Prehospital continuous positive airway pressure for acute respiratory failure: the ACUTE feasibility RCT

Gordon W Fuller,^{1*} Samuel Keating,² Steve Goodacre,¹ Esther Herbert,² Gavin D Perkins,³ Andy Rosser,⁴ Imogen Gunson,⁴ Joshua Miller,⁴ Matthew Ward,⁴ Mike Bradburn,² Praveen Thokala,⁵ Tim Harris,⁶ Margaret M Marsh,⁷ Alexander J Scott² and Cindy Cooper²

- ¹Centre for Urgent and Emergency Care Research, School of Health and Related Research (ScHARR), University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK
- ²Clinical Trials Research Unit, School of Health and Related Research (ScHARR), University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK
- ³Warwick Clinical Trials Unit, University of Warwick, Coventry, UK
- ⁴West Midlands Ambulance Service, Brierley Hill, UK
- ⁵Health Economics and Decision Science, School of Health and Related Research (ScHARR), University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK
- ⁶Centre for Neuroscience and Trauma, Blizard Institute, Queen Mary University of London, London, UK
- ⁷Sheffield Emergency Care Forum, Royal Hallamshire Hospital, Sheffield, UK

*Corresponding author g.fuller@sheffield.ac.uk

Declared competing interests of authors: Steve Goodacre is Deputy Director of the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Health Technology Assessment (HTA) programme (2016–present), chairperson of the NIHR HTA Commissioning Board (2016–present) and a member of the NIHR HTA Funding Strategy Group (2016–present). Esther Herbert reports grants from NIHR during the conduct of the study, outside the submitted work. Gavin Perkins is a NIHR Senior Investigator and a member of the Programme Grants for Applied Research board (2016–present). Cindy Cooper is a member of the NIHR Clinical Trials Unit Standing Advisory Committee (2016–present) and of the UK Clinical Research Collaboration Registered Clinical Trials Unit Network Executive Group (2016–present).

Disclaimer: This report contains transcripts of interviews conducted in the course of the research and contains language that may offend some readers.

Published February 2021 DOI: 10.3310/hta25070

Plain English summary

The ACUTE feasibility RCT Health Technology Assessment 2021; Vol. 25: No. 7 DOI: 10.3310/hta25070

NIHR Journals Library www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

Plain English summary

A cute respiratory failure is a life-threatening medical emergency. It occurs when heart or lung disease suddenly develops, or deteriorates, and leads to the patient being unable to maintain oxygen levels in their blood. Continuous positive airway pressure is a potentially useful treatment that could be used by paramedics. It involves delivering oxygen under increased pressure through a tight-fitting face mask. However, it is uncertain whether or not it could work effectively in NHS ambulance services, or if it represents value for money.

The Ambulance continuous positive airway pressure (CPAP): Use, Treatment Effect and economics (ACUTE) trial investigated whether or not it is possible and worthwhile to undertake a full-scale study comparing continuous positive airway pressure with normal paramedic treatment. Paramedics identified adults with acute respiratory failure when attending 999 emergency calls. Half were randomly assigned to receive continuous positive airway pressure, whereas the other half were treated normally. Patients were then followed up to see what happened to them.

Fewer patients than expected were entered into the trial, but paramedics were able to provide treatment with continuous positive airway pressure, and most patients were successfully followed up. It therefore seems possible to do a full-scale trial. A cost-effectiveness model also showed that it is uncertain whether or not continuous positive airway pressure represents value for money for the NHS, so further research might be worthwhile, if continuous positive airway pressure is thought to be effective.

However, examination of patients recruited to the trial uncovered important doubts about whether or not continuous positive airway pressure would help them. One-quarter of patients were not able to tolerate the tight continuous positive airway pressure mask. Some of the patients had conditions that are not usually treated by continuous positive airway pressure, or had severe underlying disease that could not be helped by this treatment. Others had collapsed lungs that could have been made worse by continuous positive airway pressure. This means that, although a full-scale trial may be possible, it is difficult to see how continuous positive airway pressure could save enough lives to make a trial worthwhile.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2021. This work was produced by Fuller *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This issue may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts (or indeed, the full report) may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Health Technology Assessment

ISSN 1366-5278 (Print)

ISSN 2046-4924 (Online)

Impact factor: 3.370

Health Technology Assessment is indexed in MEDLINE, CINAHL, EMBASE, the Cochrane Library and Clarivate Analytics Science Citation Index.

This journal is a member of and subscribes to the principles of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (www.publicationethics.org/).

Editorial contact: journals.library@nihr.ac.uk

The full HTA archive is freely available to view online at www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/hta. Print-on-demand copies can be purchased from the report pages of the NIHR Journals Library website: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

Criteria for inclusion in the Health Technology Assessment journal

Reports are published in *Health Technology Assessment* (HTA) if (1) they have resulted from work for the HTA programme, and (2) they are of a sufficiently high scientific quality as assessed by the reviewers and editors.

Reviews in *Health Technology Assessment* are termed 'systematic' when the account of the search appraisal and synthesis methods (to minimise biases and random errors) would, in theory, permit the replication of the review by others.

HTA programme

Health Technology Assessment (HTA) research is undertaken where some evidence already exists to show that a technology can be effective and this needs to be compared to the current standard intervention to see which works best. Research can evaluate any intervention used in the treatment, prevention or diagnosis of disease, provided the study outcomes lead to findings that have the potential to be of direct benefit to NHS patients. Technologies in this context mean any method used to promote health; prevent and treat disease; and improve rehabilitation or long-term care. They are not confined to new drugs and include any intervention used in the treatment, prevention or diagnosis of disease.

The journal is indexed in NHS Evidence via its abstracts included in MEDLINE and its Technology Assessment Reports inform National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidance. HTA research is also an important source of evidence for National Screening Committee (NSC) policy decisions.

This report

The research reported in this issue of the journal was funded by the HTA programme as project number 15/08/40. The contractual start date was in July 2016. The draft report began editorial review in April 2019 and was accepted for publication in October 2019. The authors have been wholly responsible for all data collection, analysis and interpretation, and for writing up their work. The HTA editors and publisher have tried to ensure the accuracy of the authors' report and would like to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments on the draft document. However, they do not accept liability for damages or losses arising from material published in this report.

This report presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR). The views and opinions expressed by authors in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the HTA programme or the Department of Health and Social Care. If there are verbatim quotations included in this publication the views and opinions expressed by the interviewees are those of the interviewees and do not necessarily reflect those of the authors, those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the HTA programme or the Department of Health and Social Care.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2021. This work was produced by Fuller *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This issue may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts (or indeed, the full report) may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Published by the NIHR Journals Library (www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk), produced by Prepress Projects Ltd, Perth, Scotland (www.prepress-projects.co.uk).

NIHR Journals Library Editor-in-Chief

Professor Ken Stein Professor of Public Health, University of Exeter Medical School, UK

NIHR Journals Library Editors

Professor John Powell Chair of HTA and EME Editorial Board and Editor-in-Chief of HTA and EME journals. Consultant Clinical Adviser, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE), UK, and Professor of Digital Health Care, Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford, UK

Professor Andrée Le May Chair of NIHR Journals Library Editorial Group (HS&DR, PGfAR, PHR journals) and Editor-in-Chief of HS&DR, PGfAR, PHR journals

Professor Matthias Beck Professor of Management, Cork University Business School, Department of Management and Marketing, University College Cork, Ireland

Dr Tessa Crilly Director, Crystal Blue Consulting Ltd, UK

Dr Eugenia Cronin Senior Scientific Advisor, Wessex Institute, UK

Dr Peter Davidson Consultant Advisor, Wessex Institute, University of Southampton, UK

Ms Tara Lamont Senior Scientific Adviser (Evidence Use), Wessex Institute, University of Southampton, UK

Dr Catriona McDaid Senior Research Fellow, York Trials Unit, Department of Health Sciences, University of York, UK

Professor William McGuire Professor of Child Health, Hull York Medical School, University of York, UK

Professor Geoffrey Meads Emeritus Professor of Wellbeing Research, University of Winchester, UK

Professor James Raftery Professor of Health Technology Assessment, Wessex Institute, Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton, UK

Dr Rob Riemsma Reviews Manager, Kleijnen Systematic Reviews Ltd, UK

Professor Helen Roberts Professor of Child Health Research, UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, UK

Professor Jonathan Ross Professor of Sexual Health and HIV, University Hospital Birmingham, UK

Professor Helen Snooks Professor of Health Services Research, Institute of Life Science, College of Medicine, Swansea University, UK

Professor Ken Stein Professor of Public Health, University of Exeter Medical School, UK

Professor Jim Thornton Professor of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, University of Nottingham, UK

Please visit the website for a list of editors: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/about/editors

Editorial contact: journals.library@nihr.ac.uk