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Abstract

Background: Nasal continuous positive airway pressure (NCPAP) for respiratory support reduces the need of endotracheal intubation and mechanical ventilation. A new mode with continuous positive pressure including a CPAP with intermittent mechanical rate synchronized with breathing SNIPPV.

Objectives: Assessing effectiveness and safety of this mode SNIPPV with the ordinary CPAP.

Methods: A prospective study on neonates with apneas and/or respiratory distress or fit for extubation randomized to receive the ordinary CPAP group1 or receive the SNIPPV group2.

Result: 18 case in each group, in both males needed more support than females, no death among group 1 while 1 case died in the second group. Apgar score mean nearly same for both groups it was 7.2 & 9.2 at 1 & 5 minutes group 1 compared to 6.9 & 8.8 at 1 & 5 minutes group 2, 1 case in each group got PIE, 2 cases in group 1 had PDA compared to 3 cases in the group 2, no cases of group 1 cases failed while 4 cases in group 2 failed this support (p 0.032), no cases in group one develop CLD compared to two cases group two, no intestinal perforation in both groups.

Conclusion: According to the data there was no significant difference in short and long term outcome between the ordinary CPAP and the SNIPPV when they used for sick neonates.

Introduction

the majority of preterm infants born before 34 weeks gestation experience apnea of prematurity in the first 10 days of life (Barrington 2002)[4]. Apnea in infants has been defined as a pause in breathing of greater than 20 seconds or an apneic event less than 20 seconds associated with bradycardia and/or cyanosis (Nelson 2008). Nasal continuous positive airway pressure NCPAP has
been reported to be an effective treatment for apneas (Andréasson & Miller 2000). A new development arises in the mechanism of delivering the continuous positive pressure including a CPAP with intermittent mechanical rate synchronized with infant breathing NIPPV. We are assessing the effectiveness and safety of this new mode of CPAP delivery system in a prospective randomized controlled trial.

**Methods**

A randomized prospective case controlled study, any neonates if develop apneas and/or respiratory distress or fit for extubation from mechanical ventilation will be randomized to one of two groups. Group one a control group receive the ordinary CPAP group two receive the SNIPPV. CPAP will be delivered using the infant flow CPAP (PEEP only), SNIPPV delivered using Infant flow Advance EME with back up rate, inspiratory time and PEEP.

**Inclusion criteria:**

All neonates admitted to NICU who develop respiratory distress/apneas required respiratory support or if the treating physician decided extubation (at a desecration of the treating physician).

**Exclusion criteria:**

- Severe respiratory distress that intubation and mechanical ventilation in indicated.
- Conditions that CPAP application is contraindicated as in postoperative.
- Gastrointestinal repairs or necrotizing enterocolitis.
- Congenital anomalies incompatible with life.

**Failure of the CPAP/SNIPPV if:**

- Clinical and/or blood gas deterioration (PH <7.20, Pco2 >60 in capillary or arterial blood gas sample and PaO2<50 arterial blood gas) and increase oxygen requirement of more than 40% FiO2.
- Deterioration in the x-ray and/or development of lung collapse.
- Recurrent apnea of more than one moderate over 6 hours or one single severe at any time, infant then will be intubated and receive pressure support mechanical ventilation. Apneas defined as mild when infant needs only tactile stimulation, moderate when infant needs vigorous tactile stimulation and increase in flow of oxygen only and sever when infant needs positive pressure ventilation.

**Success of CPAP/NIPPV:**
- Off CPAP/NIPPV for 72hrs.
- Infant requires less than 40% FiO2.
- Stable blood gases (PH>7.25, and Pco2 <60 in capillary or arterial blood gas sample and Pao2>50 arterial blood gas).
- Hemodynamically stable (mean blood pressure, heart rate).

**Blood gas monitor:**

Patient will be monitored with blood gas every 6 hours in the first 48hours then every 12 hours thereafter for 48hours then once daily if clinically stable. PEEP will be reduced gradually guided by the oxygen saturation monitor to maintain oxygen saturation between 90-95%, apnea free decrease work of breathing and resolving chest x-rays.

**Consent:**

A written consent was taken for each neonate recruited in the study from his/her parents.

**Results**

36 cases were recruited & finished the study, group one had 18 cases (mean gestational age the mean gestational age were 30.7 weeks) for whom ordinary CPAP applied compared to 18 cases (mean gestational age were 29.3 weeks) in group two for whom advanced synchronized CPAP(SNIPPV) applied, in both groups male needed more support than female (table (1)) no death among first group while one case died in the second group , Apgar score mean nearly same for both groups (table no.1,antenatal steroid also nearly same(table (1)), one cases of group one had IVH (but no PVL ) while no cases recorded to had it in group two(while one case recorded to had PVL).group one cases less needed caffeine than group two(table no.1),less cases in group one given surfactant(table (1)),one case in each group got PIE ,two cases in first group had patent ductus arterious compared to three cases in the second group, no cases of group one cases failed while 4 cases in group two failed this support, no cases died in group one while one case died in group two, no cases in group one develop CLD compared to two cases develop CLD in group two , no intestinal perforation in both groups.

**Table (1): Demographic clinical characteristics of both groups' data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>CPAP No.18&amp; %</th>
<th>SNIPPV No.18&amp; %</th>
<th>P VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gestational Age</td>
<td>30.8wks+2.5</td>
<td>29.2wks+2.53</td>
<td>0.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIABLE</td>
<td>CPAP (Mean ± s)</td>
<td>SNIPPV (Mean ± sd)</td>
<td>P VALUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gestational Age</td>
<td>30.8wks±2.5</td>
<td>29.2wks±2.53</td>
<td>0.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APGAR 1</td>
<td>7.21±.76</td>
<td>6.9±1.51</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APGAR 5</td>
<td>9.2±0.81</td>
<td>8.8±0.83</td>
<td>0.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAYS OF USE</td>
<td>1.83±2.2</td>
<td>2.1±1.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (2): comparison of continuous variables of the study data
Table (3): Pre-application Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-application/Mean</th>
<th>CPAP (Mean +sd)</th>
<th>SNIPPV (Mean +sd)</th>
<th>P VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RESP. RATE</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCO2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIO2 (HRs*)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABD.GIRTH</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.054</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (4): Post-application Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-application/Mean</th>
<th>CPAP</th>
<th>SNIPPV</th>
<th>P VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RESP. RATE</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCO2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIO2(HRs*)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>0.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABD.GIRTH</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Abbreviations**


**Discussion**

In this study we did not interfere with the primary physician treatment and decision regarding when to use the CPAP or SNIPPV or to extubate from mechanical ventilation nor what medication decided to be given to the baby (i.e; surfactant, caffeine) or whether the baby given antenatal steroid or not, despite of that the cases of SNIPPV use were given surfactant by primary physician (table (1)) and nearly same number of cases antenatal steroid were given to their mothers, more cases were seen to fail this mode of support which means that this new mode (SNIPPV)was not superior or better
than the old mode of nasal support (CPAP) despite a meta analysis (De Paoli AG, Davis PG, Lemyre B 2007 and Barrington KJ, Bull D, Finer NN 1999) concluded that the SNIPPV is an effective method of augmenting the beneficial effects of NCPAP in preterm infants in the postextubation period but recommend a Further research delineate the role of NIPPV in the management of apnoea of prematurity [2,4].

Failure of extubation from mechanical ventilation was not found to significantly different in our study despite that some studies showed a reduction in it is incidence with Non-invasive positive pressure ventilation (SNIPPV) such as (A Hutchison, S Bignall 2007) who present an increases in successful extubation by ~30%.

**Conclusion**

in regard of short  According to the data in this study, there was no significant difference (Death, pneumothorax, gastric trauma and feeding intolerance) and long term (chronic lung disease, periventricular leukomalacia and retinopathy of prematurity) outcome between the CPAP with back up rate and CPAP without back up rate.
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