

# A randomised controlled trial of infusion protocols in adult pre-hospital care

<b>Submission date</b> 25/04/2003	<b>Recruitment status</b> No longer recruiting	<input type="checkbox"/> Prospectively registered
		<input type="checkbox"/> Protocol
<b>Registration date</b> 25/04/2003	<b>Overall study status</b> Completed	<input type="checkbox"/> Statistical analysis plan
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results
<b>Last Edited</b> 07/04/2020	<b>Condition category</b> Injury, Occupational Diseases, Poisoning	<input type="checkbox"/> Individual participant data

**Plain English summary of protocol**  
Not provided at time of registration

## Contact information

**Type(s)**  
Scientific

**Contact name**  
Prof John Nicholl

**Contact details**  
School of Health and Related Research  
University of Sheffield  
Regent Court  
30 Regent Street  
Sheffield  
United Kingdom  
S1 4DA  
+44 (0)114 222 5201/2  
j.nicholl@sheffield.ac.uk

## Additional identifiers

**EudraCT/CTIS number**

**IRAS number**

**ClinicalTrials.gov number**

**Secondary identifying numbers**  
HTA 93/23/19

# Study information

## Scientific Title

A randomised controlled trial of infusion protocols in adult pre-hospital care

## Study objectives

The initiation of intravenous fluid replacement in injured patients at the accident scene is becoming a routine procedure. It has been assumed that early volume replacement in a bleeding patient will result in the patient arriving at hospital in a better haemodynamic state than if no fluids are given. However, some non-randomised studies of trauma patients and one quasi-randomised study of patients with severe bleeding injuries have begun to cast doubt on this assumption.

In the UK most on-scene fluid therapy is given by ambulance-service paramedics acting in accordance with their protocols. We therefore conducted a pragmatic study to compare the effects of two different fluid protocols, one usually with fluid administration and one usually without, used by paramedics.

## Ethics approval required

Old ethics approval format

## Ethics approval(s)

Approval from 16 local research ethics committees

## Study design

Randomised controlled trial

## Primary study design

Interventional

## Secondary study design

Randomised controlled trial

## Study setting(s)

Not specified

## Study type(s)

Not Specified

## Participant information sheet

## Health condition(s) or problem(s) studied

Injury, occupational diseases, poisoning; Other injury, occupational diseases, poisoning

## Interventions

With approval from 16 local research ethics committees, paramedics in two ambulance services were randomly allocated to one of two treatment protocols for the prehospital use of intravenous fluids in adult trauma patients. Paramedics who had been qualified for at least 1 year were randomised to an initial treatment protocol using a simple random-number generator. Approximately half way through the trial the paramedics were crossed over to the alternative protocol. Cluster randomised controlled. trial.

Protocol A: intravenous fluids were administered at the incident scene to all adult trauma patients who under current procedures the paramedic would consider starting on intravenous fluids.

Protocol B: fluids were withheld until arrival at hospital, unless the time to hospital was likely to be over 1 hour.

### **Intervention Type**

Other

### **Phase**

Not Specified

### **Primary outcome measure**

Death, complications, general health status (measured using the Short Form with 36 items (SF-36) questionnaire), processes of care and costs were measured up to 6 months post-incident.

### **Secondary outcome measures**

Not provided at time of registration

### **Overall study start date**

01/12/1995

### **Completion date**

31/01/1998

## **Eligibility**

### **Key inclusion criteria**

Trauma patients aged 16 years or over who died or stayed in hospital for three or more nights and who were attended by a paramedic crew randomised to a treatment protocol were included in the study.

### **Participant type(s)**

Patient

### **Age group**

Adult

### **Sex**

Not Specified

### **Target number of participants**

1309

### **Total final enrolment**

1309

### **Key exclusion criteria**

Patients with burns, poisoning, asphyxiation, minor uncomplicated skin or skeletal injuries, isolated fractured neck of femur, or who were pregnant were excluded.

**Date of first enrolment**

01/12/1995

**Date of final enrolment**

31/01/1998

## Locations

**Countries of recruitment**

England

United Kingdom

**Study participating centre**

School of Health and Related Research

Sheffield

United Kingdom

S1 4DA

## Sponsor information

**Organisation**

Department of Health (UK)

**Sponsor details**

Quarry House

Quarry Hill

Leeds

United Kingdom

LS2 7UE

+44 (0)1132 545 843

Sheila.Greener@doh.gsi.gov.uk

**Sponsor type**

Government

**Website**

<http://www.dh.gov.uk/en/index.htm>

**ROR**

<https://ror.org/03sbpja79>

## Funder(s)

**Funder type**

Government

**Funder Name**

NIHR Health Technology Assessment Programme - HTA (UK)

## Results and Publications

**Publication and dissemination plan**

Not provided at time of registration

**Intention to publish date****Individual participant data (IPD) sharing plan****IPD sharing plan summary**

Not provided at time of registration

**Study outputs**

Output type	Details	Date created	Date added	Peer reviewed?	Patient-facing?
<a href="#">Results article</a>	results	01/12/2000		Yes	No