An evaluation of the self-use of bulb syringes for the self-treatment of ear wax and their impact on primary care workload - a randomised controlled trial

Submission date 07/09/2005	Recruitment status No longer recruiting	
Registration date 29/09/2005	Overall study status Completed	[_] [X]
Last Edited 18/07/2011	Condition category Ear, Nose and Throat	

] Prospectively registered

] Protocol

] Statistical analysis plan

[] Results

] Individual participant data

Plain English summary of protocol Not provided at time of registration

Contact information

Type(s) Scientific

Contact name Dr Richard Coppin

Contact details

Overton Surgery Station Road Overton United Kingdom RG25 3DZ +44 (0)1256 770600 overtonsurgery@dial.pipex.com

Additional identifiers

EudraCT/CTIS number

IRAS number

ClinicalTrials.gov number

Study information

Scientific Title

Acronym

Bulb syringe study

Study objectives

Ear wax is a commonly presenting problem in primary care. It is surprisingly under-researched and as background to this study we have previously undertaken two pilot studies - a questionnaire study and a feasibility study.

Ear wax is commonly treated by syringing the ear and syringing has been shown to improve hearing and symptoms. However, most GPs have increasingly delegated managing ear wax to practice nurses. The annual salary costs of practice nurses undertaking ear syringing in UK general practice have been estimated at about £8 million. Could that time be better spent? Achieving current NHS targets (such as the New GP Contract) has significant workload implications. Patients do not like delays associated with treating ear wax and patients, GPs and practice nurses would like to encourage such self-help. In some countries plastic bulb syringes with which to irrigate the ear are widely available. Such devices could potentially be marketed in the UK. Their availability in the UK and evidence of their effectiveness and safety could both reduce demands on health service resources and satisfy patients' demands for rapid relief of symptoms. Preliminary results of the pilot study suggest bulb syringes are effective, safe and acceptable to patients.

Ethics approval required

Old ethics approval format

Ethics approval(s)

Not provided at time of registration

Study design Randomised controlled trial

Primary study design Interventional

Secondary study design Randomised controlled trial

Study setting(s) Not specified

Study type(s) Treatment

Participant information sheet

Health condition(s) or problem(s) studied

Ear wax

Interventions

Self-treatment using a bulb syringe compared with the standard treatment of syringing by a practice nurse or GP.

Intervention Type

Other

Phase Not Specified

Primary outcome measure

- 1. Objective clearance of wax
- 2. Relief of symptoms
- 3. Acceptability of treatment
- 4. Unwanted effects of treatment
- 5. Proportion of people requiring further intervention within 6 weeks
- 6. Costs of prescriptions for subsequent ear care in 6 weeks from randomisation

Secondary outcome measures

Rates of consultation with GP and practice nurse for ear care at one and two years.

Overall study start date 01/02/2004

Completion date

31/01/2007

Eligibility

Key inclusion criteria

Adults presenting at participating surgeries with symptoms of ear wax and having wax occluding one or both ear drums.

Participant type(s)

Patient

Age group Adult

Sex Both

Target number of participants 236

Key exclusion criteria

History of perforated ear drum, other significant ear disease or surgery, signs of perforation or infection in the affected ear, patients with cognitive impairment sufficient to preclude them from following the instructions or completing the questionnaire.

Date of first enrolment 01/02/2004

Date of final enrolment 31/01/2007

Locations

Countries of recruitment England

United Kingdom

Study participating centre Overton Surgery Overton United Kingdom RG25 3DZ

Sponsor information

Organisation University of Southampton (UK)

Sponsor details

Research Support Office Building 37 Room 4033 University of Southampton Southampton England United Kingdom SO17 1BJ

Sponsor type University/education

Website http://www.soton.ac.uk ROR https://ror.org/01ryk1543

Funder(s)

Funder type University/education

Funder Name Royal College of General Practitioners Scientific Foundation Board, SFB/2003/32 (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?
Results article	results	01/01/2008		Yes	No
Results article	results	01/03/2011		Yes	No