

Bolus versus continuous study

Submission date 26/05/2010	Recruitment status No longer recruiting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prospectively registered <input type="checkbox"/> Protocol
Registration date 29/07/2010	Overall study status Completed	<input type="checkbox"/> Statistical analysis plan <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results
Last Edited 15/11/2017	Condition category Signs and Symptoms	<input type="checkbox"/> Individual participant data

Plain English summary of protocol
Not provided at time of registration

Contact information

Type(s)
Scientific

Contact name
Dr Sam Eldabe

Contact details
Cheriton House
The James Cook University Hospital
Marton Road
Middlesbrough
United Kingdom
TS4 3BW
+44 (0)1642 282417
sam.eldabe@stees.nhs.uk

Additional identifiers

EudraCT/CTIS number

IRAS number

ClinicalTrials.gov number

Secondary identifying numbers
2.8022010

Study information

Scientific Title

Comparison of the effects of intermittent boli to simple continuous infusion on patients' global perceived effect in intrathecal therapy for pain

Study objectives

This study aims to compare the effect of the same daily dose of intrathecal analgesia administered by intermittent boli compared to a simple continuous infusion on the Patient-reported Global Impression of Change (PGIC) related to their intrathecal pain relief.

Ethics approval required

Old ethics approval format

Ethics approval(s)

1. UK: Leicestershire, Northampton and Rutland Research Ethics Committee 2 (now East Midlands-Northampton REC), 03/08/2010
2. Switzerland: ref: 59/10

Study design

Randomised double-blind two-period cross-over study

Primary study design

Interventional

Secondary study design

Randomised cross over trial

Study setting(s)

Hospital

Study type(s)

Treatment

Participant information sheet

Not available in web format, please use the contact details to request a patient information sheet

Health condition(s) or problem(s) studied

Severe chronic pain

Interventions

Non-clinical interventions:

1. Informed consent will be obtained by the Principal Investigator, from the patient prior to enrolment of patient into the study. This will occur only once and will take approximately 30 minutes.
2. Demographic data will be collected from the patient, by the Blinded assessor, once consent has been gained, and this will take about 5 minutes to complete
3. Five day pain diary will be completed by the patient in their home. This will be done at baseline, and at the end of each 2-week period.
4. EQ-5D Questionnaire will be completed by the patient in the Pain Clinic at baseline and at the end of each 2-week period, and this will take approximately 5 minutes to complete
5. Visual Analogue Scale (VAS) measure of patients pain relief will be completed by the patients

in the Pain Clinic at the baseline, and at the end of each 2-week period, and this will take approximately 1 minute to complete

6. Patient Global Impression of Change (PGIC) questionnaire will be completed by the patient in the clinic at the end of each 2-week period, and it will take approximately 2 minutes to complete

7. Telephone contact will be carried out by the blinded assessor, to the patient at the end of each 2-week period, and will last approximately 10 minutes each

Clinical interventions:

1. Physical examination of the participants will be conducted by the Principal Investigator on two occasions, to ascertain fitness to commence, or to continue trial with procedures

2. Programming of the ITDD device by the Principal Investigator and the unblinded Research Nurse to either intermittent bolus or simple continuous flow. This will last fifteen minutes, and will be performed on three different occasions.

3. Recording vital signs of blood pressure, pulse rate, respiratory rate, temperature and oxygen saturations, following programming of the intrathecal device. There will be eight sets of vital signs recorded, and each set will last approximately five minutes. This is done to monitor patient safety.

4. Observations of the patient post-programming will be done in clinic at the end of programming for 2 hours each, to ascertain patient safety

As this is a randomised double crossover design study, the patients are acting as their own controls. As they crossover from the study group (multiple boluses) to the control condition (continuous infusion) the total drug dose/day remains the same on both arms. There is a one week run in period followed by 2 weeks on either arm of the study. The study ends at completion of the second arm, therefore there is a total duration of 5 weeks. No longer term follow up is planned as the patients are clinically followed up regularly at 6 week intervals.

Intervention Type

Device

Primary outcome measure

Patient Global Impression of Change (PGIC), a self-evaluation of the patient's overall change since the start of the study, will be completed at the end of each 2 week period using a 7-point Likert scale (very much improved, much improved, minimally improved, no change, minimally worse, much worse, very much worse). The PGIC was chosen as it will allow the patient to balance a potential improvement in pain relief with a potential worsening in side effects.

Secondary outcome measures

Conducted at baseline and the end of each 2-week period:

1. Visual Analogue Scale (VAS) of pain relief patients will score their pain on a 100 mm line anchored with 'no pain' at the 0 mm end and 'worst pain imaginable' at the 100 mm end

2. EQ-5D is a health related quality of life questionnaire which is divided into five dimensions: mobility, self-care, usual activity, pain/discomfort and anxiety/depression

3. Patient preference - at the end of the study, patients will be asked to choose which of the two programming methods they prefer

4. Observer guess of the group - to discover how successful the blinding is, the blinded assessor and the patient will be asked if they can identify which programming method has been allocated. If neither can identify the method, this will show the blinding has been successful, and refute any claims of bias.

Overall study start date

01/09/2010

Completion date

01/09/2012

Eligibility

Key inclusion criteria

1. Patients implanted with a programmable intrathecal drug delivery (ITDD) device
2. Achieved stable pain relief on continuous flow
3. Capable of giving informed consent
4. Willing to sign the Informed Consent Form
5. Male or female, aged between 18 and 65 years

Participant type(s)

Patient

Age group

Adult

Lower age limit

18 Years

Sex

Both

Target number of participants

34

Key exclusion criteria

1. Fail to give informed consent
2. Are incapable of answering the questionnaires (PGIC, EuroQoL [EQ-5D], Visual Analogue Scale [VAS] score) for physical or psychological reasons
3. Have non-programmable ITDD device
4. Have Patient Therapy Manager (PTM) devices
5. Are using ziconotide intrathecal therapy
6. Are programmed with bolus doses (flex doses)
7. Have severe limitation in function and mobility
8. Are pregnant or lactating
9. Are not practicing a safe method of birth control

Date of first enrolment

01/09/2010

Date of final enrolment

01/09/2012

Locations

Countries of recruitment

England

Switzerland

United Kingdom

Study participating centre

The James Cook University Hospital

Middlesbrough

United Kingdom

TS4 3BW

Sponsor information

Organisation

South Tees Hospitals NHS Trust (UK)

Sponsor details

c/o Julie Rowbotham

Research and Development

Academic Centre

The James Cook University Hospital

Marton Road

Middlesbrough

England

United Kingdom

TS4 3BW

+44 (0)1642 282417

julie.rowbotham@stees.nhs.uk

Sponsor type

Hospital/treatment centre

Website

<http://www.southtees.nhs.uk/live/>

ROR

<https://ror.org/02js17r36>

Funder(s)

Funder type

Industry

Funder Name

Medtronic Europe S.A. (Switzerland)

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?
Results article	results	01/05/2017		Yes	No