

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

International, multicentre, observational study of fluid bolus therapy in neonates

Amy K Keir ⁽¹⁾,^{1,2,3} Oliver Karam,^{4,5} Nicolette Hodyl,^{1,2} Michael J Stark,^{1,2} Helen G Liley,^{6,7} Prakesh S Shah,^{8,9} Simon J Stanworth;^{10,11} on behalf of the NeoBolus Study Group[†]

¹Robinson Research Institute, Adelaide Medical School, University of Adelaide, ²Department of Neonatal Medicine, Women's and Children's Hospital, ³Healthy Mothers, Babies and Children, South Australian Medical and Research Institute, Adelaide, South Australia, ⁶Department of Neonatology, Mater Mothers' Hospital, Mater Research, ⁷Faculty of Clinical Medicine and Mater Research Institute, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia, ⁴Pediatric Intensive Care Unit, Geneva University Hospital, Geneva, Switzerland, ⁵Division of Pediatric Critical Care Medicine, Children's Hospital of Richmond at VCU, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, Virginia, United States, ⁸Department of Paediatrics, Mount Sinai Hospital, ⁹Department of Paediatrics, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, ¹⁰NHS Blood and Transplant and Department of Haematology, Oxford University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust and ¹¹Radcliffe Department of Medicine, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom

Aim: To assess the prevalence, types and indications for fluid bolus therapy in neonates with haemodynamic compromise.

Methods: This was a pragmatic, international, multicentre observational study in neonatal units across Australasia, Europe and North America with a predefined study period of 10–15 study days per participating neonatal unit between December 2015 and March 2017. Infants \leq 28 days of age who received a fluid bolus for the management of haemodynamic compromise (\geq 10 mL/kg given at \leq 6 h) were included.

Results: A total of 163 neonates received a bolus over 8479 eligible patient days in 41 neonatal units. Prevalence of fluid bolus therapy varied between centres from 0 to 28.6% of admitted neonates per day, with a pooled prevalence rate of 1.5% (95% confidence interval 1.1–1.9%). The most common fluid used was 0.9% sodium chloride (129/163; 79%), and the volume of fluid administered was most commonly 10 mL/kg (115/163; 71%) over a median of 30 min (interquartile range 20–60). The most frequent indications were hypotension (n = 56; 34%), poor perfusion (n = 20; 12%) and metabolic acidosis (n = 20; 12%). Minimal or no clinical improvement was reported by clinicians in 66 of 163 cases (40%).

Conclusions: Wide international variations in types, indications and effects of fluid bolus administration in haemodynamically compromised neonates suggest uncertainty in the risk–benefit profile. This is likely to reflect the lack of robust evidence to support the efficacy of different fluid types, doses and appropriate indications. Together, these highlight a need for further clinically relevant studies.

Key words: blood pressure; fluid; infant; newborn; therapy.

Correspondence: Dr Amy K Keir, Department of Neonatal Medicine, Women's and Children's Hospital, 72 King William Road, Adelaide, SA 5006, Australia. Fax: +61 88161 7654; email: amy.keir@adelaide.edu.au

Conflict of interest: None declared.

†Individual study site investigators/collaborators: Australia: Flinders Medical Centre: Scott Morris; Grace Centre for Newborn Care, Children's Hospital at Westmead: Kathryn Browning Carmo; John Hunter Children's Hospital: Koert De Waal, Michelle Stubbs; Mater Mothers' Hospital Brisbane: Helen Liley, Angela Pearson, Holly Campbell; The Royal Children's Hospital, Melbourne: Rodney W Hunt, Elizabeth Perkins; The Royal Hobart Hospital: Sanoj KM Ali; The Royal North Shore Hospital: Jennifer Bowen, Claire Jacobs, Mary Paradisis; The Royal Prince Alfred Hospital: David Osborn, Mark Greenhalgh; The Royal Women's Hospital: Carl Kuschel; Women's and Children's Hospital: Nicolette Hodyl, Michael Stark, Amy Keir. Canada: British Columbia Women's Hospital: Joseph Ting; Centre Hospitalier Universitaire Sainte-Justine: Keith Barrington, Anie Lapointe; Kingston General Hospital: Kimberly Dow, Helen Coo; McMaster Children's Hospital: Amit Mukerji; Mount Sinai Hospital: Adel Mohamed; Royal Columbian Hospital: Miroslav Stavel; St John's Newfoundland: Akhil Deshpandey, Nicole Tucker; Sunnybrook Health Sciences Centre: Eugene Ng, Carly Diamond. France: Hôpital de la Femme, de l'Enfant et de l'Adolescent (neonatal and paediatric intensive care units): Pierre Bourgoin, Lutz Bindl; Réanimation Pédiatrique Spécialisée Hospital Enfants: Matthieu Maria; South Paris University Hospitals, APHP and South Paris-Saclay University (Division of Pediatrics and Neonatal Critical Care, Medical Center "A.Beclere") (Prais, France): Daniele De Luca, Valentina Dell'Orto. Italy: Fondazione IRCCS Cà Granda Ospedale Maggiore Policlinico, Università degli Studi di Milano (Neonatal Intensive Care Unit, Department of Clinical Sciences and Community Health): Stefano Ghirardello. New Zealand: Christchurch Women's Hospital: Kiran More; Dunedin Hospital (South District Health Board): Liza Edmonds, Lauren Weaver. Sweden: Karolinska University Hospital in Danderyd, Karolinska University Hospital in Huddinge and Astrid Lindgren Children's Hospital, Karolinska University Hospital: Emöke Deschmann and Mikael Norman; SUS Lund University Hospital: Owain Thomas, Jonathan Karlsson. Switzerland: Hôpitaux universitaires de Genève: Roberta De Luca; Ostschweizer Kinderspital: Bjarte Rogdo. Portugal: Hospital Pediátrico de Coimbra: Rita Moinho, Alexandra Dinis. United Kingdom: John Radcliffe Hospital: Dominic Wilkinson, Anshuman Paria. United States of America: Boston Children's Hospital: Martha Sola-Visner, Vanessa Young; Emory University Midtown, Grady Memorial Hospital and Center for Transfusion and Cellular Therapy, Pathology Department, Emory University: Cassandra D Josephson, Jane Skvarich; Levine Children's Hospital (Carolinas Medical Center): Matthew Saxonhouse, Rebecca Poliquin; University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences and Arkansas Children's Hospital: Sherry Courtney, Dalton Janssen; University of Vermont Medical Center: Sarah K Harm, Allison Bartlett; University of Washington Medical Center and Seattle Children's Hospital: Dennis Mayock, Gina Lee.

Accepted for publication 17 September 2018.

What is already known on this topic

- 1 Fluid bolus therapy is used for the management of haemodynamic compromise in neonates.
- 2 The indications for, the type of fluids used and the short-term clinical outcomes of fluid bolus therapy are poorly understood.
- 3 There is increasing evidence in paediatric medicine that fluid bolus therapy may be either ineffective or harmful.

What this paper adds

- 1 Our study suggests that fluid bolus therapy remains a practice in preterm and term infants in neonatal units in highly resourced countries; the most common type of fluid used is 0.9% sodium chloride at 10 mL/kg over 30 min.
- 2 The most common indications for fluid bolus therapy in neonates are low blood pressure, decreased perfusion on clinical assessment and metabolic acidosis.
- 3 Current clinical trials in this area are focusing on the use of inotropes; however, fluid bolus therapy also warrants closer examination, and this study provides key data to develop interventional trials.

Intravenous fluid bolus therapy for suspected haemodynamic compromise in neonates with a variety of underlying conditions is a common intervention in neonatal units. Fluid boluses may include crystalloids such as 0.9% sodium chloride or colloids such as albumin or blood products, including plasma, which have different biochemical properties. While this therapy represents an established component of the management of haemodynamic compromise in neonates, the volume, type of fluid, timing and indications for this practice are not well described or understood.¹⁻³ A Cochrane review found no benefit from the use of early fluid bolus therapy in infants ≤32 weeks' gestation without haemodynamic compromise.¹ This review identified no available evidence to determine whether those with clear haemodynamic compromise might benefit from volume expansion compared to no volume expansion.¹ Another review, including two more recent studies not included in the previous meta-analysis, was again unable to establish any benefit from fluid bolus therapy in late preterm and term infants with signs of haemodynamic compromise.³ There are well-documented concerns about the consequences of fluid bolus therapy in older children, but comparable data do not exist for neonates. It is possible that some fluid boluses provide no clinical benefit and may even cause harm.4,5

As a first step in evaluating and improving the use of fluid bolus therapy in clinical practice, we conducted a pragmatic, international, multicentre, observational study to explore existing practices of fluid bolus therapy. Our primary objective was to describe the prevalence, types, indications for and doses of fluid bolus therapy administered to neonates with suspected haemodynamic compromise. Secondary objectives were to determine variations in practice of fluid bolus therapy and evaluate the degree of perceived improvement post-fluid boluses.

Methods

Study design and setting

This study was an international, pragmatic, multicentre, observational study undertaken at 41 neonatal units in Australasia (n = 12), North America (n = 16) and Europe (n = 13). Units were recruited through neonatal research networks and specialty societies, as well as through personal communications from the

2

main study investigators. Participating neonatal units collected data in blocks of five continuous days in two to three blocks for a minimum of 10 days and up to a maximum of 15 days per unit. This was a pragmatic decision, given limited study funding, to allow units to support a period of study data collection based, for example, on the availability of local research staff or individuals. Data collection occurred between December 2015 and March 2017.

Participants

Newborn infants of any gestation at birth who were ≤ 28 days of age and who received a fluid bolus for suspected haemodynamic compromise were included. Participants were identified by the individual study site co-investigators.

Exposure

The exposure of interest was a fluid bolus given for the purposes of intravascular volume expansion for suspected haemodynamic compromise. Fluids included were 0.9% sodium chloride, 0.45% sodium chloride, Ringer's lactate solution, albumin, frozen plasma and whole blood or red blood cells (RBCs). The fluid bolus had to be 10 mL/kg or a greater volume given over ≤ 6 h. Neonates who received bolus fluids for hypoglycaemia or RBC transfusions to manage anaemia of prematurity alone were excluded.

Variables

Demographic and clinical characteristics of included neonates and participating units were collected. We collected information on the type, volume and duration of bolus fluids administered. Information on indications for fluid boluses assigned according to predefined categories, including an 'other' category where site investigator was asked to define the indication, was collected. (See Appendix S1 (Supporting Information) for the data collection sheet.) The effects of fluid boluses on short-term perceived clinical outcomes at 4–6 h after administration were categorised according to a numerical score. These scores were based on clinician report 4–6 h post-bolus in four areas: (i) the reported degree of improvement in the primary indication for fluid (no change = 0, some improvement = 1, large improvement = 2); (ii) the need for escalation of therapy to inotrope use (new agent started = 0, one or more agents increased *and* one or more agents decreased = 1 or no agent started, agent decreased or stopped = 2); (iii) additional fluids bolus(es) within 6 h of the first (more than 2 = 0, one additional bolus = 1, no additional bolus = 2); and (iv) whether another treatment, for example, sodium bicarbonate infusion or blood products, was received for the primary indication (yes = 0, no = 2). These scores were summed and classified as no or minor improvement (score 0–2), mild improvement (score 3–5) or major improvement (6–8). The scoring sheet is provided in Appendix S1 (Supporting Information) and was developed by expert consensus and a formal piloting process, including neonatologists, paediatric critical care and haematologists within the study group.



Fig. 1 Prevalence of fluid bolus therapy per admitted infant per study day. Horizontal lines represent the proportion of infants who received a fluid bolus divided by the number of potentially eligible infants during the study period. For example, for site 1:0.021 (95% CI 0.004–0.037) or 2.1% of potentially eligible infants received a fluid bolus during study.

Data management

Study data were collected and managed using the Research Electronic Data Capture (REDCap) tools hosted at the University of Adelaide, Australia.⁶ REDCap is a secure, web-based application designed to support data capture for research studies, providing (i) an interface for validated data entry; (ii) audit trails for tracking data manipulation and export procedures; (iii) automated export procedures for data downloads to common statistical packages; and (iv) procedures for importing data from external sources.

Data sources

Descriptive data on unit characteristics were collected by individual study site co-ordinators, including type of unit, country, number of neonates admitted per year, availability of unit guidelines for fluid bolus and/or RBC transfusion.

Sample size

All infants in each participating institution who received at least one fluid bolus during the site collection period were included in the study. A sample of 41 units agreed to participate. Each patient was enrolled only once for the first bolus received during the study interval even if he or she received further boluses on a subsequent study day.

Statistical analysis

Normally distributed data were described by the mean and standard deviation and non-normally distributed data using the median and interquartile range (IQR). Analyses were carried out using R statistical software package (R, version 3.1.0; R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria) unless otherwise



Fig. 2 Distribution of gestational age at birth of included infants. Type of fluid bolus: (**m**), 0.9% sodium chloride; (**m**), packed red blood cells; (**m**), frozen plasma; (**m**), Ringer's lactate; (**m**), 5 or 20% albumin; (**m**), 0.45% sodium chloride.

specified. The prevalence rate for the receipt of bolus was calculated by dividing the number of neonates who received a bolus by the number of neonates who were present in the unit during the study interval who were ≤ 28 days of age. Each neonate on a given day was considered to be eligible to receive a bolus until the study period ended. Pooled prevalence rates and 95% confidence intervals (CI) were calculated using Der-simonian random-effects model with open-access Meta-analyst software.⁷

Table 1	Primary indication	for fluid bolus therapy	(n = 10)	63) and clinically	perceived scores	post-fluid bolus	administration
---------	--------------------	-------------------------	----------	--------------------	------------------	------------------	----------------

Main indication	Frequency, n (%)	No to minor improvement (score 0–2), <i>n</i> (%)	Mild improvement (score 3–5), <i>n</i> (%)	Major improvement (score 6–8), <i>n</i> (%)
Low blood pressure	56 (34)	14 (25)	17 (30)	25 (45)
Decreased perfusion on clinical assessment	20 (12)	1 (5)	7 (35)	12 (60)
Metabolic acidosis	20 (12)	1 (5)	4 (20)	15 (75)
Elevated lactate	13 (8)	2 (15)	O (O)	11 (85)
Decreased urinary output	9 (6)	O (O)	1 (11)	8 (89)
Blood loss/Haemorrhage	9 (6)	1 (11)	4 (44)	4 (44)
Hypovolemic shock	6 (4)	2 (33)	O (O)	4 (67)
Echocardiography findings (decreased cardiac output)	6 (4)	2 (33)	O (O)	4 (67)
Part of acute resuscitation in an arrested (or peri-arrest) infant	6 (4)	2 (33)	3 (50)	1 (17)
Tachycardia	4 (3)	O (O)	1 (25)	3 (75)
Septic shock	4 (3)	O (O)	2 (50)	2 (50)
Other ;	10 (6)	O (O)	2 (20)	8 (80)

†Other: Volume replacement for gastric aspirate or urinary losses, polycythaemia, dehydration and renal impairment, hypovolemia, anaemia, hyperbilirubinaemia, gastroschisis (unclear whether this was routine for this unit for this diagnosis or was for another reason, such as replacement of losses or to improve perfusion).

		c	1	1.1	
Table 2	Indication	tor fluid bolu	s (n = 163)	and type	of fluid used

	0.9% sodium chloride, n	Packed red blood cells, <i>n</i>	Frozen plasma, <i>n</i>	Ringer's lactate, n	Other, <i>n</i> †
Low blood pressure	47	3	1	1	4
Decreased perfusion on clinical assessment	18	1	_	1	
Metabolic acidosis	17	_	_	3	_
Elevated lactate	10	2	_	1	_
Decreased urinary output	8	1	_	_	
Blood loss/Haemorrhage	5	3	1	_	
Hypovolemic shock	2	2	_	1	1
Echocardiography findings (decreased cardiac output)	5	_	1	_	—
Part of acute resuscitation in an arrested (or peri-arrest) infant	3	2	—	1	—
Tachycardia	3	_	_	_	1
Septic shock	3	_	_	1	_
Other‡	8	1	1	_	

†Other: 4% albumin, 5% albumin, 0.45% sodium chloride. ‡Other: Volume replacement for gastric aspirate or urinary losses, polycythaemia, dehydration and renal impairment, hypovolemia, anaemia, hyperbilirubinaemia, gastroschisis (unclear whether this was routine for this unit for this diagnosis or was for another reason, such as replacement of losses or to improve perfusion).

Ethics approval

Site-specific ethics approval was obtained for all sites. Two centres in Canada required individual written consent prior to collection of clinical data. French and Swiss sites had an opt-out strategy, with information provided to families in the units' waiting rooms. All other ethics committees waived the requirement for individual consent given that all data were routinely collected for clinical purposes, and no individual identifying data would be recorded and sent to the lead site.

0.0 -0.3 Fig. 3 Differences in acid–base 0.6 (pH) from pre- to post-fluid bolus. Solid grey lines represent the linear regression change in pH compared to initial pH Difference level. The horizontal axis is the starting value, and the vertical axis is the change over time. The trend line (solid grey line) indicates that the further away from 0.0 'normal' the value starts, the bigger the change (closer to normal). This may due to the fluid bolus (or other factors) or -0.3 other factors such as sampling and a regression to the mean. (•), Packed red blood cells; (A), 4 or 5% albumin; (I), frozen plasma; (+) 0.9% saline; (+), Ringer's lactate.





Results

Participating centres

Forty-one units participated in the study. Ten (24%) were in Australia, eight (20%) in Canada, four (10%) in France, one (2%) in Italy, two (5%) in New Zealand, one (2%) in Portugal, four (10%) in Sweden, two (5%) in Switzerland, one (2%) in the UK and eight (20%) in the USA. Median numbers of admissions per unit per year were 650 (IQR 420–1836). Twenty-two (55%) units were classified as general perinatal centres, 16 (39%) were surgical units including cardiac and three (7.5%) were mixed (neonatal and paediatric intensive care) units.

Patient characteristics

A total of 163 neonates received a bolus over 8479 eligible patient days. The pooled prevalence rate of the receipt of fluid bolus was 1.5% (95% CI 1.1–1.9%) across all participating units. The prevalence of bolus administration in participating units varied from 0 to 28.6% of admitted neonates (\leq 28 days of age) per day. Data for individual units, grouped by geographical regional area, are provided in Figure 1.

For included infants, the birth gestation of included infants reflected a bimodal distribution, with peaks at 27 and 39 weeks, as did birthweight, with peaks at 650–850 g and 2850–3050 g (Fig. 2). The majority of neonates received their first fluid bolus on the day of birth (87/163; 53%), and there was diminishing

6

likelihood of a first fluid bolus on subsequent days; day 2 (24/163; 15%), days 3–7 (25/163; 15%) and >7 days (27/163; 17%). The reported primary indications for fluid bolus therapy are provided in Table 1.

Clinical guideline availability

Local clinical practice guidelines, which referenced fluid bolus therapy, were available in only 10 (24%) of the participating units.

Fluid bolus characteristics

Types of fluid used for fluid bolus therapy included 0.9% sodium chloride (n = 129; 79%), RBCs (n = 15; 9%), 4 or 5% albumin (n = 5; 3%), Ringer's lactate (n = 9; 5%), frozen plasma (n = 4; 3%) and 0.45% sodium chloride (n = 1; <1%). The most common volume administered was 10 mL/kg (n = 115; 67%), with a median duration of administration of 30 (IQR 20–60) min. Table 2 shows a breakdown of the indication for each fluid bolus and type of fluid used.

Short-term outcomes

Mortality

At the end of the data collection period, 151 of 163 (93%) infants were alive. None of the infants died during the receipt of the fluid bolus or within 6 h post-bolus.

Clinician-perceived improvement

Clinicians perceived no or minor improvement (score 0–2) in 25 of 163 (15%), a mild improvement (score 3–5) in 41 of 163 (25%) and a major improvement in 97 of 163 (60%) in response to bolus therapy. Improvement according to primary indication is reported in Table 1. Table S1 (Supporting Information) provides a further breakdown of indication for fluid bolus, type of fluid used and clinical improvement scores.

Laboratory indices

The following changes in laboratory parameters were observed following fluid bolus: pH 0.03 units (IQR -0.03 to 0.12 units; n = 140) (Fig. 3); lactate -0.59 mmol/L (-2.15 to 0.02 mmol/L; n = 100) (Fig. 4); bicarbonate 0 mmol/L (-1.35 to 2.00 mmol/L; n = 139); chloride 0.5 mmol/L (-1.00 to 3.00 mmol/L; n = 80); base deficit -1.10 mmol/L (-3.93 to 1.00 mmol/L; n = 128); and haemoglobin -5.00 g/L (-16.00 to 9.25 g/L; n = 88).

Variations in prevalence of fluid bolus therapy

Regions

The pooled prevalence rates for fluid bolus therapy in Australian and New Zealand units (n = 12) was 1.2% (95% CI 0.6–1.7%); in Canadian units (n = 8), it was 1.5% (95% CI 0.8–2.1%); in US-based units (n = 9), it was 1.8% (95% CI 0.8–2.8%); and in European units (n = 12), it was 2.7% (95% CI 1.1–4.4%) (Fig. 1).

Types of centre

The pooled prevalence for fluid bolus therapy within general perinatal centres (n = 22) was 1.3% (95% CI 0.9–1.8%), and within the remaining centres (surgical and mixed units) (n = 19), it was 1.9% (95% CI 1.2–2.6%). The centre with the highest prevalence rate was a non-perinatal unit caring primarily for pae-diatric patients.

Discussion

This international study explored the prevalence, types and indications of fluid bolus therapy in neonates with haemodynamic compromise. This was a pragmatic study aimed at trying to better define the current practices of fluid bolus therapy and, as such, was developed with the need to be very restrictive on the amount of data collection. While the pooled prevalence rate was low, the prevalence of this therapy varied (0–28.6%). We identified variations in the nominated indications for and frequency of use of fluid boluses between participating units. Overall, perceived improvement following fluid bolus therapy was reported in 85% of cases. Together, these results highlight a clear lack of consistent clinical approach and perceptions of variable effects.

The interpretation of our pragmatic study needs to recognise strengths and limitations. Our study was supported by a large number of units across many different countries. It describes practices in units that were selected by personal approaches by the investigators, but we cannot assume that they are representative of non-participating neonatal units and other countries. Participation was voluntary, and units selected the most convenient time to support data collection. The calculation of incidence was based on the assumption that the prevalence of fluid boluses over the short study intervals was constant and representative of standard practice in each unit. This assumption may not be true. However, variations from the reported rate could be on either side of the estimated rate, and thus, overall, the averaged results could be considered representative. In an attempt to maximise unit participation, data collection was kept to a minimum, and therefore, several outcomes of potential interest were not requested, for example, blood pressure. In addition, it was not possible to collect detailed information on potential adverse effects related to fluid bolus beyond 6 h, such as volume overload, dilutional coagulopathy, hypothermia and electrolyte disturbances.4,5 This lack of data extends to other specific fluidrelated complications, including transfusion reactions^{8,9} or 0.9% sodium chloride-induced hypochloremic metabolic acidosis, although we did not observe any significant increase in chloridelevel post-fluid bolus. We did not observe any significant changes in measured laboratory indices post-bolus. Reported outcomes post-bolus were described by the treating clinicians, and as the prescriber of the treatment, they may have preferred to perceive an improvement. One further point is that, as the majority of fluid boluses were administered at day one of age, factors such as post-natal age may also have a significant effect on the parameters of physiological responses to fluids.

Published studies evaluating fluid bolus therapy in neonates are heterogeneous and have not always included neonates with signs of haemodynamic compromise.¹⁰⁻¹⁴ There are no randomised studies primarily designed to examine fluid bolus compared to no fluid bolus in preterm infants with haemodynamic compromise.15 Studies in late preterm and term infants with haemodynamic compromise are limited to non-randomised observational studies and do not report clinical benefit.^{16,17} A survey in Canada reported that, while attitudes to the use of inotropes varied, neonatologists routinely treated suspected haemodynamic compromise in infants with a birthweight <1500 g with a fluid bolus (97%) and most commonly used 0.9% sodium chloride (95%).18 Our results are consistent with this, with the majority of fluid boluses (47/56; 84%) given to an infant to manage low blood pressure being 0.9% sodium chloride.

Only 10 of the units participating in this study had local clinical guidelines, even in areas with a limited evidence base, may reduce variation in practice.¹⁹ Nevertheless, consensus is only helpful to patients if it is the right consensus, and the lack of intervention studies defining optimal fluid bolus therapy, such as indication, type, volume and rate, in preterm and term infants makes this not possible at this time. Clinicians are left to either extrapolate data from other patient groups, some now showing potential harmful effects from fluid bolus therapy in children (e.g. Fluid Expansion as Supporting Therapy (FEAST) study²⁰), or rely on limited and potentially misleading physiological data to guide decisions. Interestingly, there was little regional variation observed in the use of fluid bolus therapy.

Conclusions

With ongoing trials examining the use of inotropes in this group of infants (http://www.neocirculation.eu and http://www.hip-trial. com), our study suggests the need for research to evaluate fluid bolus therapy. Further studies may need to explore whether

infants who are more acidotic, or with higher lactate, benefit from fluid bolus therapy as might be suggested by our findings. Research needs to consider the choice of fluid as well as dose and timing. The most common fluid bolus type in our study was 0.9% sodium chloride, although this fluid is non-physiological, and concerns have been raised about the chloride load,²¹ which may be more important in preterm infants with less mature renal function. New studies should apply clear consensus outcomes of haemodynamic compromise and optimal monitoring,²² for example, development of a core outcome set.²³ As the FEAST trial demonstrated in children,²⁰ our assumptions around the potential benefits of fluid bolus therapy in neonates may need careful reconsideration.

Acknowledgements

AK Keir received support through an Australian Government Research Training Program Scholarship and through the Eric Burnard Fellowship from the Royal Australasian College of Physicians Foundation for this work. The Women's and Children's Hospital Foundation provided financial support for this study.

References

- 1 Osborn DA, Evans N. Early volume expansion for prevention of morbidity and mortality in very preterm infants. *Cochrane Database Syst. Rev.* 2004; 2: CD002055.
- 2 Narchi H. Is an intravenous fluid bolus of albumin or normal saline beneficial in the treatment of metabolic acidosis in a normovolaemic newborn? Arch. Dis. Child. 2004; 89: 884–5.
- 3 Keir A, Froessler B, Stanworth S. QUESTION 2: Are intravenous fluid boluses beneficial in late preterm or term infants with suspected haemodynamic compromise? Arch. Dis. Child. 2016; 101: 201–2.
- 4 Goldberg RN, Chung D, Goldman SL, Bancalari E. The association of rapid volume expansion and intraventricular hemorrhage in the preterm infant. *J. Pediatr.* 1980; **96**: 1060–3.
- 5 Ewer AK, Tyler W, Francis A, Drinkall D, Gardosi JO. Excessive volume expansion and neonatal death in preterm infants born at 27–28 weeks gestation. *Paediatr. Perinat. Epidemiol.* 2003; **17**: 180–6.
- 6 Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic data capture (REDCap) – A metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. J. Biomed. Inform. 2009; 42: 377–81.
- 7 Wallace BC, Dahabreh IJ, Trikalinos TA, Lau J, Trow P, Schmid CH. Closing the gap between methodologists and end-users: R as a computational back-end. J. Stat. Softw. 2012; 49: 1–15.
- 8 Mohamed A, Shah PS. Transfusion associated necrotizing enterocolitis: A meta-analysis of observational data. *Pediatrics* 2012; **129**: 529–40.
- 9 Rashid N, Al-Sufayan F, Seshia MM, Baier RJ. Post transfusion lung injury in the neonatal population. J. Perinatol. 2012; 4: 292–6.
- Beverley DW, Pitts-Tucker TJ, Congdon PJ. Prevention of intraventricular haemorrhage by fresh frozen plasma. Arch. Dis. Child. 1985; 60: 710–3.

- 11 Ekblad H, Kero P, Korvenranta H. Renal function in preterm infants during the first five days of life: Influence of maturation and early colloid treatment. *Biol. Neonate* 1992; **61**: 308–17.
- 12 Gottuso MA, Williams ML, Oski FA. The role of exchange transfusions in the management of low-birth-weight infants with and without severe respiratory distress syndrome. II. Further observations and studies of mechanisms of action. J. Pediatr. 1976; 89: 279–85.
- 13 Lundstrom K, Pryds O, Greisen G. The haemodynamic effects of dopamine and volume expansion in sick preterm infants. *Early Hum. Dev.* 2000; **57**: 157–63.
- 14 The Northern Neonatal Nursing Initiative Trial Group. A randomized trial comparing the effect of prophylactic intravenous fresh frozen plasma, gelatin or glucose on early mortality and morbidity in preterm babies. The Northern Neonatal Nursing Initiative [NNNI] Trial Group. Eur. J. Pediatr. 1996; 155: 580–8.
- 15 Dempsey EM, Barrington KJ. Treating hypotension in the preterm infant: When and with what: A critical and systematic review. *J. Perinatol.* 2007; **27**: 469–78.
- 16 Mydam J, Zidan M, Chouthai NS. A comprehensive study of clinical biomarkers, use of inotropic medications and fluid resuscitation in newborns with persistent pulmonary hypertension. *Pediatr. Cardiol.* 2014; 1: 233–9.
- 17 Wyckoff MH, Perlman JM, Laptook AR. Use of volume expansion during delivery room resuscitation in near-term and term infants. *Pediatrics* 2005; **115**: 950–5.
- 18 Dempsey EM, Barrington KJ. Diagnostic criteria and therapeutic interventions for the hypotensive very low birth weight infant. J. Perinatol. 2006; 26: 677–81.
- 19 Kennedy PJ, Leathley CM, Hughes CF. Clinical practice variation. Med. J. Aust. 2010; 193: S97–9.
- 20 Maitland K, Kiguli S, Opoka RO *et al*. Mortality after fluid bolus in African children with severe infection. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 2011; **364**: 2483–95.
- 21 Yunos N, Bellomo R, Hegarty C, Story D, Ho L, Bailey M. Association between a chloride-liberal vs chloride-restrictive intravenous fluid administration strategy and kidney injury in critically ill adults. *JAMA* 2012; **308**: 1566–72.
- 22 Durrmeyer X, Marchand-Martin L, Porcher R et al. Abstention or intervention for isolated hypotension in the first 3 days of life in extremely preterm infants: Association with short-term outcomes in the EPI-PAGE 2 cohort study. Arch. Dis. Child. Fetal Neonatal Ed. 2017; 102: 490–6.
- 23 Webbe J, Sinha I, Gale C. Core outcome sets. Arch. Dis. Child. Educ. Pract. Ed. 2018; 103: 163–6.

Supporting Information

Additional Supporting Information may be found in the online version of this article at the publisher's web-site:

Appendix S1. Data collection sheet.

 Table S1. Fluid bolus, type of fluid used and clinical improvement scores.