

Which anaesthetic agents and techniques are most cost-effective in day surgery?

Submission date 25/04/2003	Recruitment status No longer recruiting	☐ Prospectively registered ☐ Protocol
Registration date 25/04/2003	Overall study status Completed	☐ Statistical analysis plan ☒ Results
Last Edited 08/11/2022	Condition category Other	☐ Individual participant data

Plain English summary of protocol
Not provided at time of registration

Contact information

Type(s)
Scientific

Contact name
Dr Rachel Elliott

Contact details
Health Services Research Unit
Polwarth Building
Foresterhill
Aberdeen
United Kingdom
AB25 2ZD
+44 (0)1224 553732
c.glazener@abdn.ac.uk

Additional identifiers

Protocol serial number
HTA 96/15/05

Study information

Scientific Title
Which anaesthetic agents and techniques are most cost-effective in day surgery?

Study objectives

Literature review, national survey and randomised controlled trial. This study uses a prospective randomised controlled trial design, to assess the relative cost effectiveness of inhalational and total intravenous anaesthesia, in day case surgery for adult and paediatric patients requiring general anaesthesia.

The objectives are to:

1. Assess the relative clinical outcomes of principle anaesthetic methods used in adult and paediatric day surgery
2. Identify the resource use and associated costs incurred by the NHS during the anaesthetic and post anaesthetic period for principle anaesthetic methods
3. Determine patient acceptability of principal anaesthetic methods used
4. Use clinical, economic and humanistic data collected in this study to assess the relative cost effectiveness of principle anaesthetic methods used.

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

Study type(s)

Not Specified

Health condition(s) or problem(s) studied

Not applicable

Interventions

The adult study has four arms (propofol then propofol; propofol then isoflurane/N2O propofol then sevoflurane then sevoflurane/N2O), 330 patients in each arm. The paediatric study has two arms (thiopentone [ages 3 to 6] or propofol [ages 7 to 10] then halothane/N2O; sevoflurane then hevoflurane/N2O [ages 3 to 10]), 220 patients in each arm.

Intervention Type

Drug

Phase

Not Specified

Drug/device/biological/vaccine name(s)

propofol, isoflurane, sevoflurane, thiopentone, halothane

Primary outcome(s)

Postoperative nausea and vomiting (PONV)

Key secondary outcome(s)

Not provided at time of registration

Completion date

31/07/2001

Eligibility

Key inclusion criteria

Adult general, orthopaedic and gynaecology patients, and paediatric general and ear, nose and throat (ENT) patients.

Participant type(s)

Patient

Healthy volunteers allowed

No

Age group

Other

Sex

All

Key exclusion criteria

Not provided at time of registration

Date of first enrolment

01/03/1999

Date of final enrolment

31/07/2001

Locations

Countries of recruitment

United Kingdom

Scotland

Study participating centre

Health Services Research Unit

Aberdeen

United Kingdom

AB25 2ZD

Sponsor information

Organisation

Department of Health (UK)

ROR

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

Funder(s)

Funder type

Government

Funder Name

NIHR Health Technology Assessment Programme - HTA (UK)

Results and Publications

Individual participant data (IPD) sharing plan

Not provided at time of registration

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	HTA monograph	01/10/2002		Yes	No