12	5.	Manley BJ, Arnolda GRB, Wright IMR, Owen LS, Foster JP, Huang L, Roberts CT, Clark
18	13	01	TL, Fan WQ, Fang AYW <i>et al</i> : Nasal High-Flow Therapy for Newborn Infants in
19 20	14		Special Care Nurseries. N Engl J Med 2019, 380 (21):2031-2040.
20 21	15	6.	Roberts CT, Owen LS, Manley BJ, Froisland DH, Donath SM, Dalziel KM, Pritchard MA,
22	16	0.	Cartwright DW, Collins CL, Malhotra A <i>et al</i> : Nasal High-Flow Therapy for Primary
23	17		Respiratory Support in Preterm Infants. N Engl J Med 2016, 375 (12):1142-1151.
24	18	7.	Franklin D, Babl FE, Schlapbach LJ, Oakley E, Craig S, Neutze J, Furyk J, Fraser JF,
25 26	19		Jones M, Whitty JA <i>et al</i> : A Randomized Trial of High-Flow Oxygen Therapy in
27	20		Infants with Bronchiolitis. <i>N Engl J Med</i> 2018, 378 (12):1121-1131.
28	21	8.	Papazian L, Corley A, Hess D, Fraser JF, Frat JP, Guitton C, Jaber S, Maggiore SM,
29	22		Nava S, Rello J <i>et al</i> : Use of high-flow nasal cannula oxygenation in ICU adults: a
30 31	23		narrative review. Intensive Care Med 2016, 42(9):1336-1349.
32	24	9.	Wilkinson D, Andersen C, O'Donnell CP, De Paoli AG, Manley BJ: High flow nasal
33	25		cannula for respiratory support in preterm infants. Cochrane Database Syst Rev
34	26		2016, 2 :CD006405.
35 36	27	10.	Stoll BJ, Hansen NI, Bell EF, Shankaran S, Laptook AR, Walsh MC, Hale EC, Newman
37	28		NS, Schibler K, Carlo WA et al: Neonatal outcomes of extremely preterm infants
38	29		from the NICHD Neonatal Research Network. Pediatrics 2010, 126(3):443-456.
39	30	11.	Foglia EE, Ades A, Sawyer T, Glass KM, Singh N, Jung P, Quek BH, Johnston LC, Barry
40 41	31		J, Zenge J et al: Neonatal Intubation Practice and Outcomes: An International
41	32		Registry Study. Pediatrics 2019, 143.
43	33	12.	O'Donnell CP, Kamlin CO, Davis PG, Morley CJ: Endotracheal intubation attempts
44	34		during neonatal resuscitation: success rates, duration, and adverse effects.
45 46	35		<i>Pediatrics</i> 2006, 117 (1):e16-21.
46 47	36	13.	Textbook of Neonatal Resuscitation (NRP), 7th Ed; 2016.
48	37	14.	Gerhardt T, Reifenberg L, Hehre D, Feller R, Bancalari E: Functional residual capacity
49	38		in normal neonates and children up to 5 years of age determined by a N2 washout
50	39		method. Pediatr Res 1986, 20 (7):668-671.
51 52	40	15.	Hatch LD, Grubb PH, Lea AS, Walsh WF, Markham MH, Whitney GM, Slaughter JC,
53	41		Stark AR, Ely EW: Endotracheal Intubation in Neonates: A Prospective Study of
54	42		Adverse Safety Events in 162 Infants. J Pediatr 2016, 168:62-66 e66.
55	43	16.	Lyons C, Callaghan M: Apnoeic oxygenation in paediatric anaesthesia: a narrative
56 57	44		review . Anaesthesia 2020.
58	45	17.	Patel A, Nouraei SA: Transnasal Humidified Rapid-Insufflation Ventilatory Exchange
59	46		(THRIVE): a physiological method of increasing apnoea time in patients with
60	47		difficult airways. Anaesthesia 2015, 70(3):323-329.

2			
2 3	1	18.	Gustafsson IM, Lodenius A, Tunelli J, Ullman J, Jonsson Fagerlund M: Apnoeic
4	2	10.	oxygenation in adults under general anaesthesia using Transnasal Humidified
5 6	3		Rapid-Insufflation Ventilatory Exchange (THRIVE) - a physiological study. Br J
7	4		Anaesth 2017, 118 (4):610-617.
8	5	19.	Hermez LA, Spence CJ, Payton MJ, Nouraei SAR, Patel A, Barnes TH: A physiological
9	6		study to determine the mechanism of carbon dioxide clearance during apnoea
10 11	7		when using transnasal humidified rapid insufflation ventilatory exchange (THRIVE).
12	8		Anaesthesia 2019, 74 (4):441-449.
13	9	20.	Lyons C, Callaghan M: Uses and mechanisms of apnoeic oxygenation: a narrative
14 15	10		review . Anaesthesia 2019, 74 (4):497-507.
15 16	11	21.	Humphreys S, Lee-Archer P, Reyne G, Long D, Williams T, Schibler A: Transnasal
17	12		humidified rapid-insufflation ventilatory exchange (THRIVE) in children: a
18	13		randomized controlled trial. Br J Anaesth 2017, 118(2):232-238.
19 20	14	22.	Patel R, Lenczyk M, Hannallah RS, McGill WA: Age and the onset of desaturation in
20 21	15		apnoeic children. Can J Anaesth 1994, 41 (9):771-774.
22	16	23.	O'Shea JE, Thio M, Kamlin CO, McGrory L, Wong C, John J, Roberts C, Kuschel C, Davis
23	17		PG: Videolaryngoscopy to Teach Neonatal Intubation: A Randomized Trial.
24 25	18		Pediatrics 2015, 136 (5):912-919.
25	19	24.	Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG: Research electronic
27	20		data capture (REDCap)a metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for
28	21		providing translational research informatics support. J Biomed Inform 2009,
29 30	22		42 (2):377-381.
31	23		
32			42(2):377-381.
33			
34 35			
36			
37			
38 39			
39 40			
41			
42			
43 44			
44			
46			
47			
48 49			
50			
51			
52			
53 54			
55			
56			
57 58			
58 59			
60			

Reporting checklist for protocol of a clinical trial.

Based on the SPIRIT guidelines.

Instructions to authors

Complete this checklist by entering the page numbers from your manuscript where readers will find each of the items listed below.

Your article may not currently address all the items on the checklist. Please modify your text to include the missing information. If you are certain that an item does not apply, please write "n/a" and provide a short explanation.

Upload your completed checklist as an extra file when you submit to a journal.

In your methods section, say that you used the SPIRITreporting guidelines, and cite them as:

Chan A-W, Tetzlaff JM, Altman DG, Laupacis A, Gøtzsche PC, Krleža-Jerić K, Hróbjartsson A, Mann H, Dickersin K, Berlin J, Doré C, Parulekar W, Summerskill W, Groves T, Schulz K, Sox H, Rockhold FW, Rennie D, Moher D. SPIRIT 2013 Statement: Defining standard protocol items for clinical trials. Ann Intern Med. 2013;158(3):200-207

			Page
		Reporting Item	Number
Administrative			
information			
Title	<u>#1</u>	Descriptive title identifying the study design, population,	1
		interventions, and, if applicable, trial acronym	
Trial registration	<u>#2a</u>	Trial identifier and registry name. If not yet registered, name of	2
		intended registry	
Trial registration: data	<u>#2b</u>	All items from the World Health Organization Trial Registration	2
set		Data Set	
Protocol version	<u>#3</u>	Date and version identifier	2
Funding	<u>#4</u>	Sources and types of financial, material, and other support	13
Roles and	#5a	Names, affiliations, and roles of protocol contributors	13
responsibilities:		r in the second s	
contributorship			
F	or peer re	eview only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	

1 2 3 4 5 6	Roles and responsibilities: sponsor contact information	<u>#5b</u>	Name and contact information for the trial sponsor	1
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Roles and responsibilities: sponsor and funder	<u>#5c</u>	Role of study sponsor and funders, if any, in study design; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of data; writing of the report; and the decision to submit the report for publication, including whether they will have ultimate authority over any of these activities	13
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Roles and responsibilities: committees	<u>#5d</u>	Composition, roles, and responsibilities of the coordinating centre, steering committee, endpoint adjudication committee, data management team, and other individuals or groups overseeing the trial, if applicable (see Item 21a for data monitoring committee)	12
24 25	Introduction			
26 27 28 29 30 31 32	Background and rationale	<u>#6a</u>	Description of research question and justification for undertaking the trial, including summary of relevant studies (published and unpublished) examining benefits and harms for each intervention	4
33 34 35 36	Background and rationale: choice of	<u>#6b</u>	Explanation for choice of comparators	4
37 38	comparators			
39 40	Objectives	<u>#7</u>	Specific objectives or hypotheses	5
41 42 43 44 45 46	Trial design	<u>#8</u>	Description of trial design including type of trial (eg, parallel group, crossover, factorial, single group), allocation ratio, and framework (eg, superiority, equivalence, non-inferiority, exploratory)	6
47 48	Methods:			
49 50	Participants,			
51 52	interventions, and			
53	outcomes			
54 55 56 57 58	Study setting	<u>#9</u>	Description of study settings (eg, community clinic, academic hospital) and list of countries where data will be collected. Reference to where list of study sites can be obtained	6
59 60		For peer re	view only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	

1 2 3 4 5	Eligibility criteria	<u>#10</u>	Inclusion and exclusion criteria for participants. If applicable, eligibility criteria for study centres and individuals who will perform the interventions (eg, surgeons, psychotherapists)	6
6 7 8 9	Interventions: description	<u>#11a</u>	Interventions for each group with sufficient detail to allow replication, including how and when they will be administered	7
10 11 12 13 14	Interventions: modifications	<u>#11b</u>	Criteria for discontinuing or modifying allocated interventions for a given trial participant (eg, drug dose change in response to harms, participant request, or improving / worsening disease)	7
15 16 17 18 19	Interventions: adherance	<u>#11c</u>	Strategies to improve adherence to intervention protocols, and any procedures for monitoring adherence (eg, drug tablet return; laboratory tests)	7
20 21 22 23	Interventions: concomitant care	<u>#11d</u>	Relevant concomitant care and interventions that are permitted or prohibited during the trial	7
24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33	Outcomes	<u>#12</u>	Primary, secondary, and other outcomes, including the specific measurement variable (eg, systolic blood pressure), analysis metric (eg, change from baseline, final value, time to event), method of aggregation (eg, median, proportion), and time point for each outcome. Explanation of the clinical relevance of chosen efficacy and harm outcomes is strongly recommended	8
34 35 36 37 38	Participant timeline	<u>#13</u>	Time schedule of enrolment, interventions (including any run- ins and washouts), assessments, and visits for participants. A schematic diagram is highly recommended (see Figure)	7
39 40 41 42 43	Sample size	<u>#14</u>	Estimated number of participants needed to achieve study objectives and how it was determined, including clinical and statistical assumptions supporting any sample size calculations	6
44 45 46 47	Recruitment	<u>#15</u>	Strategies for achieving adequate participant enrolment to reach target sample size	6
48 49	Methods: Assignment			
50 51	of interventions (for			
52 53	controlled trials)			
53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60	Allocation: sequence generation	<u>#16a</u>	Method of generating the allocation sequence (eg, computer- generated random numbers), and list of any factors for stratification. To reduce predictability of a random sequence, details of any planned restriction (eg, blocking) should be view only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	7

BMJ	Open
-----	------

1 2 3			provided in a separate document that is unavailable to those who enrol participants or assign interventions	
4 5 6 7 8 9	Allocation concealment mechanism	<u>#16b</u>	Mechanism of implementing the allocation sequence (eg, central telephone; sequentially numbered, opaque, sealed envelopes), describing any steps to conceal the sequence until interventions are assigned	7
10 11 12 13	Allocation: implementation	<u>#16c</u>	Who will generate the allocation sequence, who will enrol participants, and who will assign participants to interventions	7
14 15 16 17 18	Blinding (masking)	<u>#17a</u>	Who will be blinded after assignment to interventions (eg, trial participants, care providers, outcome assessors, data analysts), and how	N/A
19 20 21 22 23 24	Blinding (masking): emergency unblinding	<u>#17b</u>	If blinded, circumstances under which unblinding is permissible, and procedure for revealing a participant's allocated intervention during the trial	N/A
25 26 27	Methods: Data collection,			
28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49	management, and analysis			
	Data collection plan	<u>#18a</u>	Plans for assessment and collection of outcome, baseline, and other trial data, including any related processes to promote data quality (eg, duplicate measurements, training of assessors) and a description of study instruments (eg, questionnaires, laboratory tests) along with their reliability and validity, if known. Reference to where data collection forms can be found, if not in the protocol	9
	Data collection plan: retention	<u>#18b</u>	Plans to promote participant retention and complete follow-up, including list of any outcome data to be collected for participants who discontinue or deviate from intervention protocols	9
50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57	Data management	<u>#19</u>	Plans for data entry, coding, security, and storage, including any related processes to promote data quality (eg, double data entry; range checks for data values). Reference to where details of data management procedures can be found, if not in the protocol	9
58 59 60	F	or peer re	view only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	

Statistics: outcomes	<u>#20a</u>	Statistical methods for analysing primary and secondary outcomes. Reference to where other details of the statistical analysis plan can be found, if not in the protocol	9
Statistics: additional analyses	<u>#20b</u>	Methods for any additional analyses (eg, subgroup and adjusted analyses)	9
Statistics: analysis population and missing data	<u>#20c</u>	Definition of analysis population relating to protocol non- adherence (eg, as randomised analysis), and any statistical methods to handle missing data (eg, multiple imputation)	N/A
Methods: Monitoring			
Data monitoring: formal committee	<u>#21a</u>	Composition of data monitoring committee (DMC); summary of its role and reporting structure; statement of whether it is independent from the sponsor and competing interests; and reference to where further details about its charter can be found, if not in the protocol. Alternatively, an explanation of why a DMC is not needed	12
Data monitoring: interim analysis	<u>#21b</u>	Description of any interim analyses and stopping guidelines, including who will have access to these interim results and make the final decision to terminate the trial	12
Harms	<u>#22</u>	Plans for collecting, assessing, reporting, and managing solicited and spontaneously reported adverse events and other unintended effects of trial interventions or trial conduct	11
Auditing	<u>#23</u>	Frequency and procedures for auditing trial conduct, if any, and whether the process will be independent from investigators and the sponsor	N/A
Ethics and			
dissemination			
Research ethics approval	<u>#24</u>	Plans for seeking research ethics committee / institutional review board (REC / IRB) approval	3
Protocol amendments	<u>#25</u> r peer re	Plans for communicating important protocol modifications (eg, changes to eligibility criteria, outcomes, analyses) to relevant parties (eg, investigators, REC / IRBs, trial participants, trial registries, journals, regulators)	2
	Statistics: additional analyses Statistics: analysis population and missing data Methods: Monitoring formal committee Data monitoring: interim analysis Harms Auditing Auditing Ethics and dissemination Research ethics approval Protocol amendments	Statistics: additional analyses#20bStatistics: analysis population and missing data#20cMethods: Monitoring formal committee#21aData monitoring: formal committee#21bData monitoring: interim analysis#21bAuditing#222Ethics and dissemination#223Research ethics approval#24Protocol amendments#25	outcomes. Reference to where other details of the statistical analysis plan can be found, if not in the protocolStatistics: additional#20bMethods for any additional analyses (eg, subgroup and adjusted analyses)Statistics: analysis population and missing#20cDefinition of analysis population relating to protocol non- adherence (eg, as randomised analysis), and any statistical methods to handle missing data (eg, multiple imputation)Methods: Monitoring totata monitoring:#21aComposition of data monitoring committee (DMC); summary of is role and reporting structure; statement of whether it is independent from the sponsor and competing interests; and reference to where further details about its charter can be found, if not in the protocol. Alternatively, an explanation of why a DMC is not neededData monitoring: interim analysis#21bDescription of any interim analyses and stopping guidelines, including who will have access to these interim results and make the final decision to terminate the trialHarms#22bPlans for collecting, assessing, reporting, and managing solicited and spontaneously reported adverse events and other unintended effects of trial interventions or trial conduct.Auditing#22bFrequency and procedures for auditing trial conduct, if any, and whether the process will be independent from investigators and the sponsorExtinse and dissemination#24bPlans for communicating important protocol modifications (eg, changes to eligibility criteria, outcomes, analyses) to relevant partice (eg, investigators, REC / IRBs, trial participants, trial

1 2 3	Consent or assent	<u>#26a</u>	Who will obtain informed consent or assent from potential trial participants or authorised surrogates, and how (see Item 32)	10		
4 5 6 7 8 9	Consent or assent: ancillary studies	<u>#26b</u>	Additional consent provisions for collection and use of participant data and biological specimens in ancillary studies, if applicable	N/A		
10 11 12 13 14	Confidentiality	<u>#27</u>	How personal information about potential and enrolled participants will be collected, shared, and maintained in order to protect confidentiality before, during, and after the trial	9		
15 16 17 18	Declaration of interests	<u>#28</u>	Financial and other competing interests for principal investigators for the overall trial and each study site	13		
19 20 21 22 23	Data access	<u>#29</u>	Statement of who will have access to the final trial dataset, and disclosure of contractual agreements that limit such access for investigators	9		
24 25 26 27	Ancillary and post trial care	<u>#30</u>	Provisions, if any, for ancillary and post-trial care, and for compensation to those who suffer harm from trial participation	N/A		
28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35	Dissemination policy: trial results	<u>#31a</u>	Plans for investigators and sponsor to communicate trial results to participants, healthcare professionals, the public, and other relevant groups (eg, via publication, reporting in results databases, or other data sharing arrangements), including any publication restrictions	10		
36 37 38 39	Dissemination policy: authorship	<u>#31b</u>	Authorship eligibility guidelines and any intended use of professional writers	N/A		
40 41 42 43	Dissemination policy: reproducible research	<u>#31c</u>	Plans, if any, for granting public access to the full protocol, participant-level dataset, and statistical code	2		
44 45	Appendices					
46 47 48 49	Informed consent materials	<u>#32</u>	Model consent form and other related documentation given to participants and authorised surrogates	Uploaded		
50 51 52 53 54	Biological specimens	<u>#33</u>	Plans for collection, laboratory evaluation, and storage of biological specimens for genetic or molecular analysis in the current trial and for future use in ancillary studies, if applicable	N/A		
55 56 57 58	The SPIRIT checklist is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (3.0. This checklist was completed on 08. April 2020 using <u>https://www.goodreports.org/</u> , a tool ma					
58 59 60	EQUATOR Network in collaboration with <u>Penelope.ai</u>					