## Mifepristone and misoprostol versus placebo and misoprostol for resolution of miscarriage in women diagnosed with missed miscarriage: the MifeMiso RCT

Adam Devall,<sup>1\*</sup> Justin Chu,<sup>1</sup> Leanne Beeson,<sup>2</sup> Pollyanna Hardy,<sup>3</sup> Versha Cheed,<sup>2</sup> Yongzhong Sun,<sup>2</sup> Tracy Roberts,<sup>2</sup> Chidubem Okeke Ogwulu,<sup>2</sup> Eleanor Williams,<sup>2</sup> Laura Jones,<sup>2</sup> Jenny La Fontaine Papadopoulos,<sup>2</sup> Ruth Bender-Atik,<sup>4</sup> Jane Brewin,<sup>5</sup> Kim Hinshaw,<sup>6</sup> Meenakshi Choudhary,<sup>7</sup> Amna Ahmed,<sup>6</sup> Joel Naftalin,<sup>8</sup> Natalie Nunes,<sup>9</sup> Abigail Oliver,<sup>10</sup> Feras Izzat,<sup>11</sup> Kalsang Bhatia,<sup>12</sup> Ismail Hassan,<sup>13</sup> Yadava Jeve,<sup>13</sup> Judith Hamilton,<sup>14</sup> Shilpa Deb,<sup>15</sup> Cecilia Bottomley,<sup>16</sup> Jackie Ross,<sup>17</sup> Linda Watkins,<sup>18</sup> Martyn Underwood,<sup>19</sup> Ying Cheong,<sup>20</sup> Chitra Kumar,<sup>21</sup> Pratima Gupta,<sup>22</sup> Rachel Small,<sup>22</sup> Stewart Pringle,<sup>23</sup> Frances Hodge,<sup>24</sup> Anupama Shahid,<sup>25</sup> Ioannis Gallos,<sup>1</sup> Andrew Horne,<sup>26</sup> Siobhan Quenby<sup>27</sup> and Arri Coomarasamy<sup>1</sup>

<sup>3</sup>National Perinatal Epidemiology Unit Clinical Trials Unit, Nuffield Department of Population Health, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

- <sup>5</sup>Tommy's Charity, London, UK
- <sup>6</sup>Sunderland Royal Hospital, South Tyneside & Sunderland NHS Foundation Trust, Sunderland, UK
- <sup>7</sup>Royal Victoria Infirmary, Newcastle upon Tyne Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK
- <sup>8</sup>University College Hospital, University College London Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK
- <sup>9</sup>West Middlesex University Hospital, Chelsea and Westminster Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, Isleworth, UK

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Institute of Metabolism and Systems Research, College of Medical and Dental Sciences, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Institute of Applied Health Research, College of Medical and Dental Sciences, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>Miscarriage Association, Wakefield, UK

<sup>10</sup>St Michael's Hospital, University Hospitals Bristol NHS Foundation Trust, Bristol, UK <sup>11</sup>University Hospital Coventry, University Hospitals Coventry and Warwickshire

NHS Trust, Coventry, UK

<sup>12</sup>Burnley General Hospital, East Lancashire Hospitals NHS Trust, Burnley, UK

- <sup>13</sup>Birmingham Women's Hospital, Birmingham Women's and Children's NHS Foundation Trust, Birmingham, UK
- <sup>14</sup>Guy's and St Thomas' Hospital, Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK
- <sup>15</sup>Queen's Medical Centre, Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust, Nottingham, UK
- <sup>16</sup>Chelsea and Westminster Hospital, Chelsea and Westminster Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK

<sup>17</sup>King's College Hospital, King's College Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK
<sup>18</sup>Liverpool Women's Hospital, Liverpool Women's NHS Foundation Trust, Liverpool, UK
<sup>19</sup>Princess Royal Hospital, Shrewsbury and Telford Hospital NHS Trust, Telford, UK
<sup>20</sup>Department of Reproductive Medicine, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK
<sup>21</sup>Glasgow Royal Infirmary, NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde, Glasgow, UK
<sup>22</sup>Birmingham Heartlands Hospital, University Hospitals Birmingham NHS Foundation

Trust, Birmingham, UK

<sup>23</sup>Queen Elizabeth University Hospital, NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde, Glasgow, UK
<sup>24</sup>Singleton Hospital, Swansea Bay University Health Board, Swansea, UK

<sup>25</sup>Barts Health NHS Trust, Royal London Hospital, London, UK

<sup>26</sup>MRC Centre for Reproductive Health, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK

<sup>27</sup>Biomedical Research Unit in Reproductive Health, University of Warwick, Coventry, UK

#### \*Corresponding author a.j.devall@bham.ac.uk

**Declared competing interests of authors:** Andrew Horne reports having served as a consultant for AbbVie (Lake Bluff, IL, USA), Roche Diagnostics (Roche Holding AG, Basel, Switzerland), Ferring Controlled Therapeutics (Glasgow, UK) and Nordic Pharma Ltd (Berkshire, UK), and has received research support from the Medical Research Council (MRC), National Institute for Health Research (NIHR), Chief Scientist's Office, Wellbeing of Women, Roche Diagnostics, AstraZeneca (Cambridge, UK) and Ferring Controlled Therapeutics outside the submitted work. Pollyanna Hardy reports membership of the NIHR Health Technology Assessment (HTA) Commissioning Committee (2020–present). Meenakshi Choudhary reports membership of the NIHR HTA Maternal, Neonatal and Child Health Panel Panel (2017–18), NIHR HTA Prioritisation Committee C (Mental Health, Women and Children's Health) (2017–20) and the NIHR HTA Prioritisation Committee B (In Hospital) (2017–21). Arri Coomarasamy reports membership of the submitted work.

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

Published November 2021 DOI: 10.3310/hta25680

# **Plain English summary**

### The MifeMiso RCT

Health Technology Assessment 2021; Vol. 25: No. 68 DOI: 10.3310/hta25680

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

# **Plain English summary**

M iscarriage is a common complication of pregnancy, affecting approximately one in four women. Sometimes, medical treatment (i.e. tablets) may be offered to start or speed up the miscarriage process in order for the womb to empty itself. A drug called misoprostol (a tablet that makes the womb contract) is currently recommended for this treatment. However, the addition of another drug called mifepristone [a tablet that reduces pregnancy hormones (Mifegyne<sup>®</sup>, Exelgyn, Paris, France)] might help the miscarriage to resolve more quickly. Therefore, we carried out the MifeMiso trial to test if mifepristone plus misoprostol is more effective than misoprostol alone in resolving miscarriage within 7 days.

Women were randomly allocated by a computer to receive either mifepristone or placebo, followed by misoprostol 2 days later. Neither the women nor their health-care professionals knew which treatment they received. Some women also talked to the researchers about their experiences of taking part in the study.

In total, 711 women were randomised to receive either mifepristone plus misoprostol or placebo plus misoprostol. Overall, 83% of women who received mifepristone plus misoprostol had miscarriage resolution within 7 days, compared with 76% of the women who received a placebo plus misoprostol. Surgery was required less often in women who received mifepristone plus misoprostol: 17% of women who received it required surgery, compared with 25% of women who received the placebo. Treatment with mifepristone did not appear to have any negative effects. Treatment with mifepristone plus misoprostol was more cost-effective than misoprostol alone, with an average saving of £182 per woman. Having taken part in the study, most women would choose medical management again and would recommend it to someone they knew who was experiencing a miscarriage.

## **Health Technology Assessment**

ISSN 1366-5278 (Print)

ISSN 2046-4924 (Online)

Impact factor: 4.014

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 15/160/02. The contractual start date was in February 2017. The draft report began editorial review in August 2020 and was accepted for publication in April 2021. 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.

Copyright © 2021 Devall *et al.* This work was produced by Devall *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This is an Open Access publication distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution CC BY 4.0 licence, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, reproduction and adaption in any medium and for any purpose provided that it is properly attributed. See: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/. For attribution the title, original author(s), the publication source – NIHR Journals Library, and the DOI of the publication must be cited.

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