Original Research Article

The Effectiveness of the Heated Humidified High Flow Nasal Cannula as an Initial Noninvasive Respiratory Support for Preterm Infants Suffering from Respiratory Distress

ABSTRACT

Aims: to compare the efficacy and safety of the heated humidified high-flow nasal cannula as a noninvasive respiratory support for the initial management of respiratory distress in preterm infants ≥ 30 weeks gestation with birth weight ≥ 1300 g at different flow rates (3 L/min and 6 L/min) on admission.
Study design: A Randomized controlled trial.
Place and Duration of Study:
Neonatal Intensive Care Unit, Pediatrics department, Tanta University Hospitals, over one-year period, from December 2018 to December 2019.
Methodology: 30 preterm neonates, with gestational ages ranged between 30 to 36 weeks and birth weight ≥ 1300 g, were randomized to receive HHHFNC at either flow rate 3 or 6 L\min as an initial respiratory support. Primary outcomes included: the incidence of treatment failure of the HHHFNC at flow 3 L/min and 6 L/min, which will require n CPAP or NIMV, or will require intubation. Secondary outcomes included: rate of deaths at any time after randomization, the total duration of all types of oxygen support and incidence of neonatal morbidities such as nasal trauma, symptomatic patent ductus arteriosus (PDA), intraventricular hemorrhage (IVH ≥ grade II), pneumothorax, pulmonary hemorrhage, retinopathy of prematurity (ROP), apnea, sepsis and necrotizing enterocolitis (NEC ≥ stage II).

Results: the incidence of the need for higher flow rate of HHHFNC (n=11, 36.6%) , the need for n CPAP or NIMV after failure of higher flow rate of HHHFNC (n=11, 36.6%), the need for intubation & MV (n=1, 3.3%), the incidence of nasal trauma (n=7, 23.3%), BPD (n=0) , IVH ≥ II (n=0), NEC ≥II (n=0), pneumothorax (n=0) , the median duration of hospitalization =10 days (7-15), the median duration of all oxygen support = 6.5 days (6-7). The failure rate was 11 out of 30 infants (36.6%), no deaths or pulmonary haemorrhage.

Conclusion: HHHFNC use shows similar rates of efficacy to other forms of noninvasive respiratory support in preterm infants with respiratory distress for initial respiratory support with lesser complications. There were better outcomes with higher gestational age and birth weight at either flow rates 3 or 6 L/min.

Note: Review paper may have different types of subsections.

Keywords: ***Heated Humidified High Flow Nasal Cannula, Noninvasive, Initial support, Preterm, Respiratory distress.***

1. INTRODUCTION

Comment [AA1]: Please, review English. Insert all abbreviation. Some are cited later in the text, but they were described earlier.

Preterm is live born infant delivered before 37 weeks from the first day of the last menstrual period according to world health organization [(1)].

Premature births are responsible for 70% of neonatal mortality, 36% of infant mortality and 25-50% of long-term neurological disabilities. In the last 20 years with the scientific and technological developments observed in the field of neonatology, the survival rate of premature infants has significantly increased [2].

Preterm neonates can develop many complications such as respiratory distress syndrome (RDS), intra-ventricular hemorrhage (IVH), necrotizing entero-colitis (NEC), broncho-pulmonary dysplasia (BPD), neonatal sepsis, patent ductus arteriosus (PDA), retinopathy (ROP) and hyperbilirubinemia [3].

Respiratory distress syndrome is considered the major reason for increased mortality and morbidity among infants. Neonatal respiratory distress syndrome occurs in infants whose lungs have not yet fully developed. It can also be due to genetic problems with lung development. Most cases of RDS occur in babies born before 37 weeks [4].

Respiratory support is being achieved more frequently with nasal continuous positive airway pressure (n CPAP) and other less invasive approaches, such as the technique of intubation, surfactant, and extubation (INSURE) [5].

The non-invasive respiratory support, including n CPAP, was shown to be effective in treating infants in the initial phase of respiratory distress. The heated humidified high-flow nasal cannula (HHHFNC) is frequently used as an alternative mode of noninvasive respiratory support in the neonatal intensive care unit. Because it has a simpler interface with the infant and smaller prongs than n CPAP, the cannula is perceived as easier to use, more comfortable for the infant, and advantageous for mother–infant bonding [6].

Recent Cochrane review of HHHFNC use in preterm infants concluded that it is effective as other forms of non-invasive respiratory support in preterm infants for preventing treatment failure, death and chronic lung disease [7].

The HHHFNC is not only used as a primary respiratory support but also used after extubation to prevent alveolar collapse. However, it also has some drawbacks such as nasal trauma, head deformity, gaseous bowel distension and the difficulty to maintain the device on infant's face at all time to obtain the constant pressure [8].

The HHHFNC has been used as a respiratory support for various purposes including apnoea of prematurity [9], primary respiratory support in respiratory distress syndrome [10], CPAP weaning[11] and post extubation [12].

Also, neonatal HFNC is increasingly being applied in other clinical areas including during neonatal transport and for initial delivery room stabilization of premature infants [13,14,15].

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS / EXPERIMENTAL DETAILS / METHODOLOGY

Comment [AA2]: Insert a flowchart, as suggested by CONSORT for randomized controlled trials

Comment [S3]:

We enrolled total 45 preterm neonates after delivery in this study (15 preterm infants were excluded due to major congenital malformations, or congenital heart disease), they were admitted in the Neonatal Intensive Care Unit (NICU), Pediatrics department, Tanta University Hospitals, over one-year period, from December 2018 to December 2019, after the approval from the ethical committee of Tanta University and after written parental consents before the enrollment.

This study was a randomized controlled trial. Simple randomization was performed by using computed generated random numbers. It was double blinded with fixed and standard protocols for initiation, weaning, extubation and identification of treatment failure.

- 30 included preterm neonates, with gestational age ≥ 30 weeks and less than 37 weeks, who were suffering from mild to moderate respiratory distress on admission, were randomized to receive HHHFNC (Fisher & Paykel Optiflow System, Healthcare, Auckland, New Zealand) as an initial respiratory support [16].

UNDER PEER REVIEW

- This group was sub classified into subgroup **A** started initially at flow rate **3 L\min.** and subgroup **B** started initially at flow rate **6 L\min.**

Inclusion criteria

- Preterm neonates, born of gestational age ≥ 30 weeks and of birth weight ≥ 1300 g, suffering from signs and symptoms of respiratory distress after delivery.

Exclusion criteria

- Preterm neonates of gestational age < 30 weeks and of birth weight < 1300 g.
- Preterm neonates with major congenital heart diseases, upper airway anomalies, lung hypoplasia and neuromuscular disorders.
- Full term neonates.
- Preterm infants who required intubation and mechanical ventilation after delivery.

Usage of the HHHFNC:

- All infants, ≤ 34 weeks were received IV caffeine citrate either a loading dose of 20 mg/kg/dose or a maintenance dose of 5 mg/kg/day in the first 24 hours.
- Infants were treated with HHHFNC (Fisher & Paykel Optiflow System, Healthcare, Auckland, New Zealand) [16], with the orifice diameter of the nasal cannula (2.4 to 2.7 mm) and were fitted to maintain a leak at the nose as recommended by the user manual with the aim of occluding approximately half of the nares.
- Flow rates of HHHFNC were modified from 3 into 6 L/min or from 6 into 8 L\min. when needed.
- Oxygen saturation targets were maintained at 90-95% on HHHFNC, all infants stayed on this assigned mode of respiratory support until they were able to be managed without any respiratory support.

Weaning from HHHFNC:

Treatment with HHHFNC was stopped, as ordered by the treating team, when the infants showed no signs of respiratory distress with room air , weaned to flow rate 2 L\min. and SpO2 > 90%, PCO2 <50 mmHg with FiO2 of 0.21[17].

<u>HHHFNC treatment failure was indicated by one or more of the following:</u>

I. Respiratory acidosis (PaCO2 > 60 mmHg with pH < 7.25 at maximum setting of the allocated device [flow rate 7-8 L/min]), hypoxia (FiO2 > 0.4 to maintain SpO2 88 to 94%) [17].
II. Significant apnea (> 2–3 episodes of apnea/hour requiring bag and-mask ventilation in 24 hour period or 6 or more apneic episodes requiring tactile stimulation within 6 hours) despite adequate prong fixation and flow [17].
III. Persistent marked/severe retractions.
IV. Urgent need for ETT & MV as in cardiovascular collapse or shock as determined by the treating team.

- When a neonate met one or more of the above criteria, increasing flow rate from 3 into 6 L\min. or from 6 into 8 L\min. was done, then application of other type of non-invasive respiratory support device (from HHFNC to n CPAP and from n CPAP to NIMV) was considered within 6 hours approximately or required MV if indicated.

<u>The HHHFNC outcomes:</u>

Primary outcomes:

The incidence of treatment failure of the HHHFNC at flow 3 L/min and 6 L/min, which will require n CPAP or NIMV, or will require intubation.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

Secondary outcomes:

1. Rate of deaths at any time after randomization.
2. The total duration of all types of oxygen support.
3. Incidence of neonatal morbidities such as nasal trauma, symptomatic patent ductus arteriosus (PDA), intraventricular hemorrhage (IVH ≥ grade II), pneumothorax, pulmonary hemorrhage, retinopathy of prematurity (ROP), apnea, sepsis, and necrotizing enterocolitis (NEC ≥ stage II).

All preterm neonates were subjected to the followings:

A- Complete history taking which included:
- Peri-natal history.
- Natal history of labor and delivery.
- Resuscitation history.

B- Full clinical examination.
C- Routine laboratory investigations.
D- Chest X-ray.

E- Transcranial US.

Statistics
Data were analyzed using SPSS 22. Chi-square and t test were used for quantitative and qualitative variables, $P < 0.05$ was considered as significant level.

4. RESULTS

Table 1: Demographic data of subgroup A & B (n=30) showing:

- There was no significant difference between the two studied subgroups A & B as regard sex, gestational age, mode of delivery & age of start of HHHFNC.

	Group A (n = 15)		Group B (n = 15)		Test of Sig.	p
	No.	%	No.	%		
Sex						
Male	11	73.3	8	53.3	χ^2= 1.292	0.256
Female	4	26.7	7	46.7		
Gestational age (weeks)						
Min. – Max.	31.0 – 36.0		30.0 – 35.0		t= 0.792	0.435
Mean ± SD.	33.40 ± 1.40		33.0 ± 1.36			
Median (IQR)	33.0 (32.50 –34.50)		33.0 (32.50 – 34.0)			
Mode of delivery						
NVD	3	20.0	6	40.0	χ^2= 1.429	^{FE}p= 0.427
C.S	12	80.0	9	60.0		

UNDER PEER REVIEW

Age of start of HHHFNC (days)				
Min. – Max.	1.0 – 3.0	1.0 – 3.0	U= 109.50	0.902
Mean ± SD.	1.60 ± 0.83	1.60 ± 0.91		
Median (IQR)	1.0 (1.0 – 2.0)	1.0 (1.0 – 2.50)		

χ^2: Chi square test FE: Fisher Exact
U: Mann Whitney test t: Student t-test
p: p value for comparing between the studied groups

Group A: Initial support by HHHFNC at flow rate 3 L\min.
Group B: Initial support by HHHFNC at flow rate 6 L\min.

Table 2: Anthropometric measurements of subgroup A & B (n=30) showing:

- There was no significant difference between the two studied subgroups A & B as regard weight, length, head circumference and ponderal index.

	Group A (n = 15)	**Group B (n = 15)**	**t**	**p**
Weight (kgs)				
Min. – Max.	1.60 – 2.80	1.30 – 2.50		
Mean ± SD.	2.18 ± 0.37	2.0 ± 0.39	**1.297**	**0.205**
Median (IQR)	2.20 (1.80 – 2.50)	2.20 (1.65 – 2.30)		
Length (cms)				
Min. – Max.	40.0 – 47.0	40.0 – 45.0		
Mean ± SD.	43.53 ± 2.17	42.33 ± 1.84	**1.635**	**0.113**
Median (IQR)	44.0 (42.0 – 45.0)	43.0 (40.50 – 44.0)		
H.C. (cms)				
Min. – Max.	30.0 – 32.0	29.0 – 32.0		
Mean ± SD.	30.90 ± 0.81	30.60 ± 0.71	**1.080**	**0.289**
Median (IQR)	31.0 (30.0 – 31.50)	31.0 (30.0 – 31.0)		
Ponderal index				
Min. – Max.	2.20 – 3.0	2.0 – 3.40		
Mean ± SD.	2.59 ± 0.26	2.57 ± 0.38	**0.113**	**0.911**
Median (IQR)	2.60 (2.40 – 2.75)	2.50 (2.30 – 2.75)		

Comment [AA4]: Insert legend for abbreviation

Table 3: Antenatal Risk Factors in Group A & B (n=30) showing:

- There was a statistically significant increase as regard number of cases with pre-eclampsia and eclampsia in subgroup B as compared to subgroup A.

- There was no significant difference between the two subgroups A & B as regard antenatal risk factors as PROM, multiple pregnancies, abruptio placenta, others as UTI, chorioamnionitis and IDM.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

Antenatal risk factors	Group A (n = 15)		Group B (n = 15)		X^2	P
	No.	%	No.	%		
PROM	8	53.3	6	40.0	0.536	0.464
Pre-eclampsia, eclampsia	1	6.7	8	53.3	7.778*	^{FE}P=0.014*
Multiple pregnancies	3	20.0	1	6.7	1.154	^{FE}P=0.598
Abruptio placenta, placenta accrete	1	6.7	1	6.7	0.000	^{FE}P=1.000
Negative	4	26.7	0	0.0	4.615	^{FE}P=0.100
Others: UTI, chorioamnionitis & IDM	1	6.7	2	13.3	0.370	^{FE}P=0.100

Comment [AA5]: Insert legend for abbreviations

Table 4: Follow up data of Subgroup A & B (n=30) showing:

- There was no significant difference between the 2 subgroups A & B as regard all follow up data and outcomes of HHHFNC including: need for higher flow rate of HHHFNC (flow rate 3 into 6 & 6 into 8 L\min.), need for n CPAP or NIMV after failure of the higher flow rate of HHHFNC, need for intubation, incidence of nasal trauma, duration of antibiotics, hospitalization & all oxygen support.

	Group A (n = 15)		Group B (n = 15)		Test of Sig.	p
	No.	%	No.	%		
Need for higher flow rate of HHHFNC (3 into 6 l\min. & 6 into 8 l\min.)						
Not needed	7	46.7	12	80.0	χ^2= 3.589	0.058
Needed	8	53.3	3	20.0		
Need for n CPAP or NIMV after failure of higher flow rate of HHHFNC						
Not needed	8	53.3	11	73.3	χ^2= 1.292	0.256
Needed	7	46.7	4	26.7		
Need for intubation						
Not needed	15	100.0	14	93.3	χ^2= 1.034	^{FE}p= 1.000
Needed	0	0.0	1	6.7		
Nasal trauma						
None	12	80.0	11	73.3	χ^2= 0.186	^{FE}p= 1.000
Nasal trauma	3	20.0	4	26.7		
Antibiotics duration (days)						
Min. – Max.	7.0 – 15.0		7.0 – 21.0		U= 111.50	0.967
Mean ± SD.	10.80 ± 3.88		11.07 ± 3.90			
Median (IQR)	10.0 (7.0 – 15.0)		10.0 (8.50 – 14.0)			
Duration of hospitalization (days)						
Min. – Max.	7.0 – 15.0		7.0 – 21.0		U= 111.50	0.967
Mean ± SD.	10.80 ± 3.88		11.07 ± 3.90			
Median (IQR)	10.0(7.0 – 15.0)		10.0(8.50 – 14.0)			
Total duration of all O_2 support (days)						

UNDER PEER REVIEW

Min. – Max. Mean ± SD. Median (IQR)	4.0 – 11.0 7.67 ± 2.38 7.0 (6.0 – 10.0)	4.0 – 15.0 7.20 ± 3.08 6.0 (5.0 – 9.0)	t= 0.465	0.646

Comment [AA6]: Insert legend for abbreviation
Insert Statistical Tests

Table 5: Relation between gestational age and success rate of HHHFNC as regard its primary outcomes in each subgroup (n = 30) showing:

- There was significant positive relation between gestational age and success rate of HHHFNC as initial support at flow rate 3 l\min. as showed in subgroup A with higher number of cases who were not needed for n CPAP or NIMV after failure of higher flow of HHHFNC.
- There was significant positive relation between gestational age and success rate of HHHFNC as initial support at flow rate 6 l\min. as showed in subgroup B with higher number of cases who were not needed for n CPAP or NIMV after failure of higher flow of HHHFNC.

	Success rate	N	Gestational age (weeks)			t	p
			Min. – Max.	Mean ± SD.	Median		
Group A (n = 15)	**Need for Higher flow rate of HHHFNC (3 into 6 l\min.)**						
	Not needed	**7**	33.0 – 35.0	34.14 ± 0.90	34.0	2.151	0.051
	Needed	**8**	31.0 – 36.0	32.75 ± 1.49	32.50		
	Need for n CPAP or NIMV after failure of higher flow rate of HHHFNC						
	Not needed	**8**	33.0 – 36.0	34.37 ± 1.06	34.50	4.329*	0.001*
	Needed	**7**	31.0 – 33.0	32.29 ± 0.76	32.0		
	Need for intubation						
	Not needed	**15**	31.0 – 36.0	33.40 ± 1.40	33.0	–	–
	Needed	**0**	–	–	–		
Group B (n = 15)	**Need for Higher flow rate of HHHFNC (6 into 8 l\min.)**						
	Not needed	**12**	30.0 – 35.0	33.33 ± 1.30	33.0	2.117	0.054
	Needed	**3**	31.0 – 32.0	31.67 ± 0.58	32.0		
	Need for n CPAP or NIMV after failure of higher flow rate of HHHFNC						
	Not needed	**11**	33.0 – 35.0	33.64 ± 0.81	33.0	4.833*	<0.001*
	Needed	**4**	30.0 – 32.0	31.25 ± 0.96	31.50		
	Need for intubation						

UNDER PEER REVIEW

	Not needed	**14**	30.0 – 35.0	33.07 ± 1.38	33.0	–	–
	Needed	**1**		32.0#			

Comment [AA7]: Insert legend

Table 6: Relation between birth weight and success rate of HHHFNC as regard its primary outcomes in each subgroup (n = 30) showing:

- There was significant positive relation between birth weight and not needing for higher flow rate of HHHFNC as showed in subgroup A at flow rate 3 l\min.
- There was significant positive relation between birth weight and success rate of HHHFNC as initial support at flow rate 3 l\min. as showed in subgroup A with higher number of cases who were not needed for n CPAP or NIMV after failure of higher flow of HHHFNC.
- There was significant positive relation between birth weight and success rate of HHHFNC as initial support at flow rate 6 l\min. as showed in subgroup B with higher number of cases who were not needed for higher flow rate of HHHFNC and not needed for n CPAP or NIMV after failure of higher flow of HHHFNC.
- There was no significant relation between birth weight and need for intubation as HHHFNC outcome in the main studied group.

	Success rate	N	Weight (kgs)			t	p
			Min. – Max.	Mean ± SD.	Median		
Group A (n = 15)	**Need for Higher flow rate of HHHFNC (3 into 6 l\min.)**						
	Not needed	**7**	2.20 – 2.80	2.47 ± 0.20	2.50	4.131*	0.001*
	Needed	**8**	1.60 – 2.50	1.93 ± 0.30	1.80		
	Need for n CPAP or NIMV after failure of higher flow rate of HHHFNC						
	Not needed	**8**	2.20 – 2.80	2.48 ± 0.18	2.50	6.409*	<0.001*
	Needed	**7**	1.60 – 2.20	1.84 ± 0.20	1.80		
	Need for intubation						
	Not needed	**15**	1.60 – 2.80	2.18 ± 0.37	2.20	–	–
	Needed	**0**	–	–	–		
Group B (n = 15)	**Need for Higher flow rate of HHHFNC (6 into 8 l\min.)**						
	Not needed	**12**	1.30 – 2.50	2.13 ± 0.32	2.20	3.266*	0.006*

UNDER PEER REVIEW

Needed	**3**	1.50 – 1.50	1.50 ± 0.00	1.50		
Need for n CPAP or NIMV after failure of higher flow rate of HHHFNC						
Not needed	**11**	1.80 – 2.50	2.20 ± 0.20	2.20	7.063*	<0.001*
Needed	**4**	1.30 – 1.50	1.45 ± 0.10	1.50		
Need for intubation						
Not needed	**14**	1.30 – 2.50	2.04 ± 0.37	2.20	–	–
Needed	**1**		1.50#			

Comment [AA8]: Insert legend

4-DISCUSSSION

Comment [AA9]: Review English and the structure of the discussion, in some points it is confusing, and it is not possible to understand if the author is comparing results from other studies among them or comparing the results of other studies with his own results.

In this present study, in the main studied group (HHHFNC used as an initial respiratory support), as regard the demographic data, anthropometric measurements, antenatal risk factors and HHHFNC outcomes, there was no significant difference between both low and high flow rates subgroups A & B except for incidence of preeclampsia and eclampsia in B (n=8, 53.3%) was higher than in A (n=1, 6.7%).

Comment [AA10]: Join this paragraph with the one below.

We enrolled 30 preterm infants in with mean GA 33 weeks (32.5-34) & mean BW 2200 g (1800-2500). Resulted in the followings : the incidence of the need for higher flow rate of HHHFNC (n=11, 36.6%) , the need for n CPAP or NIMV after failure of higher flow rate of HHHFNC (n=11, 36.6%), the need for intubation & MV (n=1, 3.3%), the incidence of nasal trauma (n=7, 23.3%), BPD (n=0) , IVH ≥ II (n=0), NEC ≥ II (n=0), pneumothorax (n=0) , the median duration of hospitalization =10 days (7-15), the median duration of all oxygen support = 6.5 days (6-7). The cases who needed for n CPAP or NIMV, were changed into higher flow rate first and the case who needed for intubation, was first put on n CPAP or NIMV so failure rate was 11 out of 30 infants (36.6%), no deaths or pulmonary haemorrhage.

This comes in comparison with **Shin, et al., 2017 [17],** who enrolled 42 preterm infants, were randomized to HHFNC as a primary support when they showed respiratory distress in < 24 hours of age, using the Optiflow system as our study, at the same flow rates, the same weaning criteria from HFNC and the same criteria of treatment failure (intubation). Preterm infants who needed invasive respiratory supports were excluded unlike our study and, they compared the HFNC group to another n CPAP group. The HFNC group, with similar mean GA (32.5±1.5 weeks) and BW (2058±371 g), showed higher failure rate (16%), less need for n CPAP or NIMV (3%), more need for intubation (13%), higher incidence of BPD (n=1, 2.3%), higher incidence of air leak (n=2, 4.7%), IVH ≥ III (n=0), NEC ≥ II (n=0), longer mean duration of hospitalization =20 days (15.8-28.3) and longer mean duration of all oxygen

UNDER PEER REVIEW

support =67 days (40-106.8). These differences may be due to the different clinical decisions and rescue treatment.

While in comparison with **Sharma, et al., 2019** [18], who enrolled 50 preterm infants with mild to moderate respiratory distress were randomized to HHHFNC as a primary respiratory support within the first 6 h of birth, with smaller mean GA (31.77± 2.21 weeks) and BW (1762 ± 493.5 g), showed higher failure rate 6 out of 50 infants (12%) who needed for intubation and MV, less incidence of nasal trauma (11.4%) and shorter mean duration of total oxygen supplementation =3.48 days. Their study differed from ours in the used devices, the flow rates, the primary outcomes, the weaning protocol, and the rescue treatment.

Dimirel, et al., 2019 [19]**,** who used the HFNC as a first line respiratory support for preterm infants who had spontaneous respiration after admission initially at flow rate 6 L\min and increasing maximally into 8 L\min. They followed the same weaning protocol from HFNC and the same extubation criteria. They enrolled 53 preterm infants with smaller mean GA (31.2±2.3 weeks) and BW (1570±455 g). They found higher intubation (treatment failure) rate (n=5, 9.4%), higher incidence of BPD (n=4, 7.5%), IVH ≥ II (n=2, 3.7%), NEC ≥II (n=1, 1.8%), pneumothorax (n=2, 3.7%), longer median duration of hospitalization =27 days and shorter median duration of all oxygen support = 3 days. They differed from us in the used Vapotherm system and the clinical decisions.

Murki, et al., 2018 [20]**,** who enrolled 133 preterm infants with respiratory distress using HFNC as a primary respiratory support with initial flow rate 5 L\min and increased gradually to the maximal flow rate 7 L\min, with smaller mean GA 31.8±1.9 weeks and BW 1632±431g. They used the same Optiflow system, followed the same treatment failure criteria and the same outcomes. They found lower treatment failure rate within 72 h (n= 35, 26.3%), shorter duration of oxygen support (6.7±4.125 days), higher incidence of nasal trauma (n=7, 5.3%), pneumothorax (n=0), IVH ≥III (n=0), higher incidence of NEC ≥II (n=2, 1.5%), longer duration of hospitalization (18±13 days) and higher death rate (n=4, 3%). Their study differed in the larger numbers included with wider range of GA and BW and also in the clinical rescue decisions.

Manley, et al., 2018 [21]**,** undertook the HIPSTER trial, an international, multicenter, randomized, noninferiority trial in preterm infants born at 28-36 weeks of gestation that used HFNC 6-8 L/min as primary respiratory support for early respiratory distress. All 278 infants in the HFNC group of HIPSTER were included. The mean GA and BW were (32.0 ± 2.1 weeks) and (1737 ± 580 g), and 140 infants (50.4%) were born at< 32 weeks. Caffeine was

UNDER PEER REVIEW

administered to 109 infants (39.2%) in the first 24 hours of life. The primary outcome was treatment failure within 72 hours after randomization. 71 infants (25.5%) had treatment failure of lower rate compared to our study. In that analysis, when the 30/30 rule was applied: 'infants with both a GA of ≥30 weeks and an early (<2 hours of age) FiO2 <0.30 are more likely to be successfully treated with HFNC and avoid intubation than infants born <30 weeks of gestation or with an early FiO2 ≥ 0.30, or both', about 84% of infants were successfully treated, about 16% required CPAP "rescue," and 7% were intubated. The differences might be due to the larger numbers included with wider range of GA and smaller BW, the used devices and the different NICUs' protocols.

Zheng, et al., 2017 [22], who enrolled 65 preterm infants, with mild to moderate RDS requiring initial noninvasive respiratory support; were applied to the HHHFNC, with smaller GA (31.9±1.7 weeks), BW (1754±299 g). They used the Optiflow and the Vapotherm systems at flow rates 6-8 L\min. They followed the same intubation criteria. Their results showed higher need for intubation (treatment failure) within 7 days (n=13, 20%) unlike ours, higher incidence of BPD (n=6, 9.2%), higher incidence of IVH ≥III (n=3, 4.6%), same incidence of nasal trauma (n=14, 21.5%), air leak (n=2, 3.1%), longer mean duration of hospitalization =30.5 days (14-55) and death rate (n=1, 1.5%). These differences due to the different observational cross-sectional study, used devices, flow rates, protocols, defined primary outcome and decisions.

Lavizzari, et al. 2016 [23], who enrolled 158 preterm infants with mild to moderate RDS, were randomly applied to the HHFNC as a primary support, with mean GA (33.1±1.9 weeks), BW (1968±581 g). They used the Vapotherm system at flow rates 4-6 L\min, followed the same extubation criteria but different intubation indication and weaning criteria from the HHFNC. Their results showed higher incidence of need for MV within 72 h (n=17, 10.8%), higher incidence of BPD (n=7, 4.4%), higher incidence of IVH ≥III (n=6, 3.8%), higher incidence of air leak (n=3, 1.9%), higher incidence of NEC ≥II (n=1, 0.6%), mean duration of total oxygen support =7.5 days, longer mean duration of hospitalization =20 days (11-35).

Kugelman, et al., 2015 [10]**,** who enrolled 38 preterm infants, randomized to HHHFNC (1 – 5 L\min.) as a primary support, with mean GA 32.5 (27.5-34.7 weeks) and mean BW (1759± 488 g), showed incidence of need for higher flow rate from 3 L\min. (n=14, 36.8%), higher incidence of need for MV (n=11, 28.9%), higher incidence of BPD (n=1, 2.6%), higher incidence of IVH ≥III (n=1, 2.6%), nasal trauma (n=0) , air leak (n=0), NEC ≥II (n=0) , death (n=0) and longer mean duration of hospitalization = 39.5 days (9-113). They differed from us

UNDER PEER REVIEW

in the pilot study, used Vapotherm at different flow rates and protocols of weaning and intubation.

Lastly, **Fleeman, et al., 2019 [24],** updated a systematic review and meta-analyses examining the efficacy and safety of HHHFNC compared with standard treatments for preterm infants. The analysis of primary respiratory support included ten RCTs (n =1,676). They found higher intubation rate (n =90\704, 12.8%) compared to our study, higher incidence of BPD (n =27\348, 7.8%), death rate (n =5\717, 0.7%), air leak (n =15\702, 2.1%) and nasal trauma (n =42\578, 7.3%). All the differences are mostly due to the different used devices, flow rates, outcomes, NICUs' protocols, larger ranges of numbers included, GA and BW and the pragmatic clinical decisions.

In this present study, there was a significant positive relation between gestational age and success rate of HHHFNC as initial support at flow rate 3 l\min. as showed in subgroup A with higher number of cases who were not needed for n CPAP or NIMV after failure of higher flow of HHHFNC.

There was a significant positive relation between gestational age and success rate of HHHFNC as initial support at flow rate 6 l\min. as showed in subgroup B with higher number of cases who were not needed for n CPAP or NIMV after failure of higher flow of HHHFNC.

This comes in comparison to, **Lavizzari, et al. 2016 [23],** who enrolled 158 preterm infants with mild to moderate RDS, were randomly applied to the HHFNC as a primary support. They found that there was no difference in respiratory failure rate in any GA stratum.

While in comparison with, **Zheng, et al., 2017 [22]**, who enrolled 65 preterm infants, with mild to moderate RDS requiring initial noninvasive respiratory support; were applied to the HHHFNC. They found that there were no significant differences in neonates older than 28 weeks of gestational age in the primary outcome: treatment failure within the first 7 days.

While **Murki, et al., 2018 [20],** who enrolled 133 preterm infants with respiratory distress using HFNC as a primary respiratory support. They found that the risk difference of treatment failure was higher among infants with lower gestation (<32 weeks: 14.7%, ≥32 weeks: 10.1%).

In this present study, there was a significant positive relation between birth weight and success rate of HHHFNC as initial support at flow rate 3 l\min. as showed in subgroup A with higher number of cases who were not needed for n CPAP or NIMV after failure of higher flow of HHHFNC.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

There was a significant positive relation between birth weight and success rate of HHHFNC as initial support at flow rate 6 l\min. as showed in subgroup B with higher number of cases who were not needed for higher flow rate of HHHFNC and not needed for n CPAP or NIMV after failure of higher flow of HHHFNC.

There was no significant relation between birth weight and need for intubation as HHHFNC outcome in the main studied group (Initial support).

This comes in agreement with, **Yoder, et al., 2013 [25],** who enrolled 212 infants, who were randomly assigned to HHHFNC (at flow rates 2 to 8 L\min.) as a primary support, with mean GA (33.5± 3.6 weeks) and BW (2201±816 g). They found that the adjustment for gestation, birth weight, ventilator support, surfactant therapy, and primary diagnosis did not alter the failure rates to identify a significant difference between the study modes for early intubation.

5. CONCLUSION: our study concluded that:

- HHHFNC use has similar rates of efficacy to other forms of non-invasive respiratory support in preterm infants with respiratory distress for initial respiratory support.
- HHHFNC showed lesser complications on either flow rates 3 or 6 l\min. as regard nasal trauma, pneumothorax, pulmonary hemorrhage, IVH>=ii, NEC>=ii, PDA and death.
- There were better outcomes for the use of HHHFNC with higher gestational age and birth weight as an initial respiratory support at either flow rates 3 or 6 L/min.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

CONSENT (WHEREVER APPLICABLE)

No manuscripts will be peer-reviewed if a statement of patient consent is not presented during submission (wherever applicable).
This section is compulsory for medical journals. Other journals may require this section if found suitable. It should provide a statement to confirm that the patient has given their informed consent for the case report to be published. Journal editorial office may ask the copies of the consent documentation at any time.

Authors may use a form from their own institution or SDI Patient Consent Form 1.0. It is preferable that authors should send this form along with the submission. But if already not sent during submission, we may request to see a copy at any stages of pre and post publication.

If the person described in the case report has died, then consent for publication must be collected from their next of kin. If the individual described in the case report is a minor, or unable to provide consent, then consent must be sought from their parents or legal guardians.

Authors may use the following wordings for this section: "All authors declare that 'written informed consent was obtained from the patient (or other approved parties) for publication of this case report and accompanying images. A copy of the written consent is available for review by the Editorial office/Chief Editor/Editorial Board members of this journal."

ETHICAL APPROVAL (WHEREVER APPLICABLE)

This section is compulsory for medical journals. Other journals may require this section if found suitable. If human subjects are involved, informed consent, protection of privacy, and other human rights are further criteria against which the manuscript will be judged. It should provide a statement to confirm that the authors have obtained all necessary ethical approval from suitable Institutional or State or National or International Committee. This confirms either that this study is not against the public interest, or that the release of information is allowed by legislation.

All manuscripts which deal with animal subjects must be approved by an Institutional Review Board (IRB), Ethical Committee, or an Animal Utilization Study Committee. , and this statement, and approval number, must accompany the submission. If required, author should be ready to submit a scanned copy of the IRB or Ethical Committee Approval at any stage of publication (Pre of post publication stage). The manuscript should contain information about any post-operative care and pain management for the animals.

For manuscripts involving animal experiments, Authors may use the following wordings for this section "All authors hereby declare that "Principles of laboratory animal care" (NIH publication No. 85-23, revised 1985) were followed, as well as specific national laws where applicable. All experiments have been examined and approved by the appropriate ethics committee"

All manuscripts which deal with the study of human subjects must be accompanied by Institutional Review Board (IRB) or Ethical Committee Approval, or the national or regional

UNDER PEER REVIEW

equivalent. The name of the Board or Committee giving approval and the study number assigned must accompany the submission. If required, author should be ready to submit a scanned copy of the IRB or Ethical Committee Approval at any stage of publication (Pre of post publication stage).

For manuscripts involving human experiments, Authors may use the following wordings for this section: "All authors hereby declare that all experiments have been examined and approved by the appropriate ethics committee and have therefore been performed in accordance with the ethical standards laid down in the 1964 Declaration of Helsinki."

REFERENCES

1. **Behrman R and Butler A.** Preterm birth: causes, consequence, and prevention. The Academies Press. 2009; 101:313-45.

2. **Kültürsay N, Köroğlu ÖA, Kızılcan S, et al.** Assessment of the Awareness of Prematurity and Related Problems. Pediatr Res. 2017;4(4):227-31.

3. **Levene I, Tupedohe I and Thearle J**. Respiratory disorders. In: Levene I, Tupedohe I, Thearle J, editors. Neonatal Medicine. 3rd ed: London: Blackwell Science Ltd; 2000 p. 93-11.

4. **Wambach J and Hamvas A**. Respiratory distress syndrome in the neonate. In: Martin R, Fanaroff A, Walsh M, editors. Fanaroff and Martin's Neonatal-Perinatal Medicine. 10th ed: Philadelphia, PA: Elsevier Saunders; 2015.

5. **Pfister RH and Soll RF**. Initial respiratory support of preterm infants: the role of CPAP, the INSURE method, and noninvasive ventilation. Clin Perinatol. 2012;39(3):459-81.

6**. Tapia JL, Urzua S, Bancalari A, et al.** Randomized trial of early bubble continuous positive airway pressure for very low birth weight infants. J Pediatr. 2012; 161(1):75-80. e1.

7. **Wilkinson D, Andersen C, O'Donnell CP, et al.** High flow nasal cannula for respiratory support in preterm infants. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2016; 2: Cd006405.

8. **Garg S and Sinha S**. Non-invasive Ventilation in Premature Infants: Based on Evidence or Habit. J Clin Neonatol. 2013; 2(4):155-9.

9. **Sreenan C, Lemke RP, Hudson-Mason A, et al.** High-flow nasal cannulae in the management of apnea of prematurity: a comparison with conventional nasal continuous positive airway pressure. Pediatrics. 2001;107(5):1081-3.

10. **Kugelman A, Riskin A, Said W, et al.** A randomized pilot study comparing heated humidified high-flow nasal cannulae with NIPPV for RDS. Pediatr Pulmonol. 2015;50(6):576-83.

11. **Abdel-Hady H, Shouman B and Aly H.** Early weaning from CPAP to high flow nasal cannula in preterm infants is associated with prolonged oxygen requirement: a randomized controlled trial. Early Hum Dev. 2011;87(3):205-8.

12. **Sasi A and Malhotra A.** High flow nasal cannula for continuous positive airway pressure weaning in preterm neonates: A single-centre experience. J Paediatr Child Health. 2015;51(2):199-203.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

13. **Schlapbach LJ, Schaefer J, Brady AM, et al.** High-flow nasal cannula (HFNC) support in interhospital transport of critically ill children. Intensive Care Med. 2014;40(4):592-9.
14. **Reynolds P, Leontiadi S, Lawson T, et al.** Stabilisation of premature infants in the delivery room with nasal high flow. Arch Dis Child Fetal Neonatal Ed. 2016;101(4):284-7.
15. **Boyle M, Chaudhary R, Kent S, et al.** High-flow nasal cannula on transport: moving with the times. Acta Paediatr. 2014;103(5):181-4.
16. **Park K, Choi B, Shin J, et al.** Humidified high flow nasal cannula in preterm infants. Int J Technol Assess Health Care. 2017;32(4):650.
17. **Shin J, Park K, Lee EH, et al.** Humidified High Flow Nasal Cannula versus Nasal Continuous Positive Airway Pressure as an Initial Respiratory Support in Preterm Infants with Respiratory Distress: a Randomized, Controlled Non-Inferiority Trial. J Korean Med Sci. 2017;32(4):650-5.
18. **Sharma PK, Poonia AK and Bansal RK**. Comparison of efficacy of nasal continuous positive airway pressure and heated humidified high-flow nasal cannula as a primary mode of respiratory support in preterm infants. J Clin Neonatol. 2019;8(2):102-6.
19. **Demirel G, Vatansever B, Tastekin A.** High flow nasal cannula versus nasal continuous positive airway pressure for primary respiratory support in preterm infants: a prospective randomized study. Am J Perinatol. 2019. epub ahead of print.
20. **Murki S, Singh J, Khant C, et al.** High-Flow Nasal Cannula versus Nasal Continuous Positive Airway Pressure for Primary Respiratory Support in Preterm Infants with Respiratory Distress. Neonatology 2018; 113:235–241.
21. **Manley BJ, Roberts CT, Frøisland DH, et al.** Refining the use of nasal high-Flow therapy as primary respiratory support for preterm infants. J Pediatr. 2018; **196**: 65– 70.
22. **Zheng G, Huang X-q, Zhao H-h, et al.** The effect of the treatment with heated humidified high-flow nasal cannula on neonatal respiratory distress syndrome in China: a single-center experience. Canad Respir J. 2017; 2017:401-8.
23. **Lavizzari A, Colnaghi M, Ciuffini F, et al.** Heated, Humidified High-Flow Nasal Cannula vs Nasal Continuous Positive Airway Pressure for Respiratory Distress Syndrome of Prematurity: A Randomized Clinical Noninferiority Trial. JAMA Pediatr. 2016; 8:220-6.
24. **Fleeman N, Dundar Y, Shah PS, et al.** Heated Humidified High-Flow Nasal Cannula for Preterm Infants: An Updated Systematic Review and Metaanalysis. International Journal of Technology Assessment in Health Care 2019; 35(4): 298- 306.
25. **Yoder BA, Stoddard RA, Li M, et al.** Heated, humidified high-flow nasal cannula versus nasal CPAP for respiratory support in neonates. Pediatrics. 2013;131(5):1482-90.

UNDER PEER REVIEW