My experience as a Cochrane Fellow on a systematic review of interventions for nausea and vomiting in early pregnancy and its recent update

ANNE MATTHEWS DUBLIN CITY UNIVERSITY, IRELAND





Outline

- My route to the HRB Cochrane Fellowship & review
- The review process
- Outputs
- Outcomes
- Update 2013
- Reflections
- Acknowledgements

My route to the Fellowship and review

- All-Ireland meeting in DCU in January 2007
 - Enhanced my interest in Cochrane
 - o Information HRB/R&D Cochrane Fellowship Schemes
- Provisional query to Cochrane PCG- the effectiveness of complementary therapies for "morning sickness"
 - Warm response to my offer to do a review that already existed (2003)
 - Invitation to consider involvement in an update

Fellowship & Review process

- Application process opened, setting out criteria
- I put together review team
- Registered the title April 2007
- Submitted application May 2007
- Received a fellowship June 2007
- Submitted draft protocol Feb 2008
- Submitted revised protocol July 2008
- Protocol published Oct 2008
- Submitted review to editorial process Dec 2009
- Finalised review accepted July 2010
- Published September 2010
- Update completed and submitted November 2013

Clinical question

What interventions are effective and safe for nausea and vomiting in early pregnancy?

Source: Matthews A, Dowswell T, Haas DM, Doyle M, O'Mathúna DP. <u>Interventions for</u> <u>nausea and vomiting in early pregnancy</u>. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2010, Issue 9. Art. No.: CD007575. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD007575.pub2..

Methods

- We searched the Cochrane Pregnancy and Childbirth Group's Trials Register by contacting the Trials Search Coordinator. This contains trials identified from:
 - quarterly searches of the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL); weekly searches of MEDLINE; hand searches of 30 journals and the proceedings of major conferences; weekly current awareness alerts for a further 44 journals; monthly BioMed Central email alerts.
- The search strategy identified 66 reports of 55 studies: 27 were included, 22 excluded, 2 were ongoing and 4 were waiting further assessment.
- We describe outcomes at approximately 3 days after treatment commenced, as being a clinically meaningful time point.
- We judged the 'Risk of Bias' of included studies.

<u> </u>	Home Insert	Page Layout		Mailings	Review	View		الحي									A 🗿 Fir
<u> </u>	а Сору	Calibri	× 14 × ,	A A	÷= * 3=	* ⁴ a_*	Ż	I	AaBbCcL	AaBb(AaBbCcI	AaBbCcl	AaBbCcI	AaBb(AaBbCcI	AaBbCcI 📮 💆	A ab Re
Paste	🖋 Format Painter	B I <u>U</u> ∗al	be x₂ x² Aa∗	aby - A -	≣∎	≣∎ (;	≣• 🖄 •	-	Emphasis	Heading 1	1 Normal	Strong	Subtitle	Title	¶ No Spaci	Subtle Em 👳 Cha	ange les ∗ 🔓 Se
	ipboard 🖟		Font	6		Paragrap	h	5					Styles			Sty	Edit
]			3 · 1 · 2 · 1 ·		7				7	1 - 0 - 1 - 10				C	10 .		-)
			3 * 1 * 2 * 1 *	1.1.1	11112			. 1 . 6	1.7.1.8.	1 . 3 . 1 . 10		13 1	4 15 1	19 - 1 - 17 - 1 - 1	18 '		
								Det									
									a extract								
						Interve	ntions f	or nau	sea and v	omiting ir	n early pre	egnancy					
						non li u											
				Report	ID* (from I	PCG list)		First auth	nor; year	Reviewau	thor ID* AM/MD/TD	Date					
				4				Belluomi	ini 1994	am	RIVI/IVID/TD	14 Ju	ne 2009				
				+													
				Eligibilit	ty							Y	'es/no				
				Confirm	n eligibility	for review		Any inter	rvention for r	nausea, vomit	ing and retch	ning Y	es				
										-	of intervention						
											see definition						
										took place u	o to 20 weeks		es-12 weeks				
								gestation Study de	sign was an R	ст			ystudy comp es	letion			
				Summa	ry: Reason	for exclusi	on:	otaay ac	Jight Was and								
				Metho	ds												
		Study design					A randomized blinded study										
					udy durati	on.		2+ years									
				Dates o					October 199	2							
				Country				US, Califo		ha Laguer Fu	nd of Californ	ia Dacific Ma	dical Center, S	E			
				Funding	g source			Californi		ine Loewy Fu	nd of Californ	ia Pacific Ivie	uicai <u>Çetitet</u> , s	ог,			
									-								
				Risk of	bias (Table	:)		Quote/D	escription (in	words from	text-	Decis	ion				
								verbatim				(adeo	uate/inadequ	ate/un			
												clear					
													nment when				
				Secure	co gonoro	tion*		Pandomi	ized block de	sign		requi	red)				
				-	ice generat	ice concealr	ment*	Kanuomi	ized block de	sign -							
ge: 1 o	f 3 Words: 415	<u> </u>) 🗇 🗐 100% 😑 –	Ū

Description of eligible studies

- Twenty-seven trials were included, with a total of 4,041 participants/women.
- Studies were found of the following treatments:
 - Acupressure (P6, including acustimulation; auricular) with placebo or vitamin B6
 - Acupuncture with sham treatment and no treatment
 - o Moxibustion (Traditional Chinese Medicine) with Chinese drugs
 - Ginger with placebo, vitamin B6 or drugs
 - Vitamin B6 with placebo
 - o Anti-emetic medications with placebo

Results- symptom relief

- No statistically significant effect for P6 acupressure versus placebo or vitamin B6; results for auricular acupuncture difficult to interpret.
- No statistically significant differences between groups in the acupuncture study.
- In Moxibustion versus Chinese drugs study
 both groups showed improvement, but the study is poorly reported.
- Ginger: two studies favoured ginger over placebo; some studies favoured ginger over vitamin B6 and some favoured vitamin B6
- Results favoured vitamin B6 over placebo.
- Across the range of anti-emetics drugs studied, Debendox (Bendectin) was favoured over placebo.

Results- adverse effects & secondary outcomes

• Only some studies reported adverse maternal or fetal/neonatal effects

• Maternal effects

- Some participants had side-effects for acupressure bands (placebo and treatment groups)
- Some participants taking ginger had heartburn

• Fetal/neonatal effects

 No studies found significant differences in adverse neonatal outcomes studies did not have sufficient power to show such differences

Secondary outcomes-

• Few studies reported on quality of life (though results were not easily interpreted) and none on economic costs

Conclusion

- Little strong or consistent evidence for any intervention; it is not therefore necessary to acknowledge that it is possible to identify with confidence, effective and safe interventions.
- The results of many studies were difficult to interpret and they were difficult to pool due to differences in participants, interventions, comparisons and outcomes.
- No studies had the statistical power to provide convincing evidence regarding relatively rare adverse outcomes
- Very little information was reported on the psychological, social or economic effects of nausea and how this was affected by different interventions.
- The methodological quality of studies was mixed.
- Inadequate information was often provided on randomisation procedures and blinding.

Implications for future research

- There is a need for specific and justified outcomes in research on interventions for nausea and vomiting in pregnancy.
- A range of instruments has been used to measure outcomes the Pregnancy Unique Quantification of Emesis and Nausea (PUQE) scale developed by clinician-researchers may address this.
- There is a need to systematically measure and report adverse effects, quality of life and cost outcomes.
- There were no studies of dietary or other behavioural interventions, though these are commonly recommended; only one study measured adherence to dietary and other advice within a study of another intervention- this should be included in studies of all interventions, since this may also affect symptom relief.



Outputs 2010 review

- Published review September 2010
- Podcast (with Cochrane assistance)
- Cochrane Journal Club October 2010
- 100s of citations and mentions in print and electronic media – nationally, globally, based on press release
- Several radio interviews: BBC 5 live- led to BBC Scotland, NI and London (Vanessa Feltz show, with Anne Diamond)- led to RTE Morning Ireland; 4fm Dublin
- Several summaries updated based on review findings
- Posters annually at All-Ireland and UK/Ire meetings

护 Health Research Board

About Research Strategy & Funding

HRB

Health Information & In-House Research Publications

¥

Home > About > News News <- Back to: About Morning sickness: still no relief 9 September 2010 HRB funded researchers find no evidence of an effective remedy Anne Matthews from the School of Nursing in Dublin City University explains, RSS e-mail alerts 'Most women experience nausea and vomiting in early pregnancy, and, for many, it is the first sign of pregnancy. If you go online, you will find lots of advice based on "what worked for me" and pregnant women buy many over-the-counter remedies, especially complementary therapies, which they might consider to be "safer" than drugs, particularly in early pregnancy. We looked at sixty years of evidence for various remedies and unfortunately, nothing really stood out as effective.' The full press release from Wiley is available at the link below. There is also a link to an interview on Morning Ireland on RTE Radio 1, and a Podcast with the Cochrane Collaboration. Links:

> <u>Wiley press release</u> <u>Morning Ireland interview</u> <u>Cochrane Collaboration podcast</u>

<- Back to: About









Update in 2013

- An easier process (for me)
- Updates to the process
- Same level of support
- Results: 37 studies, 5079 women
- Conclusions largely unchanged; similar methodological problems, little meta-analysis possible
- Currently under editorial review

Supports that enabled the whole process

- Pregnancy and Childbirth group's support and specific input(s)
- Training within Cochrane generally and under Fellowship scheme in particular
- Publisher Wiley- staff support
- Thanks, I am happy to answer any questions.

In conclusion: minding your review involves

- Managing relationships
- Managing your time
- Making a commitment
- Making connections
- Needs consistent attention but very rewarding



- Co-authors on the review: Therese Dowswell, David Haas, Dónal O'Mathúna (Fellowship supervisor), Mary Doyle
- Health Research Board, for the Cochrane Fellowship
- Pregnancy and Childbirth Group: Therese, Sonja, Lynn, those involved in editorial process, consumer involvement.
- Mike Clarke, Cochrane trainers/ experts