

## Optimising bi-level non-invasive ventilation in preterm neonates: a systematic review

Dr Jack Pickard, BMBS, MRCPCH

Email: [jackpickard1985@hotmail.com](mailto:jackpickard1985@hotmail.com)

- 1) Senior Fellow, Paediatric Intensive Care, Great Ormond Street Hospital, Great Ormond Street, London WC1N 3JH
- 2) Honorary Research Fellow, University of Cambridge, King's College, King's Parade, Cambridge CB2 1ST

### Abstract

Bi-level non-invasive ventilation (BiPAP) can be used as a step-up from continuous positive airway pressure (CPAP) in preterm neonates to reduce the amount of time spent mechanically ventilated. Prolonged mechanical ventilation is associated with increased morbidity and mortality. MEDLINE was searched using the terms CPAP and BiPAP. Four studies reported a significant reduction in the need for mechanical ventilation when applying BiPAP compared with CPAP. Two studies reported no significant benefit. Studies which used 15/5 cm H<sub>2</sub>O or 20/5 cm H<sub>2</sub>O were more successful than those that used 6/5 cm H<sub>2</sub>O or 8/5 cm H<sub>2</sub>O. There was no discernible pattern to the effectiveness of respiratory rate, synchronisation or inspiratory time. In conclusion, BiPAP should be delivered at 15-20/5 cm H<sub>2</sub>O or 20/5 cm H<sub>2</sub>O.

## Key messages

BiPAP has greater efficacy than CPAP at reducing the need for mechanical ventilation in preterm neonates with respiratory distress

An inspiratory pressure of at least 15 cm H<sub>2</sub>O should be employed wherever possible

There is insufficient evidence to recommend any particular respiratory rate, inspiratory time or synchronisation mode over another

## Structured clinical question

Is BiPAP (intervention) more effective than CPAP (control) at reducing the need for mechanical ventilation in preterm neonates, and if so, what are the most effective pressures, inspiratory time, respiratory rate and synchronization mode to use?

## Search strategy

MEDLINE was searched via Pubmed using the terms 'CPAP' AND 'BiPAP'. This yielded 223 results. Further references within these articles were considered. Studies were included if they compared the effect of BiPAP vs CPAP on the need for mechanical ventilation or tracheal intubation. A total of 18 relevant studies were identified, including 15 randomised controlled trials (RCT) and one meta-analysis. Eight studies were excluded because they were already reported in the meta-analysis. Two were excluded because they were retrospective. A further two were excluded due to a lack of statistical analysis in the reporting. [1, 2]. A total of six studies remained for consideration; see table.

## Summary

Citation	Study group	Study type	Outcome	Key result	Comments
Esmaeilinia et al: J	161 neonates < 34	Randomised	Need for re-	6% vs. 17.6%, p =	Need for re-

Pediatr 2016; 26: e2352. [4]	weeks gestation randomised to receive BiPAP or CPAP	controlled trial	intubation	0.031	intubation was significantly reduced in the BiPAP group using pressures of up to 20/7 and abdominal synchronisation
			Length of hospital stay	23.92 ± 13.5 vs. 32.61 ± 21.07 (P = 0.002)	
			Chronic lung disease	0% vs 4%, P = 0.035	
Lemyre et al: Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2016: 12. [5]	1061 neonates from 24 to 34 weeks gestation from ten randomised/quasi-randomised controlled trials of BiPAP vs CPAP	Systematic review and meta-analysis	Respiratory failure	RR 0.65 (95% CI 0.51 to 0.82)	Need for intubation was significantly reduced in the BiPAP group using pressures of up to 22/7
			Need for intubation	RR 0.78 (95% CI 0.64 to 0.94)	
			Chronic lung disease	RR 0.78 (95% CI 0.58 to 1.06)	
Oncel et al: Arch Dis Child Fetal Neonatal Ed 2016: 101; F323–8. [6]	200 neonates 25 to 32 weeks gestation randomised to receive BiPAP or CPAP	Randomised controlled trial	Need for surfactant	38% vs 60% (p = 0.002), then OR: 0.39 (95% CI 0.22 to 0.71; p=0.002) after multivariate regression	Need for intubation was significantly reduced in the BiPAP group using pressures of 15-20/ 5-6
			Need for intubation	13% vs 29%; p=0.005, then OR 0.36 (95% CI 0.17 to 0.76; p = 0.008) after multivariate regression	
			Chronic lung disease	7% vs 16% (p = 0.046), but non-significant after multi-variate regression	
Sadeghnia et al: Adv Biomed Res 2016: 5; 3. [8]	70 neonates < 1500g birth weight randomised to receive BiPAP or CPAP	Randomised controlled trial	Duration of NIV, duration of complementary oxygen	P > 0.05	Need for intubation was <i>not</i> reduced in the BiPAP group using pressures of 6-8/4
			Need for mechanical ventilation	14% vs 26% (p = 0.23)	
			Chronic lung disease, intraventricular hemorrhage (IVH), pneumothorax, need for the next dose of surfactant, death rate	P > 0.05	
Shi et al: Pediatr Pulmonol 2014: 49;	179 neonates 25 weeks to term	Randomised controlled	Need for mechanical	11.4% vs. 20.9%	Need for mechanical

673–8. [7]	gestation randomised to receive BiPAP or CPAP	trial	ventilation	(p < 0.05)	ventilation was significantly reduced in the BiPAP group using pressures of 15-20/ 4-6
			Discharged without any respiratory support, feeding well, gaining weight ('favourable outcome')	93.2% vs. 84.6% (P < 0.05)	
Victor et al: Pediatrics 2016: 138(2); e20154095. [9]	541 neonates < 30 weeks gestation randomised to receive BiPAP or CPAP	Randomised controlled trial	Need for mechanical ventilation	21% vs 20% (OR 1.01, 95% CI 0.65 - 1.56, p = 0.97)	Need for intubation was <i>not</i> reduced in the BiPAP group using pressures of 6-8 / 4
			Death, oxygen requirement at 28 days, oxygen requirement at 36 weeks' corrected gestation, intraventricular hemorrhage, necrotizing enterocolitis requiring surgery, pneumothorax	No significant difference	

### Commentary

The primary purpose of non-invasive respiratory support (NIV) in preterm neonates, who frequently suffer with airway disease associated with early surfactant deficiency (respiratory distress syndrome; RDS), is to reduce the amount of time that is spent mechanically ventilated. Prolonged mechanical ventilation is associated with an increased risk of bronchopulmonary dysplasia (BPD; also known as chronic lung disease or CLD) and a poorer neurological outcome. [3] The most commonly used modalities of NIV are continuous positive airway pressure (CPAP), biphasic positive airway pressure (BiPAP), and heated humidified high flow nasal cannula oxygen (HFNC). BiPAP, also known as Bi-Phasic, non-invasive positive pressure ventilation (NIPPV), non-invasive mechanical ventilation and non-invasive mandatory ventilation (NIMV), consists of the application of intermittently higher pressure over positive end-expiratory pressure (PEEP). BiPAP is typically used in preterm neonates who are deemed to have the highest risk of requiring tracheal intubation and mechanical ventilation. This represents an assumption that BiPAP has greater efficacy in clearing carbon dioxide, improving oxygenation, and/or reducing overall respiratory effort when compared to CPAP or HFNC. However, there is a lack of consensus regarding which pressures, trigger methods, inspiratory time and respiratory rate are most effective when

BiPAP is delivered, and indeed whether BiPAP truly does confer enhanced respiratory benefit. HFNC is used less commonly in extreme preterm neonates who are most likely to require mechanical ventilation and will not be considered in this review.

Four studies, including the Cochrane collaboration meta-analysis, reported a significant reduction in the need for mechanical ventilation when applying BiPAP compared with CPAP. [4, 5, 6, 7] Two studies reported no significant benefit. [8, 9] The largest, highest quality study (the Cochrane meta-analysis) found a relative risk of intubation of 0.78 (95% CI 0.64 to 0.94). [5] Within the Cochrane review, the single study which individually posted a significant benefit, Sai Sai Sunil Kishore et al [10], used pressures of 15-16/5 cm H<sub>2</sub>O. The most striking difference about the two studies that did not report a benefit, Sadeghnia [8] and Victor, [9] was that they used much lower pressures than the other studies (6-8/4 cm H<sub>2</sub>O). It is notable that CPAP was used at between 4 and 8 cm H<sub>2</sub>O in all studies, typically achieving a lower mean airway pressure (MAP) than that of BiPAP. There is an argument that the comparison is therefore not a fair one; future research should investigate the application of CPAP with a higher MAP.

One study used synchronisation of pressure cycling with the respiratory pattern of the neonate, timed with an abdominal sensor. [4] They achieved a positive result, however the remainder of studies used an unsynchronized, variable or unreported format and achieved mixed results. A wide variety of respiratory rates, from 10 to 50 breaths per minute, were employed across studies with no discernible relationship to the outcomes that were achieved. Inspiratory time was only reported by Sadeghnia et al, [8] who used 0.5 seconds.

The development of BPD / CLD was examined in several studies. While Esmaeilnia and Sadeghnia [4, 8] found significant reductions, this was not present in the remainder of studies. The Cochrane meta-analysis showed only a trend towards a benefit (RR 0.78, 95% CI 0.58 to 1.06). [5] BiPAP was regarded as safe in all studies, even when high inspiratory pressures of as much as 22 cm H<sub>2</sub>O were employed. One study reported traumatization of nasal skin and mucosa being a problem in both groups, [4] but this recovered fully in all cases.

In conclusion, BiPAP has greater efficacy than CPAP for reducing the need for mechanical ventilation in preterm neonates. Since higher inspiratory pressures tend to be more effective and their safety has been widely demonstrated, BiPAP should be applied at higher pressures wherever possible, with the upper pressure set at a minimum of 15 cm H<sub>2</sub>O. Pressures of up to 22 cm H<sub>2</sub>O are acceptable. There is insufficient evidence at present to say which respiratory rate, inspiratory time or synchronization mode is most effective for the delivery of BiPAP in preterm neonates.

## References

- 1 Chen X, Peng WS, Wang L, Xu JL, Dong HF, Pan JH. A randomized controlled study of nasal intermittent positive pressure ventilation in the treatment of neonatal respiratory distress syndrome. *Zhongguo Dang Dai Er Ke Za Zhi.* (2013) 15:713–7. [<http://www.zgddek.com/EN/abstract/abstract13151.shtml>.]
- 2 Salama GS, Ayyash FF, Al-Rabadi AJ, Alquran ML, Shakkoury AG. Nasal-IMV versus nasal-CPAP as an initial mode of respiratory support for premature infants with RDS: a prospective randomized clinical trial. *Rawal Journal Medical* 2015;40(2):197-202. [<http://www.rmj.org.pk/?mno=173370>]
- 3 Samour I, Karnati S. Non-Invasive Respiratory Support of the Premature Neonate: From Physics to Bench. *Front Paediatr.* May 2020. [<https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fped.2020.00214/full>]
- 4 Esmailnia T, Nayeri F, Taheritafti R, Shariat M, Moghimpour-Bijani F. Comparison of Complications and efficacy of NIPPV and nasal CPAP in preterm infants With RDS. *Iran J Pediatr.* (2016) 26:e2352. [<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4904342/>]
- 5 Lemyre B, Laughon M, Bose C, Davis P. Early nasal intermittent positive pressure ventilation (NIPPV) versus early nasal continuous positive airway pressure (NCPAP) for preterm infants. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2016 Dec; 2016; 12(12). PMID: 27976361 [<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6463790/>]
- 6 Oncel MY, Arayici S, Uras N, Alyamac-Dizdar E, Sari FN, Karahan S, et al. Nasal continuous positive airway pressure versus nasal intermittent positive-pressure ventilation within the minimally invasive surfactant therapy approach in preterm infants: a randomised controlled trial. *Arch Dis Child Fetal Neonatal Ed.* (2016) 101:F323–8. [<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26553376/>]
- 7 Shi Y, Tang S, Zhao J, Shen J. A prospective, randomized, controlled study of NIPPV versus nCPAP in preterm and term infants with respiratory distress syndrome. *Pediatr Pulmonol.* (2014) 49:673–8. [<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24039148/>]
- 8 Sadeghnia A, Barekateyn B, Badieli Z, Hosseini SM. Analysis and comparison of the effects of N-BiPAP and Bubble-CPAP in treatment of preterm newborns with the weight of below 1500 grams affiliated with respiratory distress syndrome: A randomised clinical trial. *Adv Biomed Res.* 2016 Jan 27;5:3. [<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26955624/>]
- 9 Victor S, Roberts SA, Mitchell S, Aziz H, Lavender T; Extubate Trial Group. Biphasic Positive Airway Pressure or Continuous Positive Airway Pressure: A Randomized Trial. *Pediatrics.* 2016 Aug;138(2):e20154095. [<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27371758/>]
- 10 Sai Sunil Kishore M, Dutta S, Kumar P. Early nasal intermittent positive pressure ventilation versus continuous positive airway pressure for respiratory distress syndrome. *Acta Paediatrica* 2009; 98(9):1412-5. [<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19523049>]