Scopus

Documents

Baba, A.a , Webbe, J.b , Butcher, N.J.a c , Rodrigues, C.a , Stallwood, E.a , Goren, K.a , Monsour, A.a , Chang, A.S.M.d e , Trivedi, A.f , Manley, B.J.g , McCall, E.h , Bogossian, F.i , Namba, F.j , Schmölzer, G.M.k , Harding, J.l , Nguyen, K.A.m , Doyle, L.W.n , Jardine, L.o p , Rysavy, M.A.q , Konstantinidis, M.r s , Meyer, M.t , Helmi, M.A.M.u , Lai, N.M.v , Hay, S.w x , Onland, W.y z , Choo, Y.M.aa , Gale, C.b , Soll, R.F.ab ac , Offringa, M.a r ad , Core Outcome Reporting in Neonatal Trials Study Groupae

Heterogeneity and Gaps in Reporting Primary Outcomes From Neonatal Trials (2023) *Pediatrics*, 152 (3), .

DOI: 10.1542/peds.2022-060751

- ^a Child Health Evaluative Sciences, Hospital for Sick Children Research Institute, Toronto, ON, Canada
- ^b Neonatal Medicine, School of Public Health, Imperial College London, London, United Kingdom
- ^c Department of Psychiatry, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada
- ^d Quality, Safety and Risk Management, Department of Neonatology, KK Women's and Children's Hospital, Singapore
- e DUKE-NUS Medical School, Singapore
- f Children's Hospital at WestmeadNSW, Australia
- ^g The Royal Women's Hospital, Melbourne, Australia
- ^h School of Nursing and Midwifery, Queen's University of Belfast, Belfast, Northern Ireland, United Kingdom
- ⁱ University of the Sunshine Coast, Sunshine Coast, Australia
- ^j Department of Pediatrics, Saitama Medical Center, Saitama Medical UniversitySaitama, Japan
- ^k Department of Pediatrics, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada
- Liggins Institute, University of AucklandAuckland, New Zealand
- ^m Claude Bernard University Lyon, Villeurbanne, France
- ⁿ Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, University of Melbourne, The Royal Women's Hospital, Parkville, VIC, Australia
- O Department of Neonatology, Mater Mothers' Hospital, South BrisbaneQLD, Australia
- ^p University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia
- ^q University of Texas Health Science Centre at Houston, Houston, TX, United States
- ^r Institute of Health Policy, Management, Evaluation, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada
- ^s Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute, St Michael's Hospital, Unity Health Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada
- ^t Middlemore HospitalAuckland, New Zealand
- ^u Department of Paediatrics, International Islamic University, Malaysia
- ^v School of Medicine, Taylor's University, Malaysia
- ^w Department of Neonatology, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, Boston, MA, United States
- ^x Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, United States
- y Department of Neonatology, Emma Children's Hospital, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Netherlands
- ² Amsterdam Reproduction and Development Research Institute, Amsterdam, Netherlands
- ^{aa} Department of Paediatrics, University Malaya, Malaysia
- ^{ab} Burlington, VT, United States
- ac Division of Neonatal-Perinatal Medicine, University of Vermont Larner College of Medicine, Burlington, VT, United States
- ad Division of Neonatology, Hospital for Sick Children, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada

Abstract

OBJECTIVES: Clear outcome reporting in clinical trials facilitates accurate interpretation and application of findings and improves evidence-informed decision-making. Standardized core outcomes for reporting neonatal trials have been developed, but little is known about how primary outcomes are reported in neonatal trials. Our aim was to identify strengths and weaknesses of primary outcome reporting in recent neonatal trials. METHODS: Neonatal trials including ≥100 participants/arm published between 2015 and 2020 with at least 1 primary outcome from a neonatal core outcome set were eligible. Raters recruited from Cochrane Neonatal were trained to evaluate the trials' primary outcome reporting completeness using relevant items from Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials 2010 and Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials-Outcomes 2022 pertaining to the reporting of the definition, selection, measurement, analysis, and

1 of 2 9/19/2023, 5:31 PM

interpretation of primary trial outcomes. All trial reports were assessed by 3 raters. Assessments and discrepancies between raters were analyzed. RESULTS: Outcome-reporting evaluations were completed for 36 included neonatal trials by 39 raters. Levels of outcome reporting completeness were highly variable. All trials fully reported the primary outcome measurement domain, statistical methods used to compare treatment groups, and participant flow. Yet, only 28% of trials fully reported on minimal important difference, 24% on outcome data missingness, 66% on blinding of the outcome assessor, and 42% on handling of outcome multiplicity. CONCLUSIONS: Primary outcome reporting in neonatal trials often lacks key information needed for interpretability of results, knowledge synthesis, and evidence-informed decision-making in neonatology. Use of existing outcome-reporting guidelines by trialists, journals, and peer reviewers will enhance transparent reporting of neonatal trials. Copyright © 2023 by the American Academy of Pediatrics.

Index Keywords

human, neonatology, newborn, outcome assessment, peer group; Humans, Infant, Newborn, Neonatology, Outcome Assessment, Health Care, Peer Group

Publisher: NLM (Medline)

ISSN: 10984275 PubMed ID: 37641881

Language of Original Document: English Abbreviated Source Title: Pediatrics

2-s2.0-85169504498 **Document Type:** Article **Publication Stage:** Final

Source: Scopus

ELSEVIER

Copyright © 2023 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved. Scopus \circledR is a registered trademark of Elsevier B.V.

RELX Group™

2 of 2 9/19/2023, 5:31 PM