

The Probability of Reducing Hospitalization Rates for Bronchiolitis: A Bayesian Analysis

Larry Dong^{1,2}, MSc, Terry P. Klassen³, MD, David W. Johnson^{4,5}, Rhonda Correll⁶, HBScN, Serge Gouin^{7,8}, MDCM, FRCPC, Maala Bhatt^{9,10}, MD, MSc, FRCPC, Hema Patel^{11,12}, MD, FRCPC, MSc, Gary Joubert¹³, Karen J. L. Black¹⁴, MD, MSc, Troy W. S. Turner^{15,16}, MD, FRCPC, Sandra R. Whitehouse¹⁷, MD, MALS, FRCPC, Amy C. Plint^{*10,18}, Anna Heath^{*1,2,19}, MMath, PhD.

** Contributed equally as co-senior authors*

Affiliations: ¹Division of Biostatistics, Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada; ²Child Evaluative Services, the Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto, Canada; ³Children's Hospital Research Institute of Manitoba, Department of Pediatrics and Child Health, Rady Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Manitoba; Manitoba, Canada; ⁴Alberta Children's Hospital Research Institute, Calgary, Canada; ⁵Departments of Pediatrics, Emergency Medicine and Physiology & Pharmacology, Cumming School of Medicine, University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada; ⁶Children's Hospital of Eastern Ontario Research Institute, Ottawa, Canada; ⁷Pediatric Emergency Department, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire Sainte-Justine, Montréal, Canada; ⁸Department of Pediatrics, Université de Montréal, Montréal, Canada; ⁹Department of Pediatrics, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada; ¹⁰Children's Hospital of Eastern Ontario, Ottawa, Canada; ¹¹McGill University Health Centre Research Institute, Montreal, Canada; ¹²Department of Pediatrics, McGill University, Montreal, Canada; ¹³Children's Hospital, Department of Pediatrics, Western University, London, Canada; ¹⁴Division of Pediatric Emergency Medicine, British Columbia Children's Hospital, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada; ¹⁵Pediatric Emergency Department, Stollery Children's Hospital; Alberta, Canada; ¹⁶Department of Pediatrics, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada; ¹⁷Department of Pediatrics, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada; ¹⁸Department of Pediatrics and Emergency Medicine, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada; ¹⁹Department of Statistical Science, University College London, London, UK.

Corresponding Author: Larry Dong, Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, 155 College Street, Toronto ON, M5T 3M7, larry.dong@mail.utoronto.ca, 514.562.8938.

Sources of financial assistance: This work was supported by Canada Research Chairs in Statistical Trial Design [AH] and Clinical Trials [TPK] (<https://www.chairs-chaires.gc.ca/home-accueil-eng.aspx>), Tier 1 University of Ottawa Research Chair [ACP] (<https://www.uottawa.ca/faculty-medicine/research-and-innovation/research-chairs>) and an operating grant from Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR; <https://cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/193.html>) for the original CanBEST study. The funders played no role in the study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Conflict of Interest Disclosures: Amy C. Plint receives in-kind support from Amphastar for a clinical trial in bronchiolitis. The other authors have no relevant conflicts to disclose.

Prior Presentations: This results from this analysis were presented at the Statistical Society of Canada Conference 2023.

Data Sharing Statement: Data cannot be shared publicly because participants of this study did not agree for their data to be shared publicly. Data are available from CHEO for researchers who meet the criteria for access to confidential data.

Clinical Trial registry name, registration number: Current Controlled Trials number, ISRCTN56745572

Research Ethics Approval: Children's Hospital of Eastern Ontario Research Ethics Board gave approval in May 2004 for the CanBEST study with REB Number 02/59E.

Structured Abstract

Background: Bronchiolitis exerts a high burden on children, their families and the healthcare system. The Canadian Bronchiolitis Epinephrine Steroid Trial (CanBEST) assessed whether administering epinephrine alone, dexamethasone alone, or in combination (EpiDex) could reduce bronchiolitis-related hospitalizations among children less than 12 months of age compared to placebo. CanBEST demonstrated a statistically significant reduction in 7-day hospitalization risk with EpiDex in an unadjusted analysis but not after adjustment.

Objective: To explore the probability that EpiDex results in a reduction in hospitalizations using Bayesian methods.

Study Design: Using prior distributions that represent varying levels of preexisting enthusiasm or skepticism and information about the treatment effect *before* data were collected, the Bayesian distribution of the relative risk of hospitalization compared to placebo was determined. The probability that the treatment effect is less 1, 0.9, 0.8 and 0.6, indicating increasing reductions in hospitalization risk, are computed alongside 95% credible intervals.

Results: Combining a minimally informative prior distribution with the data from CanBEST provides comparable results to the original analysis. Unless strongly skeptical views about the effectiveness of EpiDex were considered, the 95% credible interval for the treatment effect lies below 1, indicating a reduction in hospitalizations. There is a 90% probability that EpiDex

results in a clinically meaningful reduction in hospitalization of 10% even when incorporating skeptical views, with a 67% probability when considering strongly skeptical views.

Conclusion: A Bayesian analysis demonstrates a high chance that EpiDex reduces hospitalization rates for bronchiolitis, although strongly skeptical individuals may require additional evidence to change practice.

1 Introduction

2 Bronchiolitis is a respiratory disease that exerts significant burden on the healthcare
3 system (1). It is the leading cause of infant hospitalization in North America and is associated
4 with substantial healthcare spending during the winter months (2–5). Despite this, there are
5 currently no treatments that have conclusively demonstrated a reduction in hospitalization rates
6 for infants with bronchiolitis (6,7). The Canadian Bronchiolitis Epinephrine Steroid Trial
7 (CanBEST) is one of the largest trials in bronchiolitis and examined the effectiveness of
8 epinephrine, dexamethasone, and their combination in reducing the risk of hospitalization by day
9 7 in children aged 6 weeks to 12 months of age (8). CanBEST used a factorial design (9) to
10 randomize participants to one of four treatment categories: a combination of nebulized
11 epinephrine and oral dexamethasone (EpiDex), nebulized epinephrine with oral placebo (Epi),
12 oral dexamethasone with nebulized placebo (Dex) and oral and nebulized placebo (placebo).
13 This design allowed CanBEST to evaluate Epi, Dex and EpiDex to determine whether any of
14 these three intervention arms resulted in a reduction in hospitalization compared to placebo.

15 CanBEST demonstrated a clinically meaningful 35% reduction in the relative risk (RR)
16 of hospitalization (a 9.3% absolute risk reduction) for EpiDex compared to placebo (8) and used
17 the standard statistical *frequentist approach* to draw conclusions from the study. The frequentist
18 approach for statistical analysis indirectly evaluates study hypotheses by calculating the chance
19 of observing the available data under the assumption that a null hypothesis is true (10), typically
20 that there is no effect of treatment on the outcome of interest. The frequentist approach assumes
21 that if the chance of observing the data when the null hypothesis is true is small, then the null
22 hypothesis can be rejected in favor of an alternative hypothesis, usually that there is a beneficial
23 treatment effect. Within this framework, answering multiple research questions within the same

24 study, as for the CanBEST study, usually requires an adjustment to maintain appropriate error
25 rates (11). However, there is a controversy around whether this is required when testing for
26 interactions in a factorial design, such as CanBEST (9,12). As a result, the CanBEST study
27 presented both an unadjusted and adjusted analysis. The unadjusted analysis resulted in a
28 statistically significant reduction in hospitalization with EpiDex at the 5% level with a p-value of
29 0.02, while the analysis adjusted for multiple comparisons was not statistically significant with a
30 p-value of 0.07 (8). The discrepancy has led to challenges in interpreting and translating the
31 results of the CanBEST study to the bedside (13) and currently, national guidelines for
32 bronchiolitis recommend only supportive care for patients with bronchiolitis (6). However,
33 extensive basic science literature demonstrates that co-administration of beta₂-adrenoceptor
34 agonists and corticosteroids mutually enhance each other's effectiveness (14–18) and their
35 synergy is also well documented in clinical trials of asthma management (19,20).

36 An alternative approach to frequentist statistical analysis (21) is also available and
37 gaining popularity: the Bayesian approach (22,23). This framework allows you to calculate the
38 probability that an intervention is effective, given the observed data (24,25). The Bayesian
39 approach also incorporates pre-existing evidence or clinical expertise into the statistical analysis
40 (26) and can thus examine how differences in clinical judgment and experience of an
41 intervention affect the interpretation of results (27). Finally, as Bayesian analyses are only
42 dependent on the data collected, the proposed model and the prior distributions (28), we
43 circumvent multiple testing issues (9). Given the extensive health system, patient and family
44 burden of bronchiolitis and the lack of recommended interventions to reduce this burden (1), we
45 undertake an unplanned Bayesian analysis of the data from the CanBEST study. This analysis
46 will calculate the probability that EpiDex reduces hospitalizations for bronchiolitis (27).

47 **Methods**

48 ***Canadian Bronchiolitis Epinephrine Steroid Trial***

49 CanBEST was a multicenter, double-blinded placebo-controlled clinical trial that assessed
50 the efficacy of epinephrine and dexamethasone, alone and in combination, each compared to
51 placebo, as a treatment for children aged 6 weeks to 12 months who presented at the emergency
52 department with bronchiolitis (8). All hospitals who participated in CanBEST are members of
53 the national research network, Pediatric Emergency Research Canada (PERC). CanBEST
54 recruited between 1st April 2004 and 31st March 2008. Written informed consent was obtained
55 from the parents or guardians of all infants included in the study. The primary outcome was
56 admission to hospital for bronchiolitis within seven days of study enrolment. The complete
57 inclusion and exclusion criteria, outcome definitions and study procedures are provided in the
58 primary publication (8). Trial participants were randomized equally into one of the four
59 treatment groups: EpiDex, Epi, Dex or placebo, with dosing details provided in the primary
60 publication (8). The target enrolment was 800 patients. Three participants were lost to follow-up
61 meaning data for 797 participants were available for this post-hoc analysis.

62 ***An Introduction to Bayesian Inference***

63 Bayesian and frequentist methods for statistical analysis differ in their philosophy,
64 leading to differences in their conduct and interpretation (26). Frequentist analyses reach
65 statistical conclusions by controlling error rates over many analyses conducted in the same
66 manner (29). When multiple research questions are evaluated within the same study, the chance
67 of making at least one incorrect conclusion is increased and necessitates adjustments to control
68 the error rate of the overall study (11). In contrast, Bayesian methods aim to make the *best*

69 conclusions using the data from the specific study (25) meaning that study conclusions depend
70 on the *data* and assumed model, rather than the analysis method (25).

71 To perform a Bayesian analysis, a *prior distribution* is required that represents the
72 available evidence, usually assumed to derive from the literature or relevant clinical experience,
73 about the plausible range of the treatment effect *before* analyzing the data (30). This prior
74 distribution is combined with the study data to determine an updated probability distribution for
75 the treatment effect, which represents our knowledge about the plausible values of the treatment
76 effect after seeing the data. This is known as *posterior* distribution. From this, we can determine
77 the probability that the intervention is beneficial. This probability is not available from
78 frequentist p-values (24) and allows us to trade-off the chance of experiencing benefit or harm
79 from an intervention (31).

80 ***Design of Prior Distributions: Reference Priors and Data-Driven Priors***

81 Designing prior distributions is a crucial element of undertaking a Bayesian analysis.
82 Furthermore, it is an inherently subjective process, which has led to criticisms of Bayesian
83 statistics as prior distributions influence the trial analysis (32). However, we exploit this by
84 selecting a range of prior distributions that explicitly represent different archetypes of beliefs
85 about the efficacy of the interventions and results from previously conducted studies (27). This
86 allows us to explore how variations in the views on the effectiveness of EpiDex influence the
87 interpretation of the CanBEST study. This is advantageous for two reasons; firstly, given the pre-
88 existing controversy on the efficacy of EpiDex for bronchiolitis, we can gain further insight into
89 the debate around its effectiveness. Secondly, readers can determine which prior best represents
90 their own background assessment of the efficacy of EpiDex, based on their experience and
91 expertise, and interpret the CanBEST study results accordingly (27).

92 We consider two classes of prior distributions in our analysis: reference priors and data-
93 driven priors (27). Reference priors represent clinical archetypes of beliefs about the treatment
94 effectiveness: enthusiastic, moderately enthusiastic, moderately skeptical, skeptical and no
95 opinion. The “no opinion” option uses a “minimally informative” prior to exert the smallest
96 possible influence on the results and provides a similar numerical result to a frequentist analysis
97 but allowing for a Bayesian interpretation. The other four reference priors are defined to reflect
98 the level of enthusiasm or skepticism about the effect of EpiDex using a normal distribution for
99 the log-RR (Figure 1) (27). Generally, we assume that skeptics believe there is no treatment
100 effect (corresponding to a treatment effect of 1) while enthusiasts believe the treatment is
101 effective at reducing hospitalization (a treatment effect less than 1). Table 1 presents the five
102 reference priors for treatment effect for EpiDex. As there is no credible evidence that these
103 therapies would increase hospitalization, we did not consider this in our reference priors.

104 [TABLE 1 HERE]

105 In addition to the reference priors, we used *data-driven* priors, which were derived by
106 fitting a mixed effects hierarchical model using uninformative priors using previously published
107 data from randomized trials in bronchiolitis (27,33). Broadly, the results using the data-driven
108 priors can be interpreted as combining data from the CanBEST study with previous studies, like
109 a meta-analysis. Studies deemed sufficiently close to CanBEST were chosen according to the
110 four following criteria: (a) study participants were randomized to either a glucocorticoid steroid,
111 a β_2 -agonist or their combination; (b) the outcome of interest was related to hospital admission –
112 ideally 7-day cumulative hospitalization, (c) participants were infants less than two years of age
113 and (d) the study was conducted prior to the publication of the initial CanBEST analysis. These
114 inclusion criteria assume that drugs in the same class as dexamethasone and epinephrine will

115 have similar effectiveness. Table A.1 in Appendix A summarizes the intervention, comparator,
116 population, outcome of interest, relative risk, and sample size for studies used for the data-driven
117 priors. There were differences in the chosen studies, including variation in the choice of drug, its
118 dosing, patient inclusion/exclusion criteria and outcomes.

119 Once the data-driven priors have been specified (Figure 1), we consider scenarios that
120 dilute their impact on the final analysis. These scenarios are based on providing a prior “weight”
121 of 100%, 50% and 10%, which represents the relative contribution of a participant in a previous
122 study compared to the contribution of a participant in the CanBEST study and is controlled by
123 the standard deviation of the prior. This weighting procedure accounts for fundamental
124 differences between the data in CanBEST and the data in the previous studies, such as
125 differences in patient population, interventions, and outcomes of interest. Thus, data-driven
126 priors are rarely developed using a full systematic review and meta-analysis as the down-
127 weighting allows us to “discount” the contribution of studies that do not entirely match the
128 CanBEST study.

129 [FIGURE 1 HERE]

130 Table 1 provides a descriptive summary of all the considered reference and data-driven
131 priors for EpiDex. We report the median RR of hospitalization, the standard deviation (SD) of
132 the log-RR distribution – where smaller SDs imply more certainty about the treatment effect
133 before seeing the data – and the probability of RR being below various thresholds, e.g. $P(RR <$
134 $0.9)$ is the probability that the treatment reduces the probability of hospitalization probability by
135 at least 10%. For similar tables pertaining to Epi alone and Dex alone priors, see Tables B.1 and
136 B.2 in the Appendix B.

137 ***Analysis***

138 For each of the prior distributions defined in Table 1, we used a Bayesian model to
139 determine the posterior distributions of the treatment effect for Epi, Dex and EpiDex compared
140 to placebo. We used a binomial generalized linear model with a log link to calculate the relative
141 risk of hospitalization for the three interventions, compared to placebo, adjusted for site. The
142 adjustment for participating sites was achieved using a hierarchical model. The Bayesian model
143 was fitted using PyMC version 4.4.0 (34) in Python version 3.9.15 with 20,000 simulations and a
144 burn-in of 10,000 to ensure convergence (35). Traceplots were examined to check for
145 convergence and autocorrelation (35).

146 The posterior distributions were summarized using the median relative risk and equi-
147 tailed 95% credible intervals; these quantities are analogues to a frequentist point estimate of
148 effect and confidence interval. Finally, we estimated the probability that the relative risk was
149 below the thresholds 1, 0.9, 0.8 and 0.6 by the proportion of the simulations that were below
150 each of those thresholds. These thresholds represent a reduction in the risk of hospitalization for
151 bronchiolitis of 0%, 10%, 20% and 40%, respectively.

152

153 **Results**

154 The primary outcome was available for 797 infants, of these 34 who received the EpiDex
155 combination, 47 who received Epi alone, 51 who received Dex alone and 53 who received
156 placebo were admitted to hospital for bronchiolitis within 7 days of study enrolment.

157 Overall, our Bayesian analysis (Table 2) demonstrated a posterior probability that the use
158 of EpiDex results in a reduction in hospitalization greater than 98%, unless the clinician was
159 strongly skeptical about the effectiveness of EpiDex. The complete results from our Bayesian
160 analysis are displayed in Table 2, while the equivalent analyses for the Epi and Dex treatment

161 groups are available in Tables B.1 and B.2 in the Appendix B. Posterior distributions for the RR
162 of EpiDex compared to placebo are displayed in Figure 2, with reference priors on the left and
163 data-driven priors on the right.

164 [TABLE 2 HERE]

165 [FIGURE 2 HERE]

166 *Reference Priors*

167 All equi-tailed 95% credible intervals exclude a null relative risk value of 1 except when
168 using a strongly skeptical prior. Using minimally informative priors for all treatment effects
169 leads to an estimated posterior median RR of 0.66 for EpiDex and a corresponding 95% equi-
170 tailed credible interval of (0.45, 0.96); this result is similar to the initial CanBEST analysis where
171 the estimated RR and 95% confidence interval were 0.65 and (0.45, 0.96), respectively, in the
172 unadjusted analysis. Comparing estimates for the posterior median, we can see that the RR
173 increases as the prior skepticism increases. Finally, the probability of a reduction in
174 hospitalization rates with EpiDex, compared to placebo ($RR < 1$) is greater than 98%, unless a
175 strongly skeptical prior is used. Similarly, the probability of a greater than 10% reduction in
176 hospitalization rates is greater than 90%, unless individuals are strongly skeptical.

177

178 *Data-Driven Priors*

179 For the data-driven priors, all equi-tailed 95% credible intervals exclude a null relative
180 risk value of 1, indicating that the combined current evidence suggests a reduction in
181 hospitalization rates with EpiDex. Increasing the weighting of the previous studies increases the
182 posterior median RR, from 0.69 to 0.77, indicating that the previous studies demonstrated a
183 smaller treatment effect than the effect observed in CanBEST. We confirm this trend by

184 computing the posterior distributions using data-driven priors with increasing weights between
185 0% and 100%; this analysis is available in Appendix D.

186

187 **Discussion**

188 Bronchiolitis exerts a huge burden on the healthcare system, patients, and families (1).
189 Our Bayesian analysis of the results from the pivotal CanBEST trial has demonstrated that there
190 is a greater than 98% probability that EpiDex reduces hospitalizations for bronchiolitis compared
191 to placebo unless clinicians are highly skeptical. Even highly skeptical individuals could be
192 swayed by the data in the CanBEST study as our analysis demonstrates that there is a 90%
193 chance that EpiDex reduces hospitalizations. This finding was also supported when we combined
194 CanBEST with data from previous studies.

195 Furthermore, our data-driven Bayesian analysis confirmed that CanBEST resulted in a
196 larger reduction in hospitalization rates compared to previous studies as the estimated posterior
197 median RR for EpiDex increases as the weight for the prior studies increases. Overall, we
198 conclude that EpiDex has the potential to reduce admissions to hospital for bronchiolitis and, as a
199 result, the burden of bronchiolitis for infants, their families, and the healthcare system.

200 The estimated posterior probability of a 10% reduction in the relative risk of
201 hospitalization varies between 65%, for the strongly skeptical prior, to 99%, for the strongly
202 enthusiastic prior and is always greater than 90% for the data-driven priors. This demonstrates
203 not only does EpiDex potentially reduce hospitalizations, but also there is a relatively high
204 chance of a *clinically meaningful* reduction in hospitalization rates with EpiDex. However, if
205 there is high skepticism about the efficacy of EpiDex, additional evidence may be required
206 before being convinced by the outcome of CanBEST. In contrast, even when moderate

207 skepticism is considered, the CanBEST results demonstrate a probability of clinically meaningful
208 reduction in hospitalization rates of 89%.

209 Our Bayesian reanalysis has added important nuance to the interpretation of CanBEST.
210 Firstly, we calculated the probability that the interventions are effective at reducing the risk of
211 hospitalization, which is not possible in standard analyses. This can facilitate conversation and
212 aligns with how clinicians make decisions when deciding on patient care (24). Secondly, by
213 representing a wide spectrum of prior beliefs, we have provided a flexible framework for
214 interpreting the CanBEST results, facilitating discussion between clinical decision makers who
215 may have differing experience and expertise. Finally, the design of priors and the lack of a strict
216 definition for statistical significance in the Bayesian paradigm encourages an in-depth discussion
217 of the implications of the results from CanBEST and whether EpiDex can be used to alleviate the
218 overwhelming health system impact of bronchiolitis, particularly in face of the recent
219 bronchiolitis surges (36).

220 There are some limitations to this reanalysis. Firstly, any inherent limitations in CanBEST are
221 not circumvented by this analysis (27). Bayesian methods provide a different framework for the
222 interpretation and dissemination of results but are unable to overcome challenges in the design of
223 the initial trial. For example, the definition of bronchiolitis varies globally and CanBEST
224 restricted participants to infants less than one year of age who were experiencing wheezing for
225 the first time in the typical “season” for respiratory syncytial virus infection. Other jurisdictions
226 include children up to 24 months of age and do not always restrict the diagnosis to those with a
227 first episode of wheezing (37). Clinicians may also be concerned about the use of corticosteroids
228 in young children although a recent comprehensive systematic review found no increased risk of
229 short-term adverse effects among children with acute respiratory illnesses treated with

230 corticosteroids compared to placebo (38). Similarly, no trial of nebulized epinephrine in
231 bronchiolitis has demonstrated serious side effects or clinically important increases in heart rate
232 or blood pressure. A theoretical risk is that children treated with epinephrine and discharged
233 home might clinically worsen as the effect of epinephrine wears off. However, a systematic
234 review of bronchiolitis studies found similar return-to-care rates in children treated with
235 epinephrine as compared with placebo and salbutamol (39). Strengths of the original trial are
236 also inherent to this analysis, e.g., the CanBEST trial has very limited loss to follow up. A
237 limitation of this analysis is that alternative prior distributions could have been considered and
238 would have changed the results (26). However, by being explicit about our prior definitions and
239 assumptions and considering a range of previous studies for the data-driven priors, we allow the
240 reader to determine which view and analysis aligns most closely with their beliefs.

241

242

243 **Conclusion**

244 Bayesian analysis provides an alternative to the commonly used frequentist interpretation
245 of clinical trials. It allows individuals with different prior experience and expertise to
246 contextualize their interpretation of the trial results. For CanBEST, our Bayesian analysis
247 demonstrated a very high probability that the combination of nebulized epinephrine and oral
248 dexamethasone reduces bronchiolitis-related hospital admissions. Thus, use of this combination
249 treatment is likely to reduce the substantial burden of bronchiolitis to both infants and their
250 families and the healthcare system. The use of Bayesian methods circumvents a discussion on
251 whether the analysis should be adjusted for multiple comparisons, which previously complicated
252 the interpretation of CanBEST. Note that due to the uncertain interpretation of CanBEST in the

253 frequentist paradigm, an international randomized trial is currently underway to answer the calls
254 for further evidence on the effectiveness of the combined therapy (40). Based on our analysis,
255 the results from this trial would be most relevant if clinicians were initially highly skeptical
256 about the effectiveness of the combined therapy and are, thus, still unconvinced by CanBEST.

257

258 FIGURE CAPTIONS

259

260 *Figure 1. Left: Reference priors for the relative risk of hospitalization within 7 days after*
261 *treatment administration. Right: Data-driven priors using different weights to control the*
262 *influence from previous studies.*

263

264 *Figure 2. Posterior distributions for the relative risk of hospitalization within 7 days after*
265 *treatment under different reference priors (left) and data-driven priors (right).*

266

References

1. Carroll KN, Gebretsadik T, Griffin MR, Wu P, Dupont WD, Mitchel EF, et al. Increasing Burden and Risk Factors for Bronchiolitis-Related Medical Visits in Infants Enrolled in a State Health Care Insurance Plan. *Pediatrics*. 2008 Jul 1;122(1):58–64.
2. Shay DK. Bronchiolitis-Associated Hospitalizations Among US Children, 1980-1996. *JAMA*. 1999 Oct 20;282(15):1440.
3. Langley JM, LeBlanc JC, Smith B, Wang EEL. Increasing Incidence of Hospitalization for Bronchiolitis among Canadian Children, 1980–2000. *J Infect Dis*. 2003 Dec;188(11):1764–7.
4. Njoo H, Pelletier L, Spika L. Infectious disease. In: *Respiratory Disease in Canada* [Internet]. Ottawa: Canadian Institute for Health Information, Canadian Lung Association, Health Canada, Statistics Canada, editors; 2001 [cited 2024 Feb 19]. p. 65–84. Available from: <https://publications.gc.ca/collections/Collection/H39-593-2001E.pdf>
5. Craig E, Jackson C, Han D, Grimwood K, NZCYES Steering Committee. *Monitoring the Health of New Zealand Children and Young People: Indicator Handbook*. Auckland, New Zealand: Paediatric Society of New Zealand and New Zealand Child and Youth Epidemiology Service; 2007.
6. Florin TA, Plint AC, Zorc JJ. Viral bronchiolitis. *The Lancet*. 2017 Jan;389(10065):211–24.
7. Hartling L, Bialy L, Vandermeer B, Tjosvold L, Johnson D, Plint A, et al. Epinephrine for bronchiolitis. *Cochrane Database Systematic Reviews*. 2011; 6: 1-134.

8. Plint AC, Johnson DW, Patel H, Wiebe N, Correll R, Brant R, et al. Epinephrine and Dexamethasone in Children with Bronchiolitis. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2009 May 14;360(20):2079–89.
9. Gelman A, Hill J, Yajima M. Why We (Usually) Don't Have to Worry About Multiple Comparisons. *J Res Educ Eff*. 2012 Apr;5(2):189–211.
10. Pocock SJ, McMurray JJV, Collier TJ. Making Sense of Statistics in Clinical Trial Reports. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2015 Dec;66(22):2536–49.
11. Bender R, Lange S. Adjusting for multiple testing—when and how? *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2001 Apr;54(4):343–9.
12. Sjölander A, Vansteelandt S. Frequentist versus Bayesian approaches to multiple testing. *Eur J Epidemiol*. 2019 Sep 13;34(9):809–21.
13. Zorc JJ, Hall CB. Bronchiolitis: Recent Evidence on Diagnosis and Management. *Pediatrics*. 2010 Feb 1;125(2):342–9.
14. Barnes PJ. Scientific rationale for using a single inhaler for asthma control. *European Respiratory Journal*. 2007 Mar 1;29(3):587–95.
15. Giembycz MA, Kaur M, Leigh R, Newton R. A Holy Grail of asthma management: toward understanding how long-acting beta₂-adrenoceptor agonists enhance the clinical efficacy of inhaled corticosteroids. *Br J Pharmacol*. 2008 Mar 29;153(6):1090–104.
16. Newton R, Holden NS. Separating Transrepression and Transactivation: A Distressing Divorce for the Glucocorticoid Receptor? *Mol Pharmacol*. 2007 Oct;72(4):799–809.
17. Kaur M, Chivers JE, Giembycz MA, Newton R. Long-Acting beta₂-adrenoceptor agonists synergistically enhance glucocorticoid-dependent transcription in human airway epithelial and smooth muscle cells. *Mol Pharmacol*. 2008 Jan;73(1):203–14.

18. Holden NS, Bell MJ, Rider CF, King EM, Gaunt DD, Leigh R, et al. β_2 -Adrenoceptor agonist-induced RGS2 expression is a genomic mechanism of bronchoprotection that is enhanced by glucocorticoids. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2011 Dec 6;108(49):19713–8.
19. Greening AP, Ind PW, Northfield M, Shaw G. Added salmeterol versus higher-dose corticosteroid in asthma patients with symptoms on existing inhaled corticosteroid. *The Lancet*. 1994 Jul;344(8917):219–24.
20. Pauwels RA, Löfdahl CG, Postma DS, Tattersfield AE, O’Byrne P, Barnes PJ, et al. Effect of Inhaled Formoterol and Budesonide on Exacerbations of Asthma. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 1997 Nov 13;337(20):1405–11.
21. Bland JM, Altman DG. Statistics notes: Bayesians and frequentists. *BMJ*. 1998 Oct 24;317(7166):1151–60.
22. Tidwell RSS, Peng SA, Chen M, Liu DD, Yuan Y, Lee JJ. Bayesian clinical trials at The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center: An update. *Clinical Trials*. 2019 Dec 26;16(6):645–56.
23. Ashby D. Bayesian statistics in medicine: a 25 year review. *Stat Med*. 2006 Nov 15;25(21):3589–631.
24. Jack Lee J, Chu CT. Bayesian clinical trials in action. *Stat Med*. 2012 Nov 10;31(25):2955–72.
25. Goodman SN. Toward Evidence-Based Medical Statistics. 1: The P Value Fallacy. *Ann Intern Med*. 1999 Jun 15;130(12):995.
26. Lee PM. *Bayesian statistics: An Introduction*. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley; 1989.

27. Goligher EC, Tomlinson G, Hajage D, Wijeyesundera DN, Fan E, Jüni P, et al. Extracorporeal Membrane Oxygenation for Severe Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome and Posterior Probability of Mortality Benefit in a Post Hoc Bayesian Analysis of a Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA*. 2018 Dec 4;320(21):2251.
28. Berry DA. Interim Analysis in Clinical Trials: The Role of the Likelihood Principle. *Am Stat*. 1987 May;41(2):117–22.
29. Neyman J. Frequentist probability and frequentist statistics. *Synthese* [Internet]. 1977 Sep [cited 2024 Feb 19];36(1):97–131. Available from: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20115217>
30. Kass RE, Wassermann L. The selection of prior distributions by formal rules. *J Am Stat Assoc* [Internet]. 1996 Sep [cited 2024 Jan 17];91(435):1343–70. Available from: <https://www.stat.cmu.edu/~kass/papers/rules.pdf>
31. Parmigiani G, Inoue L. *Decision theory: Principles and approaches*. Chichester, West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons; 2009.
32. Gelman A. Objections to Bayesian statistics. *Bayesian Anal*. 2008 Sep 1;3(3).
33. DuMouchel W. Bayesian meta-analysis. In: In Berry D *Statistical Methodology in the Pharmaceutical Sciences*. Boca Raton, Florida: CRC Press; 1990. p. 509–29.
34. Salvatier J, Wiecki T, Fonnesbeck C. Probabilistic programming in Python using PyMC3. *PeerJ Computer Science* 2 . 2016 Apr 6;e55.
35. Gelman A, Carlin J, Stern H, Dunson D, Vehtari A, Rubin DB. *Bayesian Data Analysis*. 3rd ed. Chapman and Hall/CRC; 2013.
36. Remien KA, Amarin JZ, Horvat CM, Nofziger RA, Page-Goertz CK, Besunder JB, et al. Admissions for Bronchiolitis at Children’s Hospitals Before and During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2023 Oct 26;6(10):e2339884.

37. Dalziel SR, Haskell L, O'Brien S, Borland ML, Plint AC, Babl FE, et al. Bronchiolitis. *The Lancet*. 2022 Jul;400(10349):392–406.
38. Fernandes RM, Wingert A, Vandermeer B, Featherstone R, Ali S, Plint AC, et al. Safety of corticosteroids in young children with acute respiratory conditions: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ Open*. 2019 Aug 1;9(8):e028511.
39. Hartling L, Fernandes RM, Bialy L, Milne A, Johnson D, Plint A, et al. Steroids and bronchodilators for acute bronchiolitis in the first two years of life: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ*. 2011 Apr 6;342(apr06 2):d1714–d1714.
40. Plint A. In clinicaltrials.gov, Reference Number: NCT03567473. 2022 [cited 2024 May 12]. Bronchiolitis in Infants Placebo Versus Epinephrine and Dexamethasone Study (BIPED). Available from: <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT03567473>

Authors Contribution Statement

Conceptualization; Anna Heath, Amy Plint

Data curation; Terry Klassen, David Johnson, Rhonda Correll, Serge Gouin, Maala Bhatt, Hema Patel, Gary Joubert, Karen Black, Troy Turner, Sandra Whitehouse, Amy Plint

Formal analysis; Larry Dong

Funding acquisition; Amy Plint

Methodology; Anna Heath, Larry Dong

Supervision; Anna Heath, Amy Plint

Visualization; Larry Dong

Roles/Writing - original draft: Larry Dong, Anna Heath, Amy Plint



Writing - review & editing: Terry Klassen, David Johnson, Rhonda Correll, Serge Gouin, Maala Bhatt, Hema Patel, Gary Joubert, Karen Black, Troy Turner, Sandra Whitehouse.

Table 1. The prior distributions used for the CanBEST reanalysis.

Prior Belief	Median relative risk of hospitalization with EpiDex	SD of log relative risk	Equivalent Prior Sample Size	Prior probability that the relative risk is below threshold (in %)			
				RR < 1	RR < 0.9	RR < 0.8	RR < 0.6
Reference Priors							
Minimally Informative	1	10	~0	50	50	49	48
Strongly Enthusiastic	0.6	0.31	134	95	90	82	50
Moderately Enthusiastic	0.8	0.14	668	94	80	50	2
Moderately Skeptical	1	0.31	125	50	37	24	5
Strongly Skeptical	1	0.14	594	50	23	6	0
Data-Driven Priors							
100% Weighting	0.89	0.15	478	77	52	23	0
50% Weighting	0.89	0.21	272	70	51	30	3
10% Weighting	0.89	0.47	61	59	51	41	20


Table 2. Summary table of group 1 (EpiDex) posterior characteristics: median RR, 95% credible interval and probability of RR smaller than various thresholds.

	Posterior median for the RR of hospitalization (95% Credible Interval)	Posterior probability that the RR of hospitalization is below threshold (%)			
		RR < 1	RR < 0.9	RR < 0.8	RR < 0.6
Reference Priors					
Minimally informative	0.66 (0.45, 0.96)	99	95	84	30
Strongly enthusiastic	0.63 (0.45, 0.85)	100	99	94	39
Moderately enthusiastic	0.74 (0.60, 0.91)	100	97	77	3
Skeptical	0.75 (0.55, 1.00)	98	89	67	8
Strongly skeptical	0.86 (0.70, 1.06)	92	65	23	0
Data-Driven Priors					
100% weighting	0.77 (0.62, 0.96)	99	92	63	1
50% weighting	0.74 (0.56, 0.96)	99	93	73	7
10% weighting	0.69 (0.48, 0.96)	99	94	82	23




Figure

Reference posteriors



Data-driven posteriors



Figure