



OPEN ACCESS

Thresholds for surfactant use in preterm neonates: a network meta-analysis

Aoife Branagan ,^{1,2} Ivan Yu,^{1,2} Kurinchi Gurusamy,^{2,3} Jan Miletin  ^{1,4,5,6}

► Additional supplemental material is published online only. To view, please visit the journal online (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/archdischild-2022-324184>).

¹Paediatric and Newborn Medicine, Coombe Women and Infants University Hospital, Dublin, Ireland

²Division of Surgery and Interventional Science, UCL, London, UK

³Department of Therapy, I.M. Sechenov First Moscow State Medical University, Moskva, Russian Federation

⁴UCD School of Medicine, University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland

⁵Institute for the Care of Mother and Child, Prague, Czech Republic

⁶2nd Faculty of Medicine, Motol University Hospital, Prague, Czech Republic

Correspondence to

Dr Aoife Branagan, Paediatric and Newborn Medicine, Coombe Women and Infants University Hospital, Dublin, Ireland; branagaa@tcd.ie

Received 24 March 2022

Accepted 24 November 2022



© Author(s) (or their employer(s)) 2022. Re-use permitted under CC BY. Published by BMJ.

To cite: Branagan A, Yu I, Gurusamy K, et al. *Arch Dis Child Fetal Neonatal Ed* Epub ahead of print: [please include Day Month Year]. doi:10.1136/archdischild-2022-324184

ABSTRACT

Objective To perform a network meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials of different surfactant treatment strategies for respiratory distress syndrome (RDS) to assess if a certain fraction of inspired oxygen (FiO₂) is optimal for selective surfactant therapy.

Design Systematic review and network meta-analysis using Bayesian analysis of randomised trials of prophylactic versus selective surfactant for RDS.

Setting Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials, MEDLINE, Embase and Science Citation Index Expanded.

Patients Randomised trials including infants under 32 weeks of gestational age.

Interventions Intratracheal surfactant, irrespective of type or dose.

Main outcome measures Our primary outcome was neonatal mortality, compared between groups treated with selective surfactant therapy at different thresholds of FiO₂. Secondary outcomes included respiratory morbidity and major complications of prematurity.

Results Of 4643 identified references, 14 studies involving 5298 participants were included. We found no statistically significant differences between 30%, 40% and 50% FiO₂ thresholds. A sensitivity analysis of infants treated in the era of high antenatal steroid use and nasal continuous positive airway pressure as initial mode of respiratory support showed no difference in mortality, RDS or intraventricular haemorrhage alone but suggested an increase in the combined outcome of major morbidities in the 60% threshold.

Conclusion Our results do not show a clear benefit of surfactant treatment at any threshold of FiO₂. The 60% threshold was suggestive of increased morbidity. There was no advantage seen with prophylactic treatment. Randomised trials of different thresholds for surfactant delivery are urgently needed to guide clinicians and provide robust evidence.

PROSPERO registration number CRD42020166620.

INTRODUCTION

Respiratory distress syndrome (RDS) is a common consequence of prematurity.¹ Management is through provision of respiratory support alongside exogenous surfactant.²

Early Cochrane reviews supported prophylactic surfactant and intubation.³ A more recent review compared a prophylactic strategy (administration before first breath or after brief stabilisation) to selective use (after evidence of RDS), including subgroup analysis of current best practice (nasal continuous positive airway pressure (NCPAP) and high antenatal steroid use).⁴ The risk of chronic lung disease (CLD)/death was lower in the selective

WHAT IS ALREADY KNOWN ON THIS TOPIC

- ⇒ Intratracheal surfactant, provided to premature infants with neonatal respiratory distress syndrome (RDS), decreases mortality and the respiratory complications of prematurity.
- ⇒ Current best practice supports nasal continuous positive airway pressure (NCPAP) and avoidance of mechanical ventilation, with provision of exogenous surfactant with increasing oxygen requirement or need for ventilation.
- ⇒ Due to insufficient available evidence, clinical guidelines and therefore practice on when surfactant should be provided to these infants vary.

WHAT THIS STUDY ADDS

- ⇒ This study adds to a limited evidence base on when is most appropriate to provide selective surfactant to infants with RDS.
- ⇒ A threshold of 60% fraction of inspired oxygen has been shown to increase major morbidity, most notably retinopathy of prematurity, and should be avoided.
- ⇒ No significant difference was seen between the 30%, 40% and 50% thresholds, which suggests more judicious use of surfactant may be appropriate.

HOW THIS STUDY MIGHT AFFECT RESEARCH, PRACTICE OR POLICY

- ⇒ The results of this study suggest that more judicious use of selective surfactant may be appropriate in premature infants managed on NCPAP.
- ⇒ Well designed and adequately powered randomised trials are required to further evaluate the most appropriate threshold of oxygen to provide surfactant to these infants.

group in the subgroup supporting more judicious use.

Best practice dictates stabilisation of preterm infants with NCPAP and early surfactant if the need for intubation arises. However, the threshold at which this should occur is unclear. Despite a large body of work assessing the best use of surfactant, little work has assessed the threshold of fraction of inspired oxygen (FiO₂) that surfactant should be given at, leading to variations in practice and reliance on poor quality evidence.^{5 6}

Differing views exist internationally. The European Consensus Guidelines suggest a 30%




Figure 1 Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses flow diagram. FiO_2 , fraction of inspired oxygen.

threshold.² Both the American Academy of Paediatrics and the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (UK) state surfactants should be selectively given to infants on NCPAP but do not include a FiO_2 threshold.^{7,8} More recently, the Canadian Paediatric Society suggested 50%.⁹ The value of FiO_2 in isolation as a measure of RDS severity and surfactant requirement has been disputed, as FiO_2 is influenced by multiple factors and pathologies.

Our aim was to perform a systematic review and network meta-analysis comparing different thresholds of FiO_2 for surfactant treatment in infants under 32 weeks of gestation.

METHODS

A systematic review and network meta-analysis was conducted following Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) standards and was registered with the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) before commencement (CRD42020166620).

Network meta-analysis allows indirect comparison of data across studies. In the absence of direct evidence comparing thresholds of FiO_2 , it allows indirect comparison of intervention arms of trials which compare prophylaxis (control) and selective (intervention) treatment. As selective surfactant was provided at different thresholds of FiO_2 in these trials, we can compare thresholds.

Criteria for considering studies

Studies

Randomised controlled trials (RCTs) were considered, irrespective of language, publication status or publication date.

Participants

The participants included neonates from RCTs born before 32 weeks of postmenstrual age.

Interventions

Intratracheal surfactant delivery .

Outcomes

The primary outcome was mortality.

Secondary outcomes included

- ▶ Bronchopulmonary dysplasia (BPD) (oxygen requirement or need for respiratory support at 36 weeks of corrected gestational age (CGA))¹⁰
- ▶ CLD (oxygen requirement or need for respiratory support at 28 days).¹⁰
- ▶ Pneumothorax (or other air leak).
- ▶ Surfactant therapy (proportion requiring surfactant and number of doses required)
- ▶ Major morbidity, defined as at least one of severe intraventricular haemorrhage (IVH) (grade 3 or 4),¹¹ periventricular leucomalacia (PVL),¹² necrotising enterocolitis (NEC) (stage 2A or above),¹³ retinopathy of prematurity (ROP) greater than stage 2¹⁴ or BPD.
- ▶ Neurodevelopmental outcome at 2 years of CGA, defined as one of cerebral palsy, mental retardation (Bayley Scales of Infant Development Mental Developmental Index <70), legal blindness (<20/200 visual acuity) and hearing deficit (aided or <60 dB on audiometric testing).
- ▶ Health-related quality of life (HRQOL).¹⁵

Search methods

Regarding electronic searches, we searched Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), MEDLINE (PubMed), Embase and Science Citation Index Expanded between inception and December 2021 without language restrictions.

We also searched The US National Institute of Health Ongoing Trials Register (www.clinicaltrials.gov) and WHO International Clinical Trials Registry Platform (apps.who.int/trialsearch/).

A combination of controlled vocabulary and free-text terms was used for the population (preterm infants) and intervention (surfactant) (see online supplemental eMethods).

Data collection and management

Two authors independently screened titles and abstracts and selected articles for inclusion based on full-text examination. Two authors independently extracted data in a prepiloted form, including outcome data, data on potential effect modifiers and individual study data (see online supplemental eMethods).

We collected data at maximum follow-up and shorter follow-up where applicable. Trial authors were contacted in the case of missing information. Differences were resolved by discussion. The Cochrane Risk of Bias V.2 tool was used.¹⁶ Each domain was classified as 'low risk', 'some concern' or 'high risk', leading to classification of the study.

Measurement of treatment effects

For dichotomous variables the OR with 95% credible intervals (CrI) were calculated.¹⁷ For continuous variables, we calculated the mean difference with 95% CrI. For count outcomes, we calculated the rate ratio with 95% CrI. For time-to-event outcomes, HR with 95% CI was calculated.

We estimated the ranking probabilities for all interventions (level of FiO_2) of being at each possible rank for each intervention. We obtained the surface under the cumulative ranking curve (cumulative probability), rankogram and relative ranking table with CrI for the ranking probabilities.^{18,19} The unit of

Table 1 Characteristics of included studies

Study name	Setting	Participants analysed	Threshold for selective surfactant (%)	Primary outcome	Gestational age range (weeks)	Female gender (%)	Antenatal steroids (any) (%)	Surfactant type	Surfactant dose	Ventilation	Dropouts
Kattwinkel <i>et al</i> ²⁹	8 centres, USA	1248	30	Moderate RDS*	29–33	47	No info	Bovine Infusurf	150mg/dose	Both	150
Rojas <i>et al</i> ³³	8 centres, Columbia	279	30	Need for MV	27–32	49	86	Bovine Survantia	100mg/kg	CPAP	0
Walti <i>et al</i> ³⁵	12 centres, France	256	30	Survival without BPD at 28 days	25–31	46	15	Porcine Curosurf	200mg/kg	Intubation	32
Bevilacqua <i>et al</i> ²²	2 centres: Italy and Bulgaria	93	40	Mortality Grade 3, 4 IVH	26–30	54	29	Porcine Curosurf	200mg/kg	Both	0
Dilmen <i>et al</i> ²⁴	6 centres, Turkey	159	40	Necessity for MV	25–30	55	65	Porcine Curosurf	200mg/kg	CPAP	0
Kendig <i>et al</i> ³⁰	3 centres, USA	479	40	Survival to discharge	<30	45	31	Bovine Self-prepared	90 mg/dose	Intubation	0
Lefort <i>et al</i> ³¹	1 centre, Brazil	75	40	Ventilatory parameters	<34	45	No info	Porcine Curosurf	100mg/kg	Both	0
Sandri <i>et al</i> ³⁴	Multicentre, Europe	208	40	MV in first 5 days	25–29	47	97	Porcine Curosurf	200mg/kg	CPAP	0
Finer <i>et al</i> ²⁷	Multicentre, USA	1316	50	Death/BPD at 36 weeks CGA	24–28	46	96	Individual unit protocol	Unit protocol	CPAP	0
Kandariju <i>et al</i> ²⁸	1 centre, India	153	50	Need for MV in first week of life	28–34	49	94	Porcine (Curosurf) or bovine (Survanta)	100mg/kg	CPAP	0
Merritt <i>et al</i> ³²	3 centres, USA and Finland	148	50	Mortality BPD	24–29	43	4	Human Self-prepared	70 mg/kg	Intubation	98†
de Winter <i>et al</i> ²³	2 centres, Holland	81	60	TcPO ₂ and FIO ₂ at 6 hrs	26–30	48	44	Porcine Curosurf	200mg/kg	Intubated	0
Dunn <i>et al</i> ²⁵	27 centres: USA and Canada	656	60	Death/BPD at 36 weeks CGA	26–30	49	99	Individual unit protocol	Unit protocol	Both	8
Egberts <i>et al</i> ²⁶	4 centres: Sweden and Holland	147	60%	TcPO ₂ and FIO ₂ at 6 hours	26–30	60	29	Porcine Curosurf	200mg/kg	Intubated	2

*Moderate RDS defined as mean airway pressure ≥ 8 cmH₂O or FIO₂ $\geq 40\%$.

†Including 52 patients in placebo group not included in this analysis.

BPD, bronchopulmonary dysplasia; CGA, corrected gestational age; CPAP, continuous positive airway pressure; FIO₂, fraction of inspired oxygen; IVH, intraventricular haemorrhage; MV, mechanical ventilation; RDS, respiratory distress syndrome; TcPO₂, transcutaneous oxygen tension.

Table 2 Summary of findings table for the primary outcome mortality at maximal follow-up

Mortality	30% Threshold		40% Threshold		50% Threshold		60% Threshold	
Studies: 14 Participants: 5290								
Prophylaxis: 123 per 1000 (12.3%)	OR 1.81 (1.00 to 3.44) Network estimate	79 more per 1000 (0 fewer to 202 more)	OR 1.52 (0.94 to 2.40) Network estimate	53 more per 1000 (7 fewer to 128 more)	OR 0.82 (0.50 to 1.41) Network estimate	20 fewer per 1000 (57 fewer to 42 more)	OR 1.16 (0.63 to 2.29) Network estimate	17 more per 1000 (41 fewer to 120 more)
Quality of evidence: ⊕⊕○○ Low *†	Based on 1783 participants (3 RCTs)		Based on 1014 participants (5 RCTs)		Based on 1617 participants (3 RCTs)		Based on 876 participants (3 RCTs)	
*The trials all had some concerns or were at high risk of bias. †There was significant heterogeneity. ‡This is a surrogate outcome or was an indirect comparison. §Less than 300 events in combined groups. ¶There is evidence of publication bias. RCT, randomised controlled trial.								

analysis was the participant, according to the intervention group to which the participant was randomly assigned.

Data synthesis

A network meta-analysis was conducted to compare thresholds of FiO₂ simultaneously for each outcome. Our analysis was

based on guidance by the National Institute for Clinical Excellence Decision Support Unit.^{19–21}

We obtained a network plot to ensure that the trials were connected by interventions.¹⁹ We conducted a Bayesian network meta-analysis using the Markov chain Monte Carlo method (for further details, see online supplemental eMethods). We

Table 3 Summary of findings table for secondary outcomes: respiratory outcomes

	Threshold 30%		Threshold 40%		Threshold 50%		Threshold 60%	
Bronchopulmonary dysplasia Studies: 8 Participants: 3003								
Prophylaxis: 113 per 1000 (11.3%)	OR 1.39 (0.87 to 2.24) Network estimate	38 more per 1000 (13 fewer to 109 more)	OR 0.77 (0.37 to 1.58) Network estimate	24 fewer per 1000 (68 fewer to 55 more)	OR 0.93 (0.74 to 1.16) Network estimate	7 fewer per 1000 (27 fewer to 16 more)	OR 1.02 (0.72 to 1.45) Network estimate	2 more per 1000 (30 fewer to 43 more)
Quality of evidence: ⊕○○○ Very low *†‡	Based on 279 participants (1 RCT)		Based on 460 participants (3 RCTs)		Based on 1469 participants (2 RCTs)		Based on 795 participants (2 RCTs)	
Chronic lung disease Studies: 9 Participants: 2740								
Prophylaxis: 284 per 1000 (28.4%)	OR 1.48 (0.82 to 2.63) Network estimate	86 more per 1000 (40 fewer to 227 more)	OR 1.05 (0.63 to 1.64) Network estimate	10 more per 1000 (84 fewer to 110 more)	OR 4.08 (0.77 to 35.45) Network estimate	334 more per 1000 (50 fewer to 650 more)	OR 0.59 (0.28 to 1.22) Network estimate	94 fewer per 1000 (185 fewer to 42 more)
Quality of evidence ⊕○○○ Very low *†‡	Based on 1504 participants (2 RCTs)		Based on 855 participants (4 RCTs)		Based on 153 participants (1 RCT)		Based on 228 participants (2 RCTs)	
BPD or CLD Studies: 13 Participants: 5142								
Prophylaxis: 171 per 1000 (17.1%)	OR 1.45 (0.95 to 2.21) Network estimate	59 more per 1000 (7 fewer to 142 more)	OR 0.91 (0.54 to 1.41) Network estimate	13 fewer per 1000 (71 fewer to 54 more)	OR 0.96 (0.59 to 2.00) Network estimate	6 fewer per 1000 (63 fewer to 121 more)	OR 0.86 (0.47 to 1.34) Network estimate	21 fewer per 1000 (83 fewer to 45 more)
Quality of evidence ⊕○○○ Very low *†‡	Based on 1783 participants (3 RCTs)		Based on 1014 participants (5 RCTs)		Based on 1469 participants (2 RCTs)		Based on 876 participants (3 RCTs)	
Pneumothorax Studies: 14 Participants: 5290								
Prophylaxis: 33 per 1000 (3.3%)	OR 2.41 (0.61 to 10.48) Network estimate	43 more per 1000 (13 fewer to 232 more)	OR 1.26 (0.42 to 3.97) Network estimate	8 more per 1000 (19 fewer to 87 more)	OR 0.81 (0.19 to 3.47) Network estimate	6 fewer per 1000 (27 fewer to 74 more)	OR 2.05 (0.50 to 10.72) Network estimate	33 more per 1000 (16 fewer to 237 more)
Quality of evidence ⊕○○○ Very low *†§	Based on 1783 participants (3 RCTs)		Based on 1014 participants (5 RCTs)		Based on 1617 participants (3 RCTs)		Based on 876 participants (3 RCTs)	
All results are reported as OR with 95% credible intervals. *The trials were all had some concerns or were at high risk of bias. †There was significant heterogeneity. ‡This is a surrogate outcome or was an indirect comparison. §Less than 300 events in combined groups. RCT, randomised controlled trial.								

Table 4 Summary of findings table for secondary outcomes: number of surfactant doses required

Surfactant doses (n)	Threshold 60%		Threshold 30%		Threshold 50%		Threshold 40%	
Studies: 13 Participants: 5142								
Prophylaxis: 1107 per 1000 (110.7 per 100 participants)	RaR 0.26 (0.21 to 0.32) Network estimate	815 fewer per 1000 (870 fewer to 750 fewer)	RaR 0.51 (0.46 to 0.56) Network estimate	546 fewer per 1000 (602 fewer to 484 fewer)	RaR 0.65 (0.58 to 0.73) Network estimate	384 fewer per 1000 (463 fewer to 297 fewer)	RaR 0.71 (0.63 to 0.81) Network estimate	316 fewer per 1000 (406 fewer to 215 fewer)
Rank: 5 (5–5)	Rank: 1 (1–1)		Rank: 2 (2–2)		Rank: 3 (3–4)		Rank: 4 (3–4)	
Quality of evidence: ⊕⊕○○ Low *†	Based on 334 participants (3 RCTs)		Based on 881 participants (3 RCTs)		Based on 742 participants (2 RCTs)		Based on 511 participants (5 RCTs)	
All results are reported as OR with 95% credible intervals. *The trials were all had some concerns or were at high risk of bias. †There was significant heterogeneity. RaR, rate ratio; RCT, randomised controlled trial.								

used fixed-effect and random-effect models, reporting the more conservative. We estimated the probability that each intervention ranks at one of the possible positions.

Analysis was carried out using OpenBUGS V.3.2.3 (OpenBUGS Project Management Group, UK).

We assessed inconsistency (statistical evidence of the violation of transitivity assumption) by fitting both an inconsistency model and a consistency model. In the presence of inconsistency, we assessed whether the inconsistency was due to clinical or methodological heterogeneity. We performed direct comparisons using the same technical details.

Subgroup/sensitivity analysis was planned based on (1) trials at low risk of bias compared with trials at high risk of bias, (2) gestational age and (3) current best practice—use of antenatal steroids and NCPAP.

RESULTS

A total of 4643 references were identified. Of 138 full-text articles reviewed, 112 were excluded (see online supplemental eResults). Twenty-six references describing 14 trials were included (PRISMA diagram, figure 1).

The included studies^{22–35} involved 5588 infants, 5298 after postrandomisation dropouts. Threshold of FiO₂ for provision of selective surfactant ranged from 30% (three studies) to 60% (three studies). Five studies provided surfactants at 40% and three studies provided surfactants at 50%. Mean gestational age ranged from 27 weeks to 30 weeks. The range of gestational ages included in trials was variable as shown in table 1. There does not appear to be a systematic difference in the range of gestational ages among the trials using different FiO₂ thresholds for selective surfactant provision. Regarding the prophylactic group, in seven studies, surfactant was given straight after birth; in five studies, surfactant was given within 15 min; and in three studies, surfactant was given within 1 hour. The percentage of participants with antenatal steroid exposure ranged from 4% to 99%. Eight studies used Poractant alfa (Curosurf, Chiesi Farmaceutici, Italy). One study allowed Poractant alfa or Beractant (Survanta, AbbVie, USA). Of the five remaining studies, two multicentre trials allowed surfactant as per individual unit protocol, one Calfactant (Infasurf, ONY Biotech, USA) and one a self-prepared bovine surfactant. One study used a self-prepared human surfactant (see table 1 for further details). Twelve publications were identified as follow-up of the cohort in included trials.^{36–47} Due to the nature of the intervention studied, star-shaped networks were formed for each outcome. No closed loops were present,

and each study was connected to the network for each outcome. No studies were found to be at low risk of bias, 12 had some concerns; and 2 had high risk of bias (online supplemental eTable 1). As shown in online supplemental eTable 1, there does not appear to be a systematic difference in the risk of bias among the trials using different FiO₂ thresholds.

Primary outcome

Each of the 14 studies measured mortality, including 5298 patients. A random-effect model was used. OR for each comparison, Deviance Information Criteria (DIC), median between-study SD and variance are summarised in online supplemental eTable 2. None of the estimates reached statistical significance with 30% threshold having the highest OR for this outcome (1.81) with 95% CrI of 1.0 to 3.44 (table 2). Sensitivity analysis of current best practice (NCPAP use with high rates of antenatal steroid) did not show any statistically significant difference (online supplemental eTables 3 and 4).

Secondary outcomes

ORs, DIC and variance for each comparison can be found in online supplemental eTable 5. A summary of results is provided (tables 3–5).

Respiratory outcomes

BPD, CLD and CLD/BPD at maximum follow-up were assessed. There was no difference regarding BPD or CLD alone. When evaluated at maximum follow-up, incidence was higher in the 30% group than prophylaxis when directly compared. The other outcomes showed lower point estimates, although not reaching statistical significance.

Use of surfactant

Unsurprisingly, the proportion of infants receiving surfactant was significantly higher in the prophylactic group (online supplemental eTable 5e).

Regarding the number of surfactant doses, there was a significant difference between thresholds. The 60% threshold had the least use of surfactant, 815 fewer doses per 1000. The 30% threshold ranked second at 546 fewer doses per 1000; the 50% threshold ranked third at 384 fewer doses per 1000; and the 40% threshold ranked last at 316 fewer doses per 1000.

Complications of prematurity

We showed no significant differences in incidence of IVH, PVL, NEC or BPD. The 60% threshold showed a higher

Table 5 Summary of findings table for secondary outcome: major morbidities

	30% Threshold		40% Threshold		50% Threshold		60% Threshold	
Total major morbidities (n) Studies: 12 Participants: 5134								
Prophylaxis: 316 per 1000 (31.6 per 100 participants)	RaR 1.14 (0.94 to 1.40) Network estimate	45 more per 1000 (20 fewer to 126 more)	RaR 1.18 (0.89 to 1.56) Network estimate	56 more per 1000 (34 fewer to 176 more)	RaR 1.04 (0.92 to 1.18) Network estimate	14 more per 1000 (25 fewer to 58 more)	RaR 1.02 (0.81 to 1.28) Network estimate	six more per 1000 (62 fewer to 89 more)
Quality of evidence ⊕○○○ Very low *†‡§	Based on 1783 participants (3 RCTs)		Based on 939 participants (4 RCTs)		Based on 1617 participants (3 RCTs)		Based on 795 participants (2 RCTs)	
Grade 3/4 intraventricular haemorrhage Studies: 12 Participants: 5134								
Prophylaxis 44 per 1000 (4.4%)	OR 2.01 (0.83 to 5.46) Network estimate	40 more per 1000 (7 fewer to 156 more)	OR 1.69 (0.77 to 4.10) Network estimate	28 more per 1000 (10 fewer to 114 more)	OR 1.11 (0.44 to 2.47) Network estimate	5 more per 1000 (24 fewer to 58 more)	OR 0.68 (0.22 to 2.03) Network estimate	14 fewer per 1000 (34 fewer to 41 more)
Quality of Evidence ⊕⊕○○ Low *†	Based on 1783 participants (3 RCTs)		Based on 939 participants (4 RCTs)		Based on 1617 participants (3 RCTs)		Based on 795 participants (2 RCTs)	
Periventricular leucomalacia Studies: 8 Participants: 3087								
Prophylaxis: 34 per 1000 (3.4%)	OR 0.81 (0.51 to 1.28) Network estimate	6 fewer per 1000 (16 fewer to nine more)	OR 0.64 (0.07 to 4.25) Network estimate	12 fewer per 1000 (31 fewer to 96 more)	OR 0.80 (0.21 to 2.81) Network estimate	7 fewer per 1000 (27 fewer to 56 more)	OR 0.58 (0.19 to 1.50) Network estimate	14 fewer per 1000 (27 fewer to 16 more)
Quality of evidence: ⊕○○○ Very low *†‡§	Based on 1783 participants (3 RCTs)		Based on 208 participants (1 RCT)		Based on 301 participants (2 RCTs)		Based on 795 participants (2 RCTs)	
Necrotising enterocolitis Studies: 10 Participants: 4690								
Prophylaxis: 75 per 1000 (7.5%)	OR 0.86 (0.55 to 1.35) Network estimate	10 fewer per 1000 (32 fewer to 24 more)	OR 1.27 (0.81 to 2.01) Network estimate	18 more per 1000 (13 fewer to 65 more)	OR 1.27 (0.91 to 1.77) Network estimate	18 more per 1000 (6 fewer to 51 more)	OR 1.15 (0.61 to 2.10) Network estimate	10 more per 1000 (28 fewer to 70 more)
Quality of evidence: ⊕⊕○○ Low *†	Based on 1504 participants (2 RCTs)		Based on 921 participants (4 RCTs)		Based on 1617 participants (3 RCTs)		Based on 648 participants (1 RCT)	
Retinopathy of prematurity >stage 2 Studies: 6 Participants: 3727								
Prophylaxis 52 per 1000 (5.2%)	OR 1.01 (0.01 to 96.83) Network estimate	1 more per 1000 (52 fewer to 790 more)	OR 0.87 (0.09 to 7.05) Network estimate	6 fewer per 1000 (47 fewer to 228 more)	OR 0.99 (0.12 to 6.96) Network estimate	0 fewer per 1000 (45 fewer to 225 more)	OR 2.36 (0.13 to 40.29) Network estimate	63 more per 1000 (45 fewer to 638 more)
Quality of evidence: ⊕○○○ Very low *†‡§	Based on 1248 participants (1 RCT)		Based on 367 participants (2 RCTs)		Based on 1464 participants (2 RCTs)		Based on 648 participants (1 RCT)	
BPD Studies: 8 Participants: 3003								
Prophylaxis: 113 per 1000 (11.3%)	OR 1.39 (0.87 to 2.24) Network estimate	38 more per 1000 (13 fewer to 109 more)	OR 0.77 (0.37 to 1.58) Network estimate	24 fewer per 1000 (68 fewer to 55 more)	OR 0.93 (0.74 to 1.16) Network estimate	7 fewer per 1000 (27 fewer to 16 more)	OR 1.02 (0.72 to 1.45) Network estimate	2 more per 1000 (30 fewer to 43 more)
Quality of evidence: ⊕○○○ Very low *†‡§	Based on 279 participants (1 RCT)		Based on 460 participants (3 RCT)		Based on 1469 participants (2 RCT)		Based on 795 participants (2 RCT)	
All results are reported as OR with 95% credible intervals. *The trials were all had some concerns or were at high risk of bias. †There was significant heterogeneity. ‡This is a surrogate outcome or was an indirect comparison. §Less than 300 events in combined groups. ¶There is evidence of publication bias. BPD, bronchopulmonary dysplasia; RaR, rate ratio; RCT, randomised controlled trial.								

incidence of ROP on direct comparison with prophylaxis (OR 2.35, 95% CrI 1.02 to 5.42). Due to the presentation of components of this outcome separately in included studies, we performed a combined count outcome. Studies were included if they provided data from two or more of the five components of the composite outcome. No significant differences were found.

Neurodevelopment at CGA of 2 years

One trial²⁷ reported this outcome. Forty-three of 479 in the prophylactic group and 55 of 511 in the selective group developed one or more component.

Health-related quality of life

No study assessed HRQOL.

Quality of evidence

The overall quality of the evidence was low or very low for all comparisons due to the high risk of bias, heterogeneity, indirectness, imprecision and publication bias.

Heterogeneity

Since there was no meaningful way in which to rank these studies, we were unable to perform the comparison-adjusted funnel plot to assess reporting bias. Due to paucity of data, we were unable

Table 6 Sensitivity analysis of current best practice (stabilisation with NCPAP and high levels of antenatal steroid use)

	30% Threshold		40% Threshold		50% Threshold		60% Threshold	
Mortality								
Prophylaxis: 103 per 1000 (10.3%)	OR 1.03 (0.45 to 2.35) Network estimate	2 more per 1000 (54 fewer to 110 more)	OR 1.32 (0.69 to 2.61) Network estimate	29 more per 1000 (29 fewer to 127 more)	OR 0.81 (0.61 to 1.07) Network estimate	18 fewer per 1000 (38 fewer to seven more)	OR 0.56 (0.23 to 1.29) Network estimate	43 fewer per 1000 (78 fewer to 26 more)
Quality of evidence: ⊕○○○ Very low *†‡§	Based on 279 participants (1 RCT)		Based on 367 participants (2 RCTs)		Based on 1469 participants (2 RCTs)		Based on 439 participants (1 RCT)	
Bronchopulmonary dysplasia								
Prophylaxis: 175 per 1000 (17.5%)	OR 1.40 (0.88 to 2.24) Network estimate	54 more per 1000 (18 fewer to 148 more)	OR 0.83 (0.39 to 1.70) Network estimate	26 fewer per 1000 (99 fewer to 91 more)	OR 0.93 (0.74 to 1.16) Network estimate	11 fewer per 1000 (39 fewer to 22 more)	OR 1.29 (0.84 to 2.02) Network estimate	41 more per 1000 (25 fewer to 125 more)
Quality of evidence: ⊕○○○ Very low*†‡	Based on 279 participants (1 RCT)		Based on 367 participants (2 RCT)		Based on 1469 participants (2 RCT)		Based on 439 participants (1 RCT)	
Pneumothorax								
Prophylaxis: 27 per 1000 (2.7%)	OR 4.99 (0.00 to 6953.50) Network estimate	94 more per 1000 (27 fewer to 968 more)	OR 3.09 (0.02 to 2455.29) Network estimate	52 more per 1000 (26 fewer to 959 more)	OR 1.52 (0.01 to 324.08) Network estimate	14 more per 1000 (27 fewer to 873 more)	OR 1.73 (0.00 to 2151.67) Network estimate	19 more per 1000 (27 fewer to 957 more)
Quality of evidence: ⊕○○○ Very low*†‡§	Based on 279 participants (1 RCT)		Based on 367 participants (2 RCTs)		Based on 1469 participants (2 RCTs)		Based on 439 participants (1 RCT)	
Major morbidity								
Prophylaxis: 296 per 1000 (29.6 per 100 participants)	RaR 1.20 (0.86 to 1.68) Network estimate	60 more per 1000 (41 fewer to 202 more)	RaR 1.16 (0.81 to 1.66) Network estimate	47 more per 1000 (56 fewer to 196 more)	RaR 1.06 (0.93 to 1.21) Network estimate	19 more per 1000 (20 fewer to 62 more)	RaR 2.05 (1.46 to 2.93) Network estimate	310 more per 1000 (136 more to 572 more)
Quality of evidence: ⊕○○○ Very low*†‡§	Based on 279 participants (1 RCT)		Based on 367 participants (2 RCTs)		Based on 1469 participants (2 RCTs)		Based on 439 participants (1 RCT)	
Grade 3/4 intraventricular haemorrhage								
Prophylaxis: 39 per 1000 (3.9%)	OR 1.64 (0.24 to 14.41) Network estimate			23 more per 1000 (29 fewer to 329 more)	OR 2.16 (0.87 to 5.98) Network estimate			41 more per 1000 (5 fewer to 156 more)
Quality of evidence: ⊕○○○ Very low*†‡§	Based on 279 participants (1 RCT)		Based on 367 participants (2 RCTs)		Based on 1469 participants (2 RCTs)		Based on 439 participants (1 RCT)	
*The trials were all had some concerns or were at high risk of bias. †There was significant heterogeneity. ‡This is a surrogate outcome or was an indirect comparison. §Less than 300 events in combined groups. ¶There is evidence of publication bias. NCPAP, nasal continuous positive airway pressure; RaR, rate ratio; RCT, randomised controlled trial.								

to perform planned subgroup analyses based on gestation, type of ventilation or antenatal steroid use alone. To explore heterogeneity, a sensitivity analysis was carried out comparing studies using current best practice (over 60% antenatal steroid use and NCPAP for stabilisation).

NCPAP and high antenatal steroid use

A summary of findings is shown in table 6. Six studies^{24 25 27 28 33 34} met the criteria, including 2554 infants. There was no statistically significant difference seen in mortality, BPD, pneumothorax or grade 3/4 IVH. There was an increased rate of major morbidity in the 60% threshold group—310 more per 1000 (95% CrI intervals 136 more to 572 more). ORs, DIC and variance for each comparison are provided in online supplemental eTables 3 and 4. Each comparison had a very low quality of evidence.

DISCUSSION

Our primary outcome, mortality, showed no statistically significant differences between the thresholds of FiO₂ examined. Regarding the major morbidities of preterm birth, the 60% threshold showed a higher incidence of ROP on direct comparison with prophylaxis. Regarding surfactant doses received, there was significant differences between thresholds. The 60% threshold had the least doses, 30% threshold second, 50% threshold third and 40% threshold last. This may suggest that

earlier selective treatment decreases the need for repeat doses, and that earlier use of surfactant may be appropriate as infants reaching this threshold will need more surfactant if treatment is delayed. However, this would be contradicted by the 60% threshold requiring least doses. Interpretation is complicated by differences in rescue dosing, dosing strategies between studies and total amount of doses allowed. The 30% threshold, despite having less doses of surfactant, had a higher incidence of prolonged respiratory support. This may relate to exposure to harmful effects of ventilation earlier, when the neonatal lung is more vulnerable.

A sensitivity analysis of infants treated with the current standard of care showed an increase in major morbidity in the 60% threshold group. While our analysis failed to identify an optimal threshold, it adds to scarce data. In the absence of evidence showing a benefit to treatment at 30%, 40% or 50% FiO₂, it warrants consideration of higher thresholds (except 60%)—decreasing invasive procedures, associated mechanical ventilation, surfactant use, sedation and associated side effects. The economic impact is likely to be significant.

Despite the common nature of this issue, there are little data to guide clinicians. A secondary analysis of prospectively collected data⁶ has been used to support lower thresholds. This study reviewed infants between 25 weeks and 32 weeks of gestation initially managed on NCPAP. Multivariate analysis showed

NCPAP failure was predicted by the highest FiO_2 in the first hours. This study was limited by several factors: its retrospective nature, the small numbers at each gestation and the low number primarily managed with NCPAP (50%). The authors concluded that NCPAP failure was predicted by an FiO_2 greater than 30% in the first hours and was associated with adverse outcomes. A review of the literature by Dani³ also evaluated this issue, concluding that the most effective threshold is unknown.

The European Consensus Guidelines on the management of RDS,² based on the above paper by Dargaville *et al.*,⁶ suggests 'early' use of rescue surfactant outside of the delivery room at an FiO_2 of 30% or above. However, the guideline also recommends using 30%–40% FiO_2 for initial stabilisation despite advising against prophylactic surfactant.

Despite the common use of FiO_2 as a major criterion for provision of selective surfactant, there are limitations to its use, especially in isolation. A combination of pH, clinical assessment and FiO_2 will give a more accurate assessment. FiO_2 can be influenced by many factors including NCPAP interface, mode of non-invasive ventilation and level of positive end expiratory pressure and can be a measure of pathologies other than surfactant deficiency.

The strength of this review was the range of databases searched without restrictions. Two independent reviewers carried out article identification and data extraction. Analysis was performed using fixed-effect and random-effect models, with the most conservative reported. There were limitations. A scoping search revealed no studies directly comparing thresholds for provision of surfactant, and therefore, we relied on indirect comparisons. A paucity of data decreased confidence in results and precluded planned analyses.

There was a lack of long-term neurodevelopmental follow-up and assessment of quality of life. As survival rates of prematurity increase, long-term effects become increasingly important. Parental perspective is vital in this regard.

CONCLUSION

This network meta-analysis of 14 studies and 5290 infants suggests no statistically significant difference between a range of 30% to 50% FiO_2 for the provision of surfactant to preterm infants regarding mortality, respiratory outcomes or complications of prematurity. A 60% threshold may result in more major morbidities. Despite the low quality of evidence and limitations of indirect comparisons, this review provides the strongest evidence currently available, supporting more judicious use of surfactant in preterm infants.

Contributors JM contributed to the conception and design of the study idea and methodology, performed study selection and reviewed the manuscript. AB contributed to the conception and design of the study idea and methodology, performed study selection, data extraction and risk of bias assessment, contributed to the interpretation of the data and drafted the manuscript. KG contributed to the conception and design of the study idea and methodology and the interpretation of the data. IY performed data extraction and risk of bias assessment and contributed to the interpretation of the data. All authors critically revised the manuscript, agreed to be fully accountable for ensuring the integrity and accuracy of the work, and read and approved the final manuscript. JM is responsible for the overall content as the guarantor.

Funding The authors have not declared a specific grant for this research from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Competing interests None declared.

Patient consent for publication Not applicable.

Ethics approval Not applicable.

Provenance and peer review Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

Data availability statement Data are available upon reasonable request. Data is available on reasonable request to the authors.

Supplemental material This content has been supplied by the author(s). It has not been vetted by BMJ Publishing Group Limited (BMJ) and may not have been peer-reviewed. Any opinions or recommendations discussed are solely those of the author(s) and are not endorsed by BMJ. BMJ disclaims all liability and responsibility arising from any reliance placed on the content. Where the content includes any translated material, BMJ does not warrant the accuracy and reliability of the translations (including but not limited to local regulations, clinical guidelines, terminology, drug names and drug dosages), and is not responsible for any error and/or omissions arising from translation and adaptation or otherwise.

Open access This is an open access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 Unported (CC BY 4.0) license, which permits others to copy, redistribute, remix, transform and build upon this work for any purpose, provided the original work is properly cited, a link to the licence is given, and indication of whether changes were made. See: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

ORCID iDs

Aoife Branagan <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5220-5372>

Jan Miletin <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0489-6054>

REFERENCES

- Halliday HL. The fascinating story of surfactant. *J Paediatr Child Health* 2017;53:327–32.
- Sweet DG, Carnielli V, Greisen G, *et al.* European Consensus Guidelines on the Management of Respiratory Distress Syndrome - 2019 Update. *Neonatology* 2019;115:432–50.
- Soll RF, Morley CJ. Prophylactic versus selective use of surfactant in preventing morbidity and mortality in preterm infants. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2001;2:CD000510.
- Rojas-Reyes MX, Morley CJ, Soll R. Prophylactic versus selective use of surfactant in preventing morbidity and mortality in preterm infants. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2012;3:CD000510.
- Dani C. Surfactant treatment threshold during nCPAP for the treatment of preterm infants with respiratory distress syndrome. *Am J Perinatol* 2016;33:925–9.
- Dargaville PA, Aiyappan A, De Paoli AG, *et al.* Continuous positive airway pressure failure in preterm infants: incidence, predictors and consequences. *Neonatology* 2013;104:8–14.
- Polin RA, Carlo WA, *et al.* Committee on Fetus and Newborn. Surfactant replacement therapy for preterm and term neonates with respiratory distress. *Pediatrics* 2014;133:156–63.
- Excellence NifHaC. *Specialist neonatal respiratory care for babies born preterm*. NICE guideline [NG124], 2019.
- Ng EH, Shah V. Guidelines for surfactant replacement therapy in neonates. *Paediatr Child Health* 2021;26:35–49.
- Jobe AJ. The new BPD: an arrest of lung development. *Pediatr Res* 1999;46:641–3.
- Papile LA, Burstein J, Burstein R, *et al.* Incidence and evolution of subependymal and intraventricular hemorrhage: a study of infants with birth weights less than 1,500 gm. *J Pediatr* 1978;92:529–34.
- de Vries LS, Eken P, Dubowitz LM. The spectrum of leukomalacia using cranial ultrasound. *Behav Brain Res* 1992;49:1–6.
- Neu J. Necrotizing enterocolitis: the search for a unifying pathogenic theory leading to prevention. *Pediatr Clin North Am* 1996;43:409–32.
- International Committee for the Classification of Retinopathy of Prematurity. The International classification of retinopathy of prematurity revisited. *Arch Ophthalmol* 2005;123:991–9.
- Varni JW, Seid M, Kurtin PS. PedsQL 4.0: reliability and validity of the pediatric quality of life inventory version 4.0 generic core scales in healthy and patient populations. *Med Care* 2001;39:800–12.
- Sterne JAC, Savović J, Page MJ, *et al.* Rob 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ* 2019;366:l4898.
- Severini TA. Bayesian interval estimates which are also confidence intervals. *J R Stat Soc* 1993;55:533–40.
- Salanti G, Ades AE, Ioannidis JPA. Graphical methods and numerical summaries for presenting results from multiple-treatment meta-analysis: an overview and tutorial. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2011;64:163–71.
- Chaimani A, Higgins JPT, Mavridis D, *et al.* Graphical tools for network meta-analysis in STATA. *PLoS One* 2013;8:e76654.
- Mills EJ, Ioannidis JPA, Thorlund K, *et al.* How to use an article reporting a multiple treatment comparison meta-analysis. *JAMA* 2012;308:1246–53.
- Dias S, Sutton AJ, Ades AE, *et al.* Evidence synthesis for decision making 2: a generalized linear modeling framework for pairwise and network meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Med Decis Making* 2013;33:607–17.

- 22 Bevilacqua G, Chernev T, Parmigiani S, *et al.* Use of surfactant for prophylaxis versus rescue treatment of respiratory distress syndrome: experience from an Italian-Bulgarian trial. *Acta Biomed Ateneo Parmense* 1997;68 Suppl 1:47–54.
- 23 de Winter JP, Egberts J, de Kleine MJ, *et al.* [Prevention and treatment of respiratory distress syndrome in premature infants using intratracheally administered surfactants]. *Ned Tijdschr Geneesk* 1992;136:2018–24.
- 24 Dilmen U, Özdemir R, Tatar Aksoy H, *et al.* Early regular versus late selective poractant treatment in preterm infants born between 25 and 30 gestational weeks: a prospective randomized multicenter study. *J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med* 2014;27:411–5.
- 25 Dunn MS, Kaempf J, de Klerk A, *et al.* Randomized trial comparing 3 approaches to the initial respiratory management of preterm neonates. *Pediatrics* 2011;128:e1069–76.
- 26 Egberts J, de Winter JP, Sedin G, *et al.* Comparison of prophylaxis and rescue treatment with Curosurf in neonates less than 30 weeks' gestation: a randomized trial. *Pediatrics* 1993;92:768–74.
- 27 SUPPORT Study Group of the Eunice Kennedy Shriver NICHD Neonatal Research Network, Finer NN, Carlo WA, *et al.* Early CPAP versus surfactant in extremely preterm infants. *N Engl J Med* 2010;362:1970–9.
- 28 Kandraju H, Murki S, Subramanian S, *et al.* Early routine versus late selective surfactant in preterm neonates with respiratory distress syndrome on nasal continuous positive airway pressure: a randomized controlled trial. *Neonatology* 2013;103:148–54.
- 29 Kattwinkel J, Bloom BT, Delmore P, *et al.* Prophylactic administration of calf lung surfactant extract is more effective than early treatment of respiratory distress syndrome in neonates of 29 through 32 weeks' gestation. *Pediatrics* 1993;92:90–8.
- 30 Kendig JW, Notter RH, Cox C, *et al.* A comparison of surfactant as immediate prophylaxis and as rescue therapy in newborns of less than 30 weeks' gestation. *N Engl J Med* 1991;324:865–71.
- 31 Lefort S, Diniz EMA, Vaz FAC. Clinical course of premature infants intubated in the delivery room, submitted or not to porcine-derived lung surfactant therapy within the first hour of life. *J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med* 2003;14:187–96.
- 32 Merritt TA, Hallman M, Berry C, *et al.* Randomized, placebo-controlled trial of human surfactant given at birth versus rescue administration in very low birth weight infants with lung immaturity. *J Pediatr* 1991;118:581–94.
- 33 Rojas MA, Lozano JM, Rojas MX, *et al.* Very early surfactant without mandatory ventilation in premature infants treated with early continuous positive airway pressure: a randomized, controlled trial. *Pediatrics* 2009;123:137–42.
- 34 Sandri F, Plavka R, Ancora G, *et al.* Prophylactic or early selective surfactant combined with nCPAP in very preterm infants. *Pediatrics* 2010;125:e1402–9.
- 35 Walti H, Paris-Llado J, Bréart G, *et al.* Porcine surfactant replacement therapy in newborns of 25–31 weeks' gestation: a randomized, multicentre trial of prophylaxis versus rescue with multiple low doses. The French Collaborative multicentre study Group. *Acta Paediatr* 1995;84:913–21.
- 36 Ambalavanan N, Carlo WA, Wraga LA, *et al.* Paco2 in surfactant, positive pressure, and oxygenation randomised trial (support). *Arch Dis Child Fetal Neonatal Ed* 2015;100:F145–9.
- 37 SUPPORT Study Group of the Eunice Kennedy Shriver NICHD Neonatal Research Network, Carlo WA, Finer NN, *et al.* Target ranges of oxygen saturation in extremely preterm infants. *N Engl J Med* 2010;362:1959–69.
- 38 CE M, JW K, CF T. Early neurodevelopmental outcome of premature infants in a randomized trial comparing preventilatory and postventilatory surfactant therapy for respiratory distress syndrome. *Ann Neurol* 1990;28:412–3.
- 39 CE M, JW K, CF T. Early neurodevelopmental outcome of premature-infants in a randomized trial comparing prophylactic and rescue surfactant therapy. *Pediatric Research* 1991;29:A261.
- 40 Hintz SR, Barnes PD, Bulas D, *et al.* Neuroimaging and neurodevelopmental outcome in extremely preterm infants. *Pediatrics* 2015;135:e32–42.
- 41 Navarrete CT, Wraga LA, Carlo WA, *et al.* Growth outcomes of preterm infants exposed to different oxygen saturation target ranges from birth. *J Pediatr* 2016;176:62–8.
- 42 Pelkonen AS, Hakulinen AL, Turpeinen M, *et al.* Effect of neonatal surfactant therapy on lung function at school age in children born very preterm. *Pediatr Pulmonol* 1998;25:182–90.
- 43 Sinkin RA, Kramer BM, Merzbach JL, *et al.* School-Age follow-up of prophylactic versus rescue surfactant trial: pulmonary, neurodevelopmental, and educational outcomes. *Pediatrics* 1998;101:E11.
- 44 Stevens TP, Finer NN, Carlo WA, *et al.* Respiratory outcomes of the surfactant positive pressure and oximetry randomized trial (support). *J Pediatr* 2014;165:240–9.
- 45 Vaucher YE, Harker L, Merritt TA, *et al.* Outcome at twelve months of adjusted age in very low birth weight infants with lung immaturity: a randomized, placebo-controlled trial of human surfactant. *J Pediatr* 1993;122:126–32.
- 46 Vaucher YE, Peralta-Carcelen M, Finer NN, *et al.* Neurodevelopmental outcomes in the early CPAP and pulse oximetry trial. *N Engl J Med* 2012;367:2495–504.
- 47 Vohr BR, Heyne R, Bann CM, *et al.* Extreme preterm infant rates of overweight and obesity at school age in the support neuroimaging and neurodevelopmental outcomes cohort. *J Pediatr* 2018;200:132–9.

Online Only Material

- 1) eMethods - Search Strategy
- 2) eMethods - Data extraction and Management
- 3) eMethods - Data Synthesis
- 4) eResults - Risk of Bias Assessment
eTable 1 – Risk of Bias Assessment
- 5) eResults - Excluded Studies.
- 6) eResults - Primary Outcome Mortality
eTable 2 – Odds ratio for both the direct and network comparison of the primary outcome
- 7) eResults - Secondary Outcomes
eTable 3 - Odds ratio for both the direct and network comparison for secondary outcomes
- 8) eResults - Sensitivity Analysis of Current Best Practice
eTable 4 - Odds Ratio for Sensitivity Analysis
eTable 5 - Models used for outcomes for sensitivity analysis

eMethods – Search Strategy

1) The Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) in the Cochrane Library

Searched from inception to March 2020

Search strategy:

- 1 MeSH descriptor: [Infant, Very Low Birth Weight] explode all trees
- #2 MeSH descriptor: [Infant, Newborn] explode all trees
- #3 MeSH descriptor: [Infant, Extremely Low Birth Weight] explode all trees
- #4 MeSH descriptor: [Infant, Low Birth Weight] explode all trees
- #5 MeSH descriptor: [Infant, Premature] explode all trees
- #6 MeSH descriptor: [Infant, Extremely Premature] explode all trees
- #7 MeSH descriptor: [Premature Birth] explode all trees
- #8 #1 OR #2 OR #3 OR #4 OR #5 OR #6 OR #7
- #9 Birth, Premature OR Births, Premature OR Premature Births OR Preterm Birth OR Birth, Preterm OR Births, Preterm OR Preterm Births OR Infants, Premature OR Premature Infant OR Preterm Infants OR Infant, Preterm OR Infants, Preterm OR Preterm Infant OR Premature Infants OR Neonatal OR Prematurity OR Prematurity, Neonatal OR Extremely Premature Infant OR Infants, Extremely Premature OR Premature Infant, Extremely OR Premature Infants, Extremely OR Extremely Preterm Infants OR Extremely Preterm Infant OR Infant, Extremely Preterm OR Infants, Extremely Preterm OR Preterm Infant, Extremely OR Preterm Infants, Extremely OR Extremely Premature Infants OR Extremely Low Birth Weight OR Extremely Low Birth Weight Infant OR (Extremely AND low AND birth AND weight) OR Very Low Birth Weight OR (Very AND low AND birth AND weight) OR Very Low Birth Weight Infant OR Low Birth Weight Infant OR Low Birth Weight OR Birth Weight, Low OR Birth Weights, Low OR Low Birth Weights Infants, Newborn OR Newborn Infant OR Newborn Infants OR Newborns OR Newborn OR Neonate OR Neonates OR Infants, Premature OR Premature Infant OR Preterm Infants OR Infant, Preterm OR Infants, Preterm OR Preterm Infant OR Premature Infants OR Neonatal Prematurity OR Prematurity, Neonatal OR ELBW OR VLBW OR Extreme prematurity
- #10 #8 OR #9
- #11 MeSH descriptor: [Surface-Active Agents] explode all trees
- #12 MeSH descriptor: [Pulmonary Surfactants] explode all trees
- #13 Agents, Surface-Active OR Surface Active Agents OR Active Agents, Surface OR Agents, Surface Active OR Tensides OR Surfactants OR Surfactant OR Amphiphilic Agents OR Agents, Amphiphilic OR Surfactants, Pulmonary OR Pulmonary Surfactant OR Surfactant, Pulmonary
- #14 #11 OR #12 OR #13
- #15 #8 AND #14

2) MEDLINE (PubMed)

Searched from inception to March 2020

Search strategy:

- a) Population – neonates
 "Infant, Newborn"[Mesh]
 "Infant, Extremely Low Birth Weight"[Mesh]
 "Infant, Low Birth Weight"[Mesh]
 "Infant, Very Low Birth Weight"[Mesh]
 "Infant, Premature"[Mesh]
 "Extremely Premature"[Mesh]
 "Premature Birth"[Mesh]

Entry terms:

Birth, Premature
 Births, Premature

Premature Births
Preterm Birth
Birth, Preterm
Births, Preterm
Preterm Births
Infants, Premature
Premature Infant
Preterm Infants
Infant, Preterm
Infants, Preterm
Preterm Infant
Premature Infants
Neonatal Prematurity
Prematurity, Neonatal
Extremely Premature Infant
Infants, Extremely Premature
Premature Infant, Extremely
Premature Infants, Extremely
Extremely Preterm Infants
Extremely Preterm Infant
Infant, Extremely Preterm
Infants, Extremely Preterm
Preterm Infant, Extremely
Preterm Infants, Extremely
Extremely Premature Infants
Extremely-Low-Birth-Weight [all fields] OR
Extremely Low Birth Weight [all fields] OR
Extremely Low Birth Weight Infant
Extremely AND low AND birth AND weight [all fields] OR
Very Low Birth Weight [all fields] OR
Very Low-Birth-Weight [all fields] OR
Very AND low AND birth AND weight OR
Infant, Very-Low-Birth-Weight [all fields] OR
Infants, Very-Low-Birth-Weight [all fields] OR
Very Low Birth Weight Infant [all fields] OR
Very-Low-Birth-Weight Infants [all fields] OR
Low-Birth-Weight Infant
Infant, Low-Birth-Weight
Infants, Low-Birth-Weight
Low Birth Weight Infant
Low-Birth-Weight Infants
Low Birth Weight
Birth Weight, Low
Birth Weights, Low
Low Birth Weights
Infants, Newborn [all fields] OR
Newborn Infant [all fields] OR
Newborn Infants [all fields] OR
Newborns [all fields] OR
Newborn [all fields] OR
Neonate [all fields] OR
Neonates [all fields] OR
ELBW [all fields] OR
VLBW [all fields] OR
Extreme prematurity [all fields]

b) Intervention – Surfactant

34 "Surface-Active Agents"[Mesh]

35 "Pulmonary Surfactants"[Mesh]

Entry terms

36 Agents, Surface-Active [all fields] OR

37 Surface Active Agents [all fields] OR

38 Active Agents, Surface [all fields] OR

39 Agents, Surface Active [all fields] OR

40 Tensides [all fields] OR

41 Surfactants [all fields] OR

42 Surfactant [all fields] OR

43 Amphiphilic Agents [all fields] OR

44 Agents, Amphiphilic [all fields] OR

45 Surfactants, Pulmonary [all fields] OR

46 Pulmonary Surfactant [all fields] OR

47 Surfactant, Pulmonary [all fields]

The population and intervention search strategies above were combined with boolean operator 'AND'. The pubmed controlled clinical trials filter was applied.

3) **EMBASE**

Searched from inception to March 2020

Search strategy:

1. infant newborn.mp. or exp newborn/

2. extremely low birth weight.mp. or exp low birth weight/ or exp very low birth weight/ or exp extremely low birth weight/ or exp newborn/ or exp prematurity/

3. extremely-low-birth-weight.mp.

4. (extremely and low and birth and weight).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]

5. very low birth weight.mp. or exp very low birth weight/

6. very-low-birth-weight.mp.

7. (very and low and birth and weight).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]

8. newborn infant.mp.

9. neonate.mp.

10. premature.mp.

11. exp premature labor/ or preterm.mp. or exp gestational age/

12. elbw.mp.

13. vlbw.mp.

14. 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 or 11 or 12 or 13

15. exp surfactant associated protein/ or exp surfactant/ or surfactant.mp.

16. pulmonary surfactant.mp. or exp lung surfactant/

17. surface active agents.mp. or surfactant/

18. surfactant/ or tensides.mp.

19. surfactants.mp. or surfactant/

20. 15 or 16 or 17 or 18 or 19

21. (random* or factorial* or crossover* or cross over* or cross-over* or placebo* or doubl* blind* or singl* blind* or assign* or allocat* or volunteer*).af.

22. exp crossover-procedure/ or exp double-blind procedure/ or exp randomized controlled trial/ or exp single-blind procedure/

23. 21 or 22

24. 14 and 20 and 23

4) Science Citation Index Expanded (Web of Science)

Searched from inception to March 2020

Search strategy:

TI = (Surface-Active Agents OR Pulmonary Surfactants OR Agents, Surface-Active OR Active Agents, Surface OR Agents, Surface Active OR Surfactants OR Surfactant OR Surfactants, Pulmonary OR Pulmonary Surfactant OR Surfactant, Pulmonary)

TI = (Infant, Extremely Low Birth Weight OR Infant, Low Birth Weight OR Infant, Very Low Birth Weight OR Infant, Premature OR Extremely Premature)

TI = (Infants, Premature OR Premature Infant OR Preterm Infants OR Infant, Preterm OR Preterm Infant OR Premature Infants OR Neonatal Prematurity OR Prematurity, Neonatal OR Extremely Premature Infant OR Infants, Extremely Premature OR Premature Infant, Extremely OR Premature Infants, Extremely OR Extremely Preterm Infants)

TI = (Extremely Preterm Infant OR Extremely Premature Infants OR Extremely-Low-Birth-Weight OR Extremely Low Birth Weight [all fields] OR(Extremely AND low AND birth AND weight) OR Very Low Birth Weight OR Very Low-Birth-Weight OR Neonate OR Neonates OR ELBW OR VLBW OR extreme prematurity)

TS=(random* OR rct* OR crossover OR masked OR blind* OR placebo* OR meta-analysis OR systematic review* OR meta-analys*)

5) ClinicalTrials.gov

Searched from inception to March 2020

Condition: prematurity

Intervention: Surfactant

6) World Health Organization International Clinical Trials Registry Platform (apps.who.int/trialsearch/)

Searched from inception to March 2020

Condition: neo*

Intervention: surfactant

eMethod – Data extraction and Management

Two authors independently extracted the data below in a pre-piloted data extraction form:

- Outcome data (for each outcome and each intervention group):
 - o Number of participants randomised
 - o Number of participants included for the analysis
 - o Number of participants with events for binary outcomes, mean and standard deviation for continuous outcomes, number of events and the mean follow-up period for count outcomes and number of participants with events and the mean follow-up period for time-to-event outcomes
 - o Natural logarithm of hazard ratio and its standard error if this was reported rather than the number of participants with events and the mean follow-up period for time-to-event outcomes
- Data on potential effect modifiers:
 - o Participant characteristics such as sex, gestational age, birthweight, use of antenatal steroids
 - o Details of the intervention and control
 - o Length of follow-up
 - o Information related to ‘Risk of Bias’ assessment
- Other data:
 - o Year and language of publication
 - o Country
 - o Year(s) in which the trial was conducted
 - o Inclusion and exclusion criteria

We collected data at maximum follow-up provided and also at shorter (up to three months) and medium-term follow-up (three months to 1 year) where applicable. We attempted to contact trial authors in the case of unclear or missing information. Any differences in opinion were resolved by discussion.

eMethods – Data Synthesis

A network meta-analysis was conducted to compare thresholds of FiO₂ simultaneously for each of the primary and secondary outcomes. Network meta-analysis combines direct evidence within trials and indirect evidence across trials [1]. Our analysis was based on guidance by the National Institute for Clinical Excellence (NICE) Decision Support Unit (DSU).[1-4]

We obtained a network plot to ensure that the trials were connected by interventions [3]. We excluded any trials unconnected to the network from the meta-analysis and reported only the direct pair-wise meta-analysis for such comparisons.

We conducted a Bayesian network meta-analysis using the Markov chain Monte Carlo method.

We used a fixed-effect model and random-effects model for the network meta-analysis. For each pair-wise comparison in a table, we reported the fixed-effect model if the two models reported similar results; otherwise, we reported the more conservative model.

We used a hierarchical Bayesian model using three different initial values, employing codes provided by NICE DSU [5]. We used a normal distribution with large variance (10,000) for treatment effect priors (vague or flat priors). For the random-effects model, we used a prior distributed uniformly (limits: 0 to 5) for between-trial standard deviation but assumed the same between-trial standard deviation across treatment comparisons [5]. We used a 'burn-in' of 10,000 simulations, checked for convergence (of effect estimates and between-study heterogeneity) visually (i.e. whether the values in different chains mix very well by visualisation) and ran the models for another 10,000 simulations to obtain effect estimates. If we did not obtain convergence, we increased the number of simulations for the 'burn-in'.

We estimated the probability that each intervention ranks at one of the possible positions using the NICE DSU codes [5].

Analysis was carried out using OpenBUGS, version 3.2.3

We assessed inconsistency (statistical evidence of the violation of transitivity assumption) by fitting both an inconsistency model and a consistency model. We used inconsistency models employed in the NICE DSU manual, as we used a common between-study standard deviation [2].

In the presence of inconsistency, we assessed whether the inconsistency was due to clinical or methodological heterogeneity.

We performed the direct comparisons using the same codes and the same technical details

Subgroup/sensitivity analysis: Subgroup analysis was planned based on 1) trials at low risk of bias compared to trials at high risk of bias, 2) gestational age, 3) Current best practice – use of antenatal steroids and NCPAP. Due to a paucity of data these could not be carried out. A sensitivity analysis of current best practice was performed. No trials reported only per-protocol analysis results, therefore no best-worst case scenario/worst-best case scenario analyses as sensitivity analyses were required. No imputations were required for mean or standard deviation, therefore sensitivity analysis excluding same was not required.

eResults – Risk of Bias Assessment

eTable 1 – Risk of Bias Assessment

	Bev.	DuW	Dilm	Dunn	Egb	Finer	Kand	Katt	Kend	Lefor	Merr	Roja	Sand	Walti
Randomisation process	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Deviations from intended interventions	Low	SC	High	Low	SC	Low	SC	High	Low	SC	Low	Low	Low	SC
Missing outcome data	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Measurement of the outcome	SC	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Selection of the reported result	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC
Overall risk of bias	SC	SC	High	SC	SC	SC	SC	High	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC

eTable 1a – Risk of bias in each domain for each included study, Author 1. SC some concerns

	Bev.	DuW.	Dilm	Dunn	Egb.	Finer	Kand	Katt.	Kend	Lefor	Merri	Roja	Sand	Walti
Randomisation process	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Deviations from intended interventions	Low	SC	High	Low	SC	Low	SC	High	Low	SC	Low	Low	Low	SC
Missing outcome data	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Measurement of the outcome	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Selection of the reported result	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC
Overall risk of bias	SC	SC	High	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC

eTable 1b – Risk of bias in each domain for each included study, Author 2. SC some concerns

eResults – Excluded Studies

None of the excluded studies met the inclusion criteria.

5 of the studies were identified as review articles or systematic reviews [6-10]. 1 study is an ongoing trial assessing surfactant thresholds for treatment [11]. We were unable to translate 2 studies and the abstracts did not provide sufficient information for inclusion [12,13]. 23 were not randomised control trials [14-36]. 6 trials met the inclusion criteria but did not list an fio2 for treatment with selective surfactant [37-42]. 55 did not meet the inclusion criteria of a trial assessing prophylactic treatment with surfactant vs selective treatment with surfactant [43-96]. 10 of the references are trial register or published abstracts of an included trial: [97-106]. 3 references were abstracts without a published trial found despite attempts to contact the author [107-109].

eResults – Primary Outcome Mortality

A random-effect model was used for the network meta-analysis because it was more conservative.

Deviance Information Criteria (DIC) for fixed model was 171.1, random 172.3.

Median between-study standard deviation for the random-effect model 0.23 (95% CrI 0.011, 0.742), variance 0.055.

Model used for direct comparisons are included in Table 1 with the odds ratio for each comparison.

eTable 2. Odds ratio for both the direct and network comparison of the primary outcome

Mortality	Prophylaxis	Threshold 30%	Threshold 40%	Threshold 50%	Threshold 60%
Prophylaxis		1.88[0.25,16.51] *	1.52[0.87,2.52] *	0.8[0.62,1.04] #	1.1[0.67,1.78] #
Threshold 30%	1.81[1.00,3.44]		-	-	-
Threshold 40%	1.52[0.94,2.40]	0.84[0.37,1.77]		-	-
Threshold 50%	0.82[0.50,1.41]	0.45[0.20,1.01]	0.54[0.28,1.13]		-
Threshold 60%	1.16[0.63,2.29]	0.64[0.27,1.60]	0.76[0.36,1.80]	1.41[0.64,3.31]	

eTable 2. Odds ratio for both the direct and network comparison of the primary outcome

Network Meta-analysis comparisons are below the greyed line, direct comparisons are above the line. Comparisons that did not reach statistical significance (credibility intervals for the odds ratio cross 1) are highlighted in yellow. Comparisons that do reach statistical significance are highlighted in blue.

Most conservative method of analysis was used in each case. * denotes fixed-effect model, # denotes random effect model for direct comparisons.

eResults – Sensitivity Analysis of Current Best Practice

Six studies met the criteria. This included 2554 patients. 1268 were in the combined prophylaxis arm and were compared with 138 (one study) in the 30% threshold arm, 183 (2 studies) in the 40% arm, 727 (two studies) in the 50% arm and 216 (one study) in the 60% arm.

eTable 4 shows the odds ratio for each comparison within the analysis, along with the model of comparison used. Most conservative model was used in each case.

Fixed-effects model was used for all outcomes, except pneumothorax, where random-effects model was used. DIC, between-study variance with 95% CrI and variance where applicable are shown in eTable 5.

There was no statistically significant difference seen in mortality, BPD, pneumothorax, or grade 3/4 IVH.

There was an increased rate of major morbidity in the 60% threshold group– 31 more per 1000 (95% CrI intervals 136 more to 572 more).

Each comparison was deemed to be at very-low quality of evidence.

eTable 3. Odds Ratio for Sensitivity Analysis

Mortality	Prophylaxis	30% Threshold	40% Threshold	50% Threshold	60% Threshold
Prophylaxis		1.02[0.45,2.34] &	1.33[0.69,2.6] *	0.81[0.61,1.07] *	0.55[0.23,1.29] &
30% Threshold	1.03[0.45,2.35]		-	-	-
40% Threshold	1.32[0.69,2.61]	1.30[0.45,3.77]		-	-
50% Threshold	0.81[0.61,1.07]	0.79[0.33,1.90]	0.61[0.29,1.24]		-
60% Threshold	0.56[0.23,1.29]	0.54[0.16,1.77]	0.42[0.14,1.22]	0.69[0.27,1.66]	

eTable 3a. Odds ratio for sensitivity analysis for mortality

Bronchopulmonary Dysplasia	Prophylaxis	30% Threshold	40% Threshold	50% Threshold	60% Threshold
Prophylaxis		1.39[0.87,2.23]	0.83[0.39,1.7]	0.93[0.74,1.16]	1.3[0.84,2.02]
30% Threshold	1.40[0.88,2.24]		-	-	-
40% Threshold	0.83[0.39,1.70]	0.59[0.24,1.40]		-	-
50% Threshold	0.93[0.74,1.16]	0.66[0.39,1.11]	1.12[0.53,2.44]		-
60% Threshold	1.29[0.84,2.02]	0.93[0.49,1.76]	1.57[0.68,3.74]	1.40[0.86,2.30]	

eTable 3b. Odds ratio for sensitivity analysis for bronchopulmonary dysplasia

Pneumothorax	Prophylaxis	30% Threshold	40% Threshold	50% Threshold	60% Threshold
Prophylaxis		4.78[1.42,22.97] &	3.73[0.01,3209.92]#	1.07[0.71,1.62] *	1.73[0.67,4.82] &
30% Threshold	4.99[0.00,6953.50]		-	-	-
40% Threshold	3.09[0.02,2455.29]	0.65[0.00,14472.42]		-	-
50% Threshold	1.52[0.01,324.08]	0.31[0.00,2426.00]	0.48[0.00,754.46]		-
60% Threshold	1.73[0.00,2151.67]	0.36[0.00,8681.94]	0.54[0.00,2972.03]	1.13[0.00,8391.71]	

eTable 3c. Odds ratio for sensitivity analysis for pneumothorax

Major Morbidity	Prophylaxis	30% Threshold	40% Threshold	50% Threshold	60% Threshold
Prophylaxis		1.21[0.87,1.7] &	1.15[0.8,1.66] *	1.06[0.93,1.21] *	2.05[1.45,2.92] &
30% Threshold	1.20[0.86,1.68]		-	-	-
40% Threshold	1.16[0.81,1.66]	0.96[0.58,1.57]		-	-
50% Threshold	1.06[0.93,1.21]	0.88[0.62,1.26]	0.92[0.63,1.34]		-
60% Threshold	2.05[1.46,2.93]	1.70[1.05,2.78]	1.77[1.07,2.95]	1.92[1.34,2.83]	

eTable 3d. Odds ratio for sensitivity analysis for major morbidity

Grade 3 or 4 Intraventricular Haemorrhage	Prophylaxis	30% Threshold	40% Threshold	50% Threshold	60% Threshold
Prophylaxis		1.62[0.24,14.17] &	2.16[0.86,5.88] *	1.28[0.93,1.78] *	0.71[0.23,2.12] &
30% Threshold	1.64[0.24,14.41]		-	-	-
40% Threshold	2.16[0.87,5.98]	1.32[0.12,11.55]		-	-
50% Threshold	1.28[0.93,1.78]	0.78[0.09,5.46]	0.59[0.21,1.56]		-
60% Threshold	0.71[0.23,2.09]	0.43[0.04,3.90]	0.33[0.07,1.36]	0.55[0.17,1.71]	

eTable 3e. Odds ratio for sensitivity analysis for grade 3 or 4 Intraventricular Haemorrhage

eTable 3 (a-e) above shows the odds ratio for the network and direct comparisons for each outcome in the sensitivity analysis.

Network meta-analysis comparisons are below the greyed line, direct comparisons are above the line.

Comparisons that did not reach statistical significance (credibility intervals for the odds ratio cross 1) are highlighted in yellow. Comparisons that do reach statistical significance are highlighted in blue.

Most conservative model of analysis was used in each case.

*denotes fixed-effect model, # denotes random effect model for the direct comparison, & denotes only one study in comparison leading to use of the random effects model,

^ denotes zero events in at least one arm of one study leading to use of the fixed effect model.

eTable 4. Models used for outcomes for sensitivity analysis

Outcome	DIC – Fixed	DIC - Random	Model Used	SD	95% CrI	Variance
Mortality	74.72	76.47	Fixed			
BPD	76.01	76.54	Fixed			
Pneumothorax	75.86	63.82	Random	3.424	1.22, 4.92	11.72
Major Morbidity	89.54	89.58	Fixed			
Grade 3/4 IVH	66.33	67.54	Fixed			

eTable 4. Models used for outcomes for sensitivity analysis

DIC – Deviance Information Criteria, Fixed – Fixed effect model, Random – Random effect model

SD – between study standard deviation, CrI – Credible interval, BPD – bronchopulmonary dysplasia, IVH – intraventricular haemorrhage

eResults – Secondary Outcomes

1. Bronchopulmonary Dysplasia

Network meta-analysis was performed using a fixed-effects model as it was more conservative. DIC for the fixed-effect model was 91.45, random-effect model 92.9.

Model used for the direct comparisons along with odds ratio for each comparison, both network and direct are shown in eTable 3a.

eTable 5. Odds Ratio for Both the Direct and Network Comparisons For Secondary Outcomes

Bronchopulmonary Dysplasia	Prophylaxis	Threshold 30%	Threshold 40%	Threshold 50%	Threshold 60%
Prophylaxis		1.4[0.87,2.23] &	0.77[0.37,1.61] ^	0.93[0.74,1.16] *	1.02[0.71,1.45] *
Threshold 30%	1.39[0.87,2.24]		-	-	-
Threshold 40%	0.77[0.37,1.58]	0.55[0.23,1.30]		-	-
Threshold 50%	0.93[0.74,1.16]	0.66[0.39,1.12]	1.20[0.57,2.61]		-
Threshold 60%	1.02[0.72,1.45]	0.73[0.40,1.32]	1.32[0.60,3.01]	1.10[0.72,1.67]	

eTable 5a. Odds ratio for both the direct and network comparison for the outcome bronchopulmonary dysplasia.

Network meta-analysis comparisons are below the greyed line, direct comparisons are above the line.

Comparisons that did not reach statistical significance (credibility intervals for the odds ratio cross 1) are highlighted in yellow. Comparisons that do reach statistical significance are highlighted in blue.

Most conservative method of analysis was used in each case.

*denotes fixed effect model, # denotes random effect model for direct comparisons, & denotes only one study in comparison with no convergence of random effect model – fixed effect used, ^ denotes zero events in one arm of one study leading to use of the fixed effect model

2. Chronic Lung Disease

Network meta-analysis was performed using a random-effects model, as the most conservative model.

DIC for the fixed-effect model was 109, random-effect model 110.7. Median between-study standard deviation 0.1751 (95% CrI 0.0078, 0.8729), variance 0.031.

Models used in the direct comparisons with odds ratio for each comparison are shown in table 3.

Chronic Lung Disease	Prophylaxis	Threshold 30%	Threshold 40%	Threshold 50%	Threshold 60%
Prophylaxis		1.47[0.07,30.69] #	1.07[0.8,1.43] *	3.97[0.88,30.78] &	0.6[0.33,1.06] *
Threshold 30%	1.48[0.82,2.63]		-	-	-
Threshold 40%	1.05[0.63,1.64]	0.71[0.32,1.48]		-	-

Threshold 50%	4.08[0.77,35.45]	2.75[0.46,25.87]	3.90[0.69,35.98]		-
Threshold 60%	0.59[0.28,1.22]	0.40[0.16,1.01]	0.56[0.23,1.36]	0.14[0.01,0.91]	

eTable 5b. Odds ratio for both the direct and network comparisons for CLD. Description of table as per table 3a

3. Bronchopulmonary Dysplasia or Chronic Lung Disease at maximal follow up

For this outcome, a random-effect model was used for the network meta-analysis as the more conservative choice.

DIC for the fixed model was 152.9, random model 154.7. Median between study deviation 0.1619 (95% CrI 0.0071, 0.678), variance 0.26.

Models used in the direct comparisons along with odds ratio for each comparison are shown in eTable 3c.

CLD or BPD	Prophylaxis	Threshold 30%	Threshold 40%	Threshold 50%	Threshold 60%
Prophylaxis		1.45[1.09,1.93] *	0.94[0.68,1.29] ^	0.93[0.74,1.16] ^	0.91[0.65,1.26] *
Threshold 30%	1.45[0.95,2.21]		-	-	-
Threshold 40%	0.91[0.54,1.41]	0.63[0.32,1.13]		-	-
Threshold 50%	0.96[0.59,2.00]	0.66[0.36,1.58]	1.06[0.57,2.75]		-
Threshold 60%	0.86[0.47,1.34]	0.59[0.28,1.06]	0.94[0.46,1.81]	0.90[0.32,1.64]	

eTable 5c. Odds ratio for the comparisons of both the direct and network comparisons for CLD or BPD. Description of table as per eTable 3a

4. Pneumothorax (or other air-leak)

Network meta-analysis was performed using a random-effects model, as the most conservative model.

DIC for the fixed-effect model was 159.5, random-effect model was 154.3. Between study standard deviation was 0.859 (95% CrI 0.197, 2.115), variance 0.74.

Models used in the direct comparisons along with odds ratio for each comparison are shown in eTable 3d.

Pneumothorax	Prophylaxis	Threshold 30%	Threshold 40%	Threshold 50%	Threshold 60%
Prophylaxis		2.36[0.29,22.15] #	1.38[0.89,2.17] *	0.92[0.63,1.35] *	1.67[0.88,3.19] *
Threshold 30%	2.41[0.61,10.48]		-	-	-
Threshold 40%	1.26[0.42,3.97]	0.52[0.08,3.13]		-	-
Threshold 50%	0.81[0.19,3.47]	0.33[0.04,2.49]	0.64[0.10,3.99]		-
Threshold 60%	2.05[0.50,10.72]	0.85[0.11,7.42]	1.62[0.27,12.07]	2.54[0.35,23.13]	

eTable 5d. Odds ratio for the comparisons of both the direct and network comparisons for pneumothorax. Description of table as per eTable 3a

5. Surfactant Treatment (proportion requiring surfactant)

Network meta-analysis not performed.

Proportions receiving surfactant (binary): 99.07% of the prophylaxis group received any surfactant
 41.54% in the 30% group
 53.82% in the 40% group
 64.42% in the 50% group
 46.22% of 60% group.

6. Number of Surfactant Doses Required

Network meta-analysis was performed using a random-effects model, as the most conservative model.

DIC for the fixed-effect model was 270, random-effect model 269. Between study standard deviation 2.504 (95% CrI 0.1212, 4.879), variance 6.27.

Models used in the direct comparisons along with odds ratio for each comparison are shown in eTable 3f.

Surfactant - Number of Doses	Prophylaxis	Threshold 30%	Threshold 40%	Threshold 50%	Threshold 60%
Prophylaxis		0.51[0.46,0.56] *	0.71[0.63,0.8] *	0.65[0.58,0.73] *	0.26[0.21,0.32] *
Threshold 30%	0.51[0.46,0.56]		-	-	-
Threshold 40%	0.71[0.63,0.81]	1.41[1.20,1.65]		-	-
Threshold 50%	0.65[0.58,0.73]	1.29[1.10,1.51]	0.91[0.77,1.08]		-
Threshold 60%	0.26[0.21,0.32]	0.52[0.41,0.65]	0.37[0.29,0.47]	0.40[0.32,0.51]	

eTable 5e. Odds ratio for the comparisons of both the direct and network comparisons for number of surfactant doses required. Description of table as per eTable 3a

7. Total Number of Major Morbidities

Network meta-analysis was performed using a fixed-effects model, as the most conservative model. DIC for the fixed-effect model was 168.5, random-effect model 168.5.

Models used in the direct comparisons along with odds ratio for each comparison are shown in eTable 3g.

Major Morbidity	Prophylaxis	Threshold 30%	Threshold 40%	Threshold 50%	Threshold 60%
Prophylaxis		1.14[0.93,1.4] *	1.18[0.89,1.56] *	1.04[0.92,1.18] *	1.02[0.81,1.28] *
Threshold 30%	1.14[0.94,1.40]		-	-	-
Threshold 40%	1.18[0.89,1.56]	1.03[0.73,1.45]		-	-
Threshold 50%	1.04[0.92,1.18]	0.91[0.72,1.16]	0.89[0.65,1.20]		-

Threshold 60%	1.02[0.81,1.28]	0.89[0.65,1.21]	0.86[0.60,1.24]	0.97[0.75,1.27]	
----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	--

eTable 5f. Odds ratio for the comparisons of both the direct and network comparisons for total number of major morbidities. Description of table as per eTable 3a

8. Grade 3 or 4 Intraventricular Haemorrhage

Network meta-analysis was performed using a random-effects model, as the most conservative model.

DIC for the fixed-effect model was 138.3, random-effect model 137.8. Between study standard deviation 0.449 (95% CrI 0.326, 1.281), variance 0.2.

Models used in the direct comparisons along with odds ratio for each comparison are shown in eTable 3h.

Grade 3 or 4 Intraventricular Haemorrhage	Prophylaxis	Threshold 0.3	Threshold 0.4	Threshold 0.5	Threshold 0.6
Prophylaxis		2.16[0.14,34.19] #	1.59[0.91,2.84] *	1.21[0.9,1.63] &	0.67[0.32,1.32] &
Threshold 0.3	2.01[0.83,5.46]		-	-	-
Threshold 0.4	1.69[0.77,4.10]	0.84[0.24,2.93]		-	-
Threshold 0.5	1.11[0.44,2.47]	0.55[0.14,1.75]	0.65[0.18,1.94]		-
Threshold 0.6	0.68[0.22,2.03]	0.34[0.07,1.35]	0.40[0.09,1.52]	0.61[0.16,2.60]	

eTable 5g. Odds ratio for the comparisons of both the direct and network comparisons for grade 3 or 4 intraventricular haemorrhage. Description of table as per eTable 3a

9. Periventricular Leukomalacia

Network meta-analysis was performed using a fixed-effect model, as the most conservative model. DIC for the fixed-effect model was 78.82, random-effect model 80.17.

Models used in the direct comparisons along with odds ratio for each comparison are shown in eTable 3i.

Periventricular Leucomalacia	Prophylaxis	Threshold 30%	Threshold 40%	Threshold 50%	Threshold 60%
Prophylaxis		0.81[0.51,1.28] *	0.63[0.07,4.18] *	0.81[0.22,2.77] *	0.58[0.2,1.5] *
Threshold 30%	0.81[0.51,1.28]		-	-	-
Threshold 40%	0.64[0.07,4.25]	0.79[0.09,5.53]		-	-
Threshold 50%	0.80[0.21,2.81]	0.98[0.25,3.79]	1.26[0.13,14.92]		-
Threshold 60%	0.58[0.19,1.50]	0.71[0.22,2.06]	0.91[0.10,9.56]	0.72[0.14,3.64]	

eTable 5h. Odds ratio for the comparisons of both the direct and network comparisons for periventricular leukomalacia. Description of table as per eTable 3a

10. Necrotising Enterocolitis

Network meta-analysis was performed using a fixed-effects model, as the most conservative model. DIC for the fixed-effect model was 112.5, random-effect model 114.4.

Models used in the direct comparisons along with odds ratio for each comparison are shown in eTable 3j.

Necrotising Enterocolitis	Prophylaxis	Threshold 30%	Threshold 40%	Threshold 50%	Threshold 60%
Prophylaxis		0.86[0.54,1.36] *	1.27[0.81,2] ^	1.27[0.92,1.77] *	1.15[0.61,2.08] &
Threshold 30%	0.86[0.55,1.35]		-	-	-
Threshold 40%	1.27[0.81,2.01]	1.48[0.78,2.80]		-	-
Threshold 50%	1.27[0.91,1.77]	1.48[0.84,2.59]	1.00[0.57,1.74]		-
Threshold 60%	1.15[0.61,2.10]	1.33[0.61,2.84]	0.90[0.41,1.91]	0.90[0.44,1.80]	

eTable 5i. Odds ratio for the comparisons of both the direct and network comparisons for necrotising enterocolitis. Description of table as per eTable 3a

11. Retinopathy of Prematurity

Network meta-analysis was performed using a random-effects model, as the most conservative model.

DIC for the fixed-effect model was 65.68, random-effect model 67.53. Between study standard deviation 0.517 (95% CrI 0.0198, 3.845), variance 0.27.

Models used in the direct comparisons along with odds ratio for each comparison are shown in eTable 3k.

Retinopathy of Prematurity > Stage 2	Prophylaxis	Threshold 30%	Threshold 40%	Threshold 50%	Threshold 60%
Prophylaxis		1.02[0.03,37.98] &	0.9[0.34,2.31] *	1.01[0.72,1.41] *	2.35[1.02,5.42] &
Threshold 30%	1.01[0.01,96.83]		-	-	-
Threshold 40%	0.87[0.09,7.05]	0.85[0.01,117.92]		-	-
Threshold 50%	0.99[0.12,6.96]	0.97[0.01,121.39]	1.14[0.06,23.17]		-
Threshold 60%	2.36[0.13,40.29]	2.31[0.01,464.98]	2.69[0.07,101.80]	2.38[0.07,76.63]	

eTable 5j. Odds ratio for the comparisons of both the direct and network comparisons for retinopathy of prematurity greater than stage 2. Description of table as per eTable 3a

References

1. Mills EJ, Ioannidis JP, Thorlund K, Schünemann HJ, Puhan MA, Guyatt GH (2012) How to use an article reporting a multiple treatment comparison meta-analysis. *Jama* 308 (12):1246-1253. doi:10.1001/2012.jama.11228
2. Dias S, Sutton AJ, Ades AE, Welton NJ (2013) Evidence synthesis for decision making 2: a generalized linear modeling framework for pairwise and network meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Med Decis Making* 33 (5):607-617. doi:10.1177/0272989x12458724
3. Chaimani A, Higgins JP, Mavridis D, Spyridonos P, Salanti G (2013) Graphical tools for network meta-analysis in STATA. *PLoS One* 8 (10):e76654. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0076654
4. Salanti G, Ades AE, Ioannidis JP (2011) Graphical methods and numerical summaries for presenting results from multiple-treatment meta-analysis: an overview and tutorial. *J Clin Epidemiol* 64 (2):163-171. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2010.03.016
5. Dias S, Welton N, Sutton A, Ades A (2016) NICE DSU technical support document 2: a generalised linear modelling framework for pairwise and network meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials (Update Sept 2016). NICE DSU
6. Alallah J (2012) Early CPAP versus surfactant in extremely preterm infants. *Journal of Clinical Neonatology* 1 (1):12-13. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.4103/2249-4847.92233
7. Bahadue FL, Soll R (2012) Early versus delayed selective surfactant treatment for neonatal respiratory distress syndrome. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* (11). doi:10.1002/14651858.CD001456.pub2
8. Bancalari E (2012) Non-invasive neonatal respiratory support. *Journal of Maternal-Fetal and Neonatal Medicine* 25:2. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.3109/14767058.2012.679162
9. Corbet A (1993) CLINICAL-TRIALS OF SYNTHETIC SURFACTANT IN THE RESPIRATORY-DISTRESS SYNDROME OF PREMATURE-INFANTS. *Clin Perinatol* 20 (4):737-760
10. Dani C (2016) Surfactant Treatment Threshold during NCPAP for the Treatment of Preterm Infants with Respiratory Distress Syndrome. *Am J Perinatol* 33 (10):925-929. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1055/s-0036-1582395
11. Carnielli VP, Ancona OR (2020) Medium vs Low Oxygen Threshold for the Surfactant Administration. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT04199364>,
12. Iarukova N, Chernev T, Nikolov A (1998) [The use of Curosurf with premature infants--the prevention or treatment of the neonatal RDS]. *Akush Ginekol (Sofia)* 37 (3):12-14
13. Mostovoï AV, Aleksandrovich I, Sapun OI, Trifonova EG, Tret'iakova EP, Bogdanova RZ, Karpova AL (2009) Effect of surfactant administration time on the outcomes in low and extremely low birth weight neonates. *Anesteziologija i reanimatologija* (1):43-46
14. Alba J, Agarwal R, Hegyi T, Hiatt IM (1995) EFFICACY OF SURFACTANT THERAPY IN INFANTS MANAGED WITH CPAP. *Pediatric Pulmonology* 20 (3):172-176. doi:10.1002/ppul.1950200308
15. Billman D, Nicks J, Schumacher R (1994) Exosurf rescue surfactant improves high ventilation-perfusion mismatch in respiratory distress syndrome. *Pediatric pulmonology* 18 (5):279-283
16. Bower LK, Barnhart SL, Betit P, Hendon B, MasiLynch J, Wilson BG (1996) Surfactant replacement therapy (Reprinted from *Respiratory Care*, vol 39, pg 824-829, 1994). *Int Anesthesiol Clin* 34 (1):153-161. doi:10.1097/00004311-199603410-00019
17. Bunt JE, Carnielli VP, Janssen DJ, Wattimena JL, Hop WC, Sauer PJ, Zimmermann LJ (2000) Treatment with exogenous surfactant stimulates endogenous surfactant synthesis in premature infants with respiratory distress syndrome. *Critical care medicine* 28 (10):3383-3388. doi:10.1097/00003246-200010000-00001
18. Dunn MS, Shennan AT, Hoskins EM, Lennox K, Enhorning G (1988) Two-year follow-up of infants enrolled in a randomized trial of surfactant replacement therapy for prevention of neonatal respiratory distress syndrome. *Pediatrics* 82 (4):543-547
19. Egberts J, De Winter JP, Van Sonderen L, Van Den Anker JN (1994) Theoretical calculation of the cost for neonatal care after any prophylaxis or therapeutical administration of surfactant. [Dutch] (Een theoretische berekening van de kosten van de neonatale zorg na een eventueel profylactisch of therapeutisch gebruik van surfactant.). *Tijdschrift voor Kindergeneeskunde* 62 (2):97-103
20. Gore SM (1993) OSIRIS trial. *Lancet (london, england)* 341 (8838):172; author reply 173-174
21. Hanssler L, Zhou C, Roll C, Wiesemann HG (1994) Effects of exogenous surfactant therapy on lung function in mechanically ventilated preterm infants with severe respiratory distress syndrome (RDS). [German] (Effekte der surfactant-substitution auf die lungenfunktion beatmeter fruhgeborener mit schwerem atemnotsyndrom.). *Pediatrics and Related Topics* 32 (1):31-39

22. Hentschel R, Dittrich F, Hilgendorff A, Wauer R, Westmeier M, Gortner L (2009) Neurodevelopmental outcome and pulmonary morbidity two years after early versus late surfactant treatment: does it really differ? *Acta Paediatr* 98 (4):654-659. doi:10.1111/j.1651-2227.2008.01216.x
23. Keller RL, Eichenwald EC, Hibbs AM, Rogers EE, Wai KC, Black DM, Ballard PL, Asselin JM, Truog WE, Merrill JD, Mammel MC, Steinhorn RH, Ryan RM, Durand DJ, Bendel CM, Bendel-Stenzel EM, Courtney SE, Dhanireddy R, Hudak ML, Koch FR, Mayock DE, McKay VJ, Helderman J, Porta NF, Wadhawan R, Palermo L, Ballard RA, Grp TS (2017) The Randomized, Controlled Trial of Late Surfactant: Effects on Respiratory Outcomes at 1-Year Corrected Age. *Journal of Pediatrics* 183:19-+. doi:10.1016/j.jpeds.2016.12.059
24. Keller RL, Rogers E, Eichenwald E, Hibbs A, Black D, Ballard P, Ballard R (2016) One year pulmonary outcomes in the trial of late surfactant (TOLSURF). *Journal of Investigative Medicine* 64 (1):250-251. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/jim-d-15-00013.268
25. Kim SM, Park YJ, Chung SH, Choi YS, Kim CH, Bae CW (2014) Early prophylactic versus late selective use of surfactant for respiratory distress syndrome in very preterm infants: a collaborative study of 53 multicenter trials in Korea. *J Korean Med Sci* 29 (8):1126-1131. doi:10.3346/jkms.2014.29.8.1126
26. Kong X, Cui Q, Hu Y, Huang W, Ju R, Li W, Wang R, Xia S, Yu J, Zhu T, Feng Z (2016) Bovine Surfactant Replacement Therapy in Neonates of Less than 32 Weeks' Gestation: A Multicenter Controlled Trial of Prophylaxis versus Early Treatment in China--a Pilot Study. *Pediatr Neonatol* 57 (1):19-26. doi:10.1016/j.pedneo.2015.03.007
27. Lefort S, Diniz EMA, Vaz FAC (1999) A follow-up clinical trial involving preterm neonates at risk for Respiratory Distress Syndrome (RDS), submitted to prophylactic surfactant of porcine origin comparing two different dosage regimens. 4th World Congress of Perinatal Medicine. Medimond S R L, 40128 Bologna
28. Morley C (1993) OSIRIS trial. *Lancet* 341 (8838):172-173; author reply 173-174
29. Robertson B (1990) European multicenter trials of curosurf for treatment of neonatal respiratory distress syndrome. *Lung* 168 Suppl:860-863. doi:10.1007/bf02718220
30. Robertson B, Curstedt T, Tubman R, Strayer D, Berggren P, Kok J, Koppe J, van Sonderen L, Halliday H, McClure G, et al. (1992) A 2-year follow up of babies enrolled in a European multicentre trial of porcine surfactant replacement for severe neonatal respiratory distress syndrome. Collaborative European Multicentre Study Group. *Eur J Pediatr* 151 (5):372-376. doi:10.1007/bf02113261
31. Robertson B, Speer CP (1993) OSIRIS trial. *Lancet* 341 (8838):172; author reply 173-174
32. Sanghvi KP, Merchant RH (1998) Single dose surfactant rescue therapy in neonatal respiratory distress syndrome. *Indian Pediatr* 35 (6):533-536
33. Svenningsen NW, Saugstad OD (1996) Surfactant treatment of extremely low birth weight (ELBW) infants. *Acp* 6 (1):11-17
34. Tarnow-Mordi W (1993) OSIRIS trial. *Lancet* 341 (8838):174
35. Wagner CL, Kramer BM, Kendig JW, Brooks JG, Cox C, Wagner MT, Phelps DL (1995) SCHOOL-AGE FOLLOW-UP OF A SINGLE-DOSE PROPHYLACTIC SURFACTANT COHORT. *J Dev Behav Pediatr* 16 (5):327-332
36. Ware J, Taeusch HW, Soll RF, McCormick MC (1990) Health and developmental outcomes of a surfactant controlled trial: follow-up at 2 years. *Pediatrics* 85 (6):1103-1107
37. Anonymous (1992) Early versus delayed neonatal administration of a synthetic surfactant - The judgment of OSIRIS. *Lancet* 340 (8832):1363-1369. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0140-6736%2892%2992557-V
38. Anonymous (1992) Early or selective surfactant (colfosceril palmitate, Exosurf) for intubated babies at 26 to 29 weeks gestation. A European double-blind trial with sequential analysis. European Exosurf Study Group. The Online journal of current clinical trials Doc No 28:[3886 words; 3847 paragraphs]
39. Chu GL, Wang J, Xin Y, Zheng J, Zheng RX, Bi DZ (2006) Protective and curative effects of prophylactic administration of pulmonary surfactant on neonatal respiratory distress syndrome. [Chinese]. *National Medical Journal of China* 86 (13):876-880
40. Dunn MS, Shennan AT, Zayack D, Possmayer F (1991) Bovine surfactant replacement therapy in neonates of less than 30 weeks' gestation: A randomized controlled trial of prophylaxis versus treatment. *Pediatrics* 87 (3):377-386
41. Rong ZH, Chang LW, Cheng HB, Wang HZ, Zhu XF, Peng F, Fan QH, Lu W, Pan R, Xiong L, Jiao R, Sun J, Xia SW, Xie JJ (2019) A Multicentered Randomized Study on Early versus Rescue Calsurf Administration for the Treatment of Respiratory Distress Syndrome in Preterm Infants. *Am J Perinatol* 36 (14):1492-1497. doi:10.1055/s-0039-1678530

42. Verder H, Robertson B, Greisen G, Ebbesen F, Albertsen P, Lundstrom K, Jacobsen T (1994) Surfactant therapy and nasal continuous positive airway pressure for newborns with respiratory distress syndrome. Danish-Swedish Multicenter Study Group. *N Engl J Med* 331 (16):1051-1055. doi:10.1056/nejm199410203311603
43. Anonymous (2004) Early surfactant for neonates with mild to moderate respiratory distress syndrome: A multicenter, randomized trial. *Journal of Pediatrics* 144 (6):804-808. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jpeds.2004.03.024
44. Bevilacqua G, Halliday H, Parmigiani S, Robertson B (1993) Randomized multicentre trial of treatment with porcine natural surfactant for moderately severe neonatal respiratory distress syndrome. *Journal of Perinatal Medicine* 21 (5):329-340
45. Bevilacqua G, Parmigiani S, Robertson B (1996) Prophylaxis of respiratory distress syndrome by treatment with modified porcine surfactant at birth: A multicentre prospective randomized trial. *Journal of Perinatal Medicine* 24 (6):609-620. doi:10.1515/jpme.1996.24.6.609
46. Centre Hospitalier Universitaire A (2011) Surfactant Versus Nasal Continuous Positive Airway Pressure (nCPAP) for Respiratory Distress Syndrome in the Newborn \geq 35 Weeks of Gestation. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT01306240>,
47. Chen JY (1990) Exogenous surfactant for treatment of respiratory distress syndrome in premature infants. *Journal of the Formosan Medical Association / Taiwan yi zhi* 89 (2):110-114
48. Chile PUCd (2007) Early CPAP in Respiratory Distress Syndrome. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT00368680>,
49. Chile PUCd, Pediatría SCd (2006) Two Strategies of RDS Treatment in Newborns With Birth Weight $>$ 1500 Grams. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT00277030>,
50. China Medical University C, Hospital NTU, Hospital TMU, Hospital CG, Hospital CGM (2009) Prevention of Chronic Lung Disease (CLD) in Preterm Infants. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT00883532>,
51. Cologne Uo, Schleswig-Holstein Uo, Hospital ACs, Bochum RUo, Datteln VK-uJ, Leverkusen Ho, Kliniken der Stadt Koeln KR, Heinrich-Heine University D, Aschaffenburg-Alzenau K, GmbH AKH, Stuttgart K, Siegen DK, University Hospital B, Charite University B, Germany, Cologne TCTC, Education GFMo, Research (2009) Surfactant Application During Spontaneous Breathing With Continuous Positive Airway Pressure (CPAP) in Premature Infants $<$ 27 Weeks. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT00751959>,
52. CTRI/2008/091/000234 (2009) Early Surfactant Therapy to prevent need for ventilation for preterm infants(gestation <34weeks)on Bubble CPAP. (trans: No sponsor N).
53. CTRI/2015/07/005968 (2015) Exogenous surfactant obtained from goat lungs for treating respiratory difficulty due to lack of surfactant in preterm neonates (trans: All India Institute of Medical Sciences New Delhi Y).
54. Escobedo MB, Gunkel JH, Kennedy KA, Shattuck KE, Sanchez PJ, Seidner S, Hensley G, Cochran CK, Moya F, Morris B, Denson S, Stribley R, Naqvi M, Lasky RE, Texas Neonatal Res G (2004) Early surfactant for neonates with mild to moderate respiratory distress syndrome: A multicenter, randomized trial. *Journal of Pediatrics* 144 (6):804-808. doi:10.1016/j.jpeds.2004.03.024
55. Finer NN, Carlo WA, Duara S, Fanaroff AA, Donovan EF, Wright LL, Kandefer S, Poole WK, Natl Inst Child Hlth Human Dev N (2004) Delivery room continuous positive airway pressure/positive end-expiratory pressure in extremely low birth weight infants: A feasibility trial. *Pediatrics* 114 (3):651-657. doi:10.1542/peds.2004-0394
56. Gopel W, Kribs A, Laux R, Hohn T, Wieg C, Kattner E, Avenarius S, Von der Wense A, Vochem M, Groneck P, Weller U, Moller J, Roth B, Herting E (2010) SURFACTANT TREATMENT OF SPONTANEOUSLY BREATHING PRETERM INFANTS TO AVOID MECHANICAL VENTILATION - A RANDOMIZED CONTROLLED TRIAL. *Pediatric Research* 68:21-21
57. Gortner L, Bernsau U, Hellwege HH, Hieronimi G, Jorch G, Reiter HL (1990) A multicenter randomized controlled clinical trial of bovine surfactant for prevention of respiratory distress syndrome. *Lung* 168 (SUPPL.):864-869
58. Gortner L, Wauer RR, Hammer H, Stock GJ, Heitmann F, Reiter HL, Kuhl PG, Moller JC, Friedrich HJ, Reiss I, Hentschel R, Jorch G, Hieronimi G, Kuhls E (1998) Early versus late surfactant treatment in preterm infants of 27 to 32 weeks' gestational age: a multicenter controlled clinical trial. *Pediatrics* 102 (5):1153-1160. doi:10.1542/peds.102.5.1153
59. Goto A (1988) Surfactant replacement therapy in neonatal RDS. Multicentre, randomized controlled trial. *Yokohama Medical Bulletin* 39 (5-6):211-217
60. Hascoet JM, ARAIRLOR, S.p.A. CF, Universitaire MR (2009) Exogenous Surfactant in Very Preterm Neonates in Prevention of Bronchopulmonary Dysplasia. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT01039285>,

61. Horn AR, Pieper C, Els I, Holgate S (2009) Early surfactant therapy and nasal continuous positive airways pressure for mild respiratory distress syndrome - A pilot study. *SAJCH South African Journal of Child Health* 3 (2):48-54
62. Hospital D, University tRiOsoTMM (2016) Surfactant Administration in Preterm Infants. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT02821273>,
63. Hospital D, University tRiOsoTMM (2017) Surfactant for Neonate With Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS). <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT03217162>,
64. Institute OHR (2013) A Multi-center Trial to Determine if Curosurf® Reduces the Duration of Mechanical Ventilation in Very Preterm Infants. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT01709409>,
65. IRCT138905104486N1 (2010) Effect of prophylactic surfactant on outcome of premature neonate (trans: Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences N).
66. IRCT201205213512N2 (2012) The effect of the use of surfactant administration during NCPAP treatment on complications of RDS (trans: Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences N).
67. IRCT20120728010430N8 (2019) Investigating CPAP in Treatment of RDS (trans: Esfahan University of Medical Sciences N).
68. Kattwinkel J, Bloom BT, Delmore P, Glick C, Brown D, Lopez S, Willett L, Egan EA, Conaway M, Patrie J (2000) High-versus low-threshold surfactant retreatment for neonatal respiratory distress syndrome. *Pediatrics* 106 (2 Pt 1):282-288. doi:10.1542/peds.106.2.282
69. Keller RL, Merrill JD, Black DM, Steinhorn RH, Eichenwalds EC, Durand DJ, Ryan RM, Truog WE, Courtney SE, Ballard PL, Ballard RA (2012) Late administration of surfactant replacement therapy increases surfactant protein-B content: a randomized pilot study. *Pediatric Research* 72 (6):613-619. doi:10.1038/pr.2012.136
70. Kendig JW, Ryan RM, Sinkin RA, Maniscalco WM, Notter RH, Guillet R, Cox C, Dweck HS, Horgan MJ, Reubens LJ, et al. (1998) Comparison of two strategies for surfactant prophylaxis in very premature infants: a multicenter randomized trial. *Pediatrics* 101 (6):1006-1012. doi:10.1542/peds.101.6.1006
71. Konishi M, Fujiwara T, Chida S, Maeta H, Shimada S, Kasai T, Fuji Y, Murakami Y (1992) A prospective, randomized trial of early versus late administration of a single dose of surfactant-TA. *Early Human Development* 29 (1-3):275-282. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0378-3782%2892%2990164-C
72. Mahmoud I, Raheleh D, Manijeh K, Azizollah A (2013) Comparison of Nasal Continuous Positive Airway Pressure Therapy with and without Prophylactic Surfactant in Preterm Neonates. *Iranian Journal of Neonatology* 4 (3):26-34
73. Manitoba Uo (2012) Early CPAP And Large Volume Minimally Invasive Surfactant (ECALMIST) in Preterm Infants With RDS. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT01553292>,
74. Manitoba Uo (2013) ECALMIST Versus InSurE in Preterm Infant < 32 Weeks, Multicenter, Multinational RCT. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT01848262>,
75. Morley CJ, Davis PG, Doyle LW, Brion LP, Hascoet JM, Carlin JB (2008) Nasal CPAP or intubation at birth for very preterm infants. *New England Journal of Medicine* 358 (7):700-708. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa072788
76. Nakhshab M, Tajbakhsh M, Khani S, Farhadi R (2015) Comparison of the effect of surfactant administration during nasal continuous positive airway pressure with that of nasal continuous positive airway pressure alone on complications of respiratory distress syndrome: a randomized controlled study. *Pediatr Neonatol* 56 (2):88-94. doi:10.1016/j.pedneo.2014.05.006
77. Nct (2005) SURFAXIN® Treatment for Prevention of Bronchopulmonary Dysplasia (BPD) in Very Low Birth Weight (VLBW) Infants. <https://clinicaltrials.gov/show/NCT00215540>
78. Nct (2007) Curosurf and Survanta Treatment(CAST)of RDS in Very Premature Infants. <https://clinicaltrials.gov/show/NCT00767039>
79. NCT03217162 (2017) Surfactant for Neonate With Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS) (trans: Daping H, the Research Institute of Surgery of the Third Military Medical University Y).
80. Okulu E, Arsan S, Akin IM, Atasay B, Alan S, Kilic A, Turmen T (2011) COMPARISON OF TWO STRATEGIES FOR SURFACTANT PROPHYLAXIS IN PREMATURE INFANTS: PRELIMINARY DATA OF A RANDOMIZED TRIAL. *Pediatric Research* 70:535-535. doi:10.1038/pr.2011.760
81. Okulu E, Arsan S, Akin IM, Kilic A, Alan S, Atasay B (2012) The timing of surfactant prophylaxis in very-low-birth-weight preterms: Is earlier better? *Early Human Development* 88:S110
82. Okulu E, Arsan S, Akin IM, Kilic A, Alan S, Atasay B (2012) The timing of surfactant prophylaxis in very-lowbirth-weight preterms: Is earlier better? *Archives of Disease in Childhood* 97:A67. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/archdischild-2012-302724.0232

83. Okulu E, Arsan S, Mungan Akin I, Alan S, Kilic A, Atasay B (2015) Early or later prophylactic INSURE in preterm infants of less than 30 weeks' gestation. *Turk J Pediatr* 57 (1):1-8
84. Plavka R, Kopecky P, Sebron V, Leiska A, Svihovec P, Ruffer J, Dokoupilova M, Zlatohlavkova B, Janus V, Keszler M (2002) Early versus delayed surfactant administration in extremely premature neonates with respiratory distress syndrome ventilated by high-frequency oscillatory ventilation. *Intensive Care Med* 28 (10):1483-1490. doi:10.1007/s00134-002-1440-1
85. Research ZTBWsH, Hospital E (2010) Surfactant Administration During Spontaneous Breathing. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT01329432>,
86. Stevenson D, Walther F, Long W, Sell M, Pauly T, Gong A, Easa D, Pramanik A, LeBlanc M, Anday E, et al. (1992) Controlled trial of a single dose of synthetic surfactant at birth in premature infants weighing 500 to 699 grams. The American Exosurf Neonatal Study Group I. *J Pediatr* 120 (2 Pt 2):S3-12. doi:10.1016/s0022-3476(05)81226-0
- 10.1016/s0022-3476(05)81226-0.
87. Tapia JL, Urzua S, Bancalari A, Meritano J, Torres G, Fabres J, Toro CA, Rivera F, Cespedes E, Burgos JF, Mariani G, Roldan L, Silvera F, Gonzalez A, Dominguez A (2012) Randomized Trial of Early Bubble Continuous Positive Airway Pressure for Very Low Birth Weight Infants. *The Journal of Pediatrics* 161 (1):75-80.e71. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpeds.2011.12.054>
88. Therapeutics W (2005) SURFAXIN® Treatment for Prevention of Bronchopulmonary Dysplasia (BPD) in Very Low Birth Weight (VLBW) Infants. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT00215540>,
89. Uk C, Trust LTHNHS, London IC (2018) The Effect of Surfactant Dose on Outcomes in Preterm Infants With RDS. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT03808402>,
90. University A (2010) Comparison of Two Strategies for Surfactant Prophylaxis in Premature Infants. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT01294852>,
91. University of California SF, National Heart L, Institute B (2010) Trial of Late Surfactant for Prevention of Bronchopulmonary Dysplasia. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT01022580>,
92. University XHoCS (2007) Early NCPAP Before Surfactant Treatment in Very Preterm Infants With RDS. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT01996670>,
93. Verder H, Albertsen P, Ebbesen F, Greisen G, Robertson B, Bertelsen A, Agertoft L, Djernes B, Nathan E, Reinholdt J (1999) Nasal continuous positive airway pressure and early surfactant therapy for respiratory distress syndrome in newborns of less than 30 weeks' gestation. *Pediatrics* 103 (2):E24. doi:10.1542/peds.103.2.e24
94. Verder H, Ebbesen F, Fenger-Gron J, Henriksen TB, Andreasson B, Bender L, Bertelsen A, Bjorklund LJ, Dahl M, Esberg G, Eschen C, Hovring M, Kreft A, Kroner J, Lundberg F, Pedersen P, Reinholdt J, Stanchev H (2013) Early surfactant guided by lamellar body counts on gastric aspirate in very preterm infants. *Neonatology* 104 (2):116-122. doi:10.1159/000351638
- 10.1159/000351638. Epub 2013 Jul 9.
95. Wauer RR, Schmalisch G, Abel, Arandt, Eckert, Hock S, Jahrig D, Klaube, Meier, Plath, Rustow, Schmalisch, Schwerecke, Thummler, Tiller, Topke B, Vogtmann, Wauer (1996) Retrospective analysis of a preterm stopped controlled randomized multicentre rescue trial of neonatal respiratory distress syndrome using bovine surfactant. [German] (Retrospektive analyse einer vorzeitig abgebrochenen klinischen kontrollierten studie zur therapie des neonatalen atemnotsyndroms mit einem bovinen surfactant-preparat.). *Pediatrics and Related Topics* 34 (5):337-352
96. Yekta M, Research ZTBWsH, Hospital E (2012) Comparison of Effectiveness of Nasal CPAP and Nasal IMV in Early Rescue Surfactant Treatment in Preterm Infants. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT01741129>,
97. Ctri (2009) Early Surfactant Therapy to prevent need for ventilation for preterm infants(gestation <34weeks)on Bubble CPAP (trans: No sponsor N).
98. Finer NN (2011) SUPPORT trial: Focussing on ROP and BPD. Early CPAP vs. surfactant in extremely preterm infants. *Monatsschrift fur Kinderheilkunde* 159:22. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00112-011-2453-z>
99. Network NNR, National Heart L, Institute B, Resources NCfR, Health EKSNIoC, Development H (2005) Surfactant Positive Airway Pressure and Pulse Oximetry Trial. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT00233324>,
100. Network NNR, Resources NCfR (2000) Early Surfactant to Reduce Use of Mechanical Breathing in Low Birth Weight Infants. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT00005774>,
101. Network VO (2003) Delivery Room Management Trial of Premature Infants at High Risk of Respiratory Distress Syndrome. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT00244101>,
102. Rojas MA, Lozano JM, Rojas MX, Rondon MA, Charry L, Laughon M, Bose C, Bastidas J, Ovalle O, Perez LA, Rojas C, Garcia J, Celis A, Jaramillo ML (2007) Very early surfactant without mandatory ventilation

- in premature infants treated with early continuous positive airway pressure. A randomized controlled trial. *Acta Paediatr* 96:235-235
103. S.p.A. CF (2007) Efficacy of Combining Prophylactic Curosurf With Early Nasal CPAP in Delivery Room: the Curpap Study. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT00501982>,
104. Sandri F, Ancora G, Lanzoni A, Tagliabue P, Colnaghi M, Ventura ML, Rinaldi M, Mondello I, Gancia P, Salvioli GP, Orzalesi M, Mosca F, Italian Soc N (2004) Prophylactic nasal continuous positive airways pressure in newborns of 28-31 weeks gestation: multicentre randomised controlled clinical trial. *Archives of Disease in Childhood* 89 (5):F394-F398. doi:10.1136/adc.2003.037010
105. Sandri F, Plavka R, Simeoni U (2008) The CURPAP study: An international randomized controlled trial to evaluate the efficacy of combining prophylactic surfactant and early nasal continuous positive airway pressure in very preterm infants. *Neonatology* 94 (1):60-62. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1159/000113060>
106. Simeoni U, Sandri F, Plavka R (2009) CURPAP study - An international randomised controlled trial to evaluate the efficacy of combining prophylactic surfactant and early nasal continuous positive airway pressure in extremely low gestational age neonates. *Neonatology* 95 (4):378. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1159/000209304>
107. Imani M, Derafshi R, Arbabisarjou A (2013) Comparison of nasal continuous positive airway pressure therapy with and without prophylactic surfactant in preterm neonates. *Intensive Care Medicine* 39:S138. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00134-013-2950-8>
108. Merritt TA, Hallman M, Bloom BT, Berry C, Benirschke K, Sahn D, Key T, Edwards D, Jarvenpaa AL, Pohjavuori M, et al. (1986) Prophylactic treatment of very premature infants with human surfactant. *N Engl J Med* 315 (13):785-790. doi:10.1056/nejm198609253151301
109. Thomson MA, Grp IS (2002) Early nasal continuous positive airways pressure (nCPAP) with prophylactic surfactant for neonates at risk of RDS. The IFDAS multi-centre randomised trial. *Pediatric Research* 51 (4):379A-379A

Online Only Material

- 1) eMethods - Search Strategy
- 2) eMethods - Data extraction and Management
- 3) eMethods - Data Synthesis
- 4) eResults - Risk of Bias Assessment
eTable 1 – Risk of Bias Assessment
- 5) eResults - Excluded Studies.
- 6) eResults - Primary Outcome Mortality
eTable 2 – Odds ratio for both the direct and network comparison of the primary outcome
- 7) eResults - Secondary Outcomes
eTable 3 - Odds ratio for both the direct and network comparison for secondary outcomes
- 8) eResults - Sensitivity Analysis of Current Best Practice
eTable 4 - Odds Ratio for Sensitivity Analysis
eTable 5 - Models used for outcomes for sensitivity analysis

eMethods – Search Strategy

1) The Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) in the Cochrane Library

Searched from inception to March 2020

Search strategy:

- 1 MeSH descriptor: [Infant, Very Low Birth Weight] explode all trees
- #2 MeSH descriptor: [Infant, Newborn] explode all trees
- #3 MeSH descriptor: [Infant, Extremely Low Birth Weight] explode all trees
- #4 MeSH descriptor: [Infant, Low Birth Weight] explode all trees
- #5 MeSH descriptor: [Infant, Premature] explode all trees
- #6 MeSH descriptor: [Infant, Extremely Premature] explode all trees
- #7 MeSH descriptor: [Premature Birth] explode all trees
- #8 #1 OR #2 OR #3 OR #4 OR #5 OR #6 OR #7
- #9 Birth, Premature OR Births, Premature OR Premature Births OR Preterm Birth OR Birth, Preterm OR Births, Preterm OR Preterm Births OR Infants, Premature OR Premature Infant OR Preterm Infants OR Infant, Preterm OR Infants, Preterm OR Preterm Infant OR Premature Infants OR Neonatal OR Prematurity OR Prematurity, Neonatal OR Extremely Premature Infant OR Infants, Extremely Premature OR Premature Infant, Extremely OR Premature Infants, Extremely OR Extremely Preterm Infants OR Extremely Preterm Infant OR Infant, Extremely Preterm OR Infants, Extremely Preterm OR Preterm Infant, Extremely OR Preterm Infants, Extremely OR Extremely Premature Infants OR Extremely Low Birth Weight OR Extremely Low Birth Weight Infant OR (Extremely AND low AND birth AND weight) OR Very Low Birth Weight OR (Very AND low AND birth AND weight) OR Very Low Birth Weight Infant OR Low Birth Weight Infant OR Low Birth Weight OR Birth Weight, Low OR Birth Weights, Low OR Low Birth Weights Infants, Newborn OR Newborn Infant OR Newborn Infants OR Newborns OR Newborn OR Neonate OR Neonates OR Infants, Premature OR Premature Infant OR Preterm Infants OR Infant, Preterm OR Infants, Preterm OR Preterm Infant OR Premature Infants OR Neonatal Prematurity OR Prematurity, Neonatal OR ELBW OR VLBW OR Extreme prematurity
- #10 #8 OR #9
- #11 MeSH descriptor: [Surface-Active Agents] explode all trees
- #12 MeSH descriptor: [Pulmonary Surfactants] explode all trees
- #13 Agents, Surface-Active OR Surface Active Agents OR Active Agents, Surface OR Agents, Surface Active OR Tensides OR Surfactants OR Surfactant OR Amphiphilic Agents OR Agents, Amphiphilic OR Surfactants, Pulmonary OR Pulmonary Surfactant OR Surfactant, Pulmonary
- #14 #11 OR #12 OR #13
- #15 #8 AND #14

2) MEDLINE (PubMed)

Searched from inception to March 2020

Search strategy:

- a) Population – neonates
 "Infant, Newborn"[Mesh]
 "Infant, Extremely Low Birth Weight"[Mesh]
 "Infant, Low Birth Weight"[Mesh]
 "Infant, Very Low Birth Weight"[Mesh]
 "Infant, Premature"[Mesh]
 "Extremely Premature"[Mesh]
 "Premature Birth"[Mesh]

Entry terms:

Birth, Premature
 Births, Premature

Premature Births
Preterm Birth
Birth, Preterm
Births, Preterm
Preterm Births
Infants, Premature
Premature Infant
Preterm Infants
Infant, Preterm
Infants, Preterm
Preterm Infant
Premature Infants
Neonatal Prematurity
Prematurity, Neonatal
Extremely Premature Infant
Infants, Extremely Premature
Premature Infant, Extremely
Premature Infants, Extremely
Extremely Preterm Infants
Extremely Preterm Infant
Infant, Extremely Preterm
Infants, Extremely Preterm
Preterm Infant, Extremely
Preterm Infants, Extremely
Extremely Premature Infants
Extremely-Low-Birth-Weight [all fields] OR
Extremely Low Birth Weight [all fields] OR
Extremely Low Birth Weight Infant
Extremely AND low AND birth AND weight [all fields] OR
Very Low Birth Weight [all fields] OR
Very Low-Birth-Weight [all fields] OR
Very AND low AND birth AND weight OR
Infant, Very-Low-Birth-Weight [all fields] OR
Infants, Very-Low-Birth-Weight [all fields] OR
Very Low Birth Weight Infant [all fields] OR
Very-Low-Birth-Weight Infants [all fields] OR
Low-Birth-Weight Infant
Infant, Low-Birth-Weight
Infants, Low-Birth-Weight
Low Birth Weight Infant
Low-Birth-Weight Infants
Low Birth Weight
Birth Weight, Low
Birth Weights, Low
Low Birth Weights
Infants, Newborn [all fields] OR
Newborn Infant [all fields] OR
Newborn Infants [all fields] OR
Newborns [all fields] OR
Newborn [all fields] OR
Neonate [all fields] OR
Neonates [all fields] OR
ELBW [all fields] OR
VLBW [all fields] OR
Extreme prematurity [all fields]

b) Intervention – Surfactant

34 "Surface-Active Agents"[Mesh]

35 "Pulmonary Surfactants"[Mesh]

Entry terms

36 Agents, Surface-Active [all fields] OR

37 Surface Active Agents [all fields] OR

38 Active Agents, Surface [all fields] OR

39 Agents, Surface Active [all fields] OR

40 Tensides [all fields] OR

41 Surfactants [all fields] OR

42 Surfactant [all fields] OR

43 Amphiphilic Agents [all fields] OR

44 Agents, Amphiphilic [all fields] OR

45 Surfactants, Pulmonary [all fields] OR

46 Pulmonary Surfactant [all fields] OR

47 Surfactant, Pulmonary [all fields]

The population and intervention search strategies above were combined with boolean operator 'AND'. The pubmed controlled clinical trials filter was applied.

3) **EMBASE**

Searched from inception to March 2020

Search strategy:

1. infant newborn.mp. or exp newborn/
2. extremely low birth weight.mp. or exp low birth weight/ or exp very low birth weight/ or exp extremely low birth weight/ or exp newborn/ or exp prematurity/
3. extremely-low-birth-weight.mp.
4. (extremely and low and birth and weight).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]
5. very low birth weight.mp. or exp very low birth weight/
6. very-low-birth-weight.mp.
7. (very and low and birth and weight).mp. [mp=title, abstract, heading word, drug trade name, original title, device manufacturer, drug manufacturer, device trade name, keyword, floating subheading word, candidate term word]
8. newborn infant.mp.
9. neonate.mp.
10. premature.mp.
11. exp premature labor/ or preterm.mp. or exp gestational age/
12. elbw.mp.
13. vlbw.mp.
14. 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 or 11 or 12 or 13
15. exp surfactant associated protein/ or exp surfactant/ or surfactant.mp.
16. pulmonary surfactant.mp. or exp lung surfactant/
17. surface active agents.mp. or surfactant/
18. surfactant/ or tensides.mp.
19. surfactants.mp. or surfactant/
20. 15 or 16 or 17 or 18 or 19
21. (random* or factorial* or crossover* or cross over* or cross-over* or placebo* or doubl* blind* or singl* blind* or assign* or allocat* or volunteer*).af.
22. exp crossover-procedure/ or exp double-blind procedure/ or exp randomized controlled trial/ or exp single-blind procedure/
23. 21 or 22
24. 14 and 20 and 23

4) Science Citation Index Expanded (Web of Science)

Searched from inception to March 2020

Search strategy:

TI = (Surface-Active Agents OR Pulmonary Surfactants OR Agents, Surface-Active OR Active Agents, Surface OR Agents, Surface Active OR Surfactants OR Surfactant OR Surfactants, Pulmonary OR Pulmonary Surfactant OR Surfactant, Pulmonary)

TI = (Infant, Extremely Low Birth Weight OR Infant, Low Birth Weight OR Infant, Very Low Birth Weight OR Infant, Premature OR Extremely Premature)

TI = (Infants, Premature OR Premature Infant OR Preterm Infants OR Infant, Preterm OR Preterm Infant OR Premature Infants OR Neonatal Prematurity OR Prematurity, Neonatal OR Extremely Premature Infant OR Infants, Extremely Premature OR Premature Infant, Extremely OR Premature Infants, Extremely OR Extremely Preterm Infants)

TI = (Extremely Preterm Infant OR Extremely Premature Infants OR Extremely-Low-Birth-Weight OR Extremely Low Birth Weight [all fields] OR(Extremely AND low AND birth AND weight) OR Very Low Birth Weight OR Very Low-Birth-Weight OR Neonate OR Neonates OR ELBW OR VLBW OR extreme prematurity)

TS=(random* OR rct* OR crossover OR masked OR blind* OR placebo* OR meta-analysis OR systematic review* OR meta-analys*)

5) ClinicalTrials.gov

Searched from inception to March 2020

Condition: prematurity

Intervention: Surfactant

6) World Health Organization International Clinical Trials Registry Platform (apps.who.int/trialsearch/)

Searched from inception to March 2020

Condition: neo*

Intervention: surfactant

eMethod – Data extraction and Management

Two authors independently extracted the data below in a pre-piloted data extraction form:

- Outcome data (for each outcome and each intervention group):
 - o Number of participants randomised
 - o Number of participants included for the analysis
 - o Number of participants with events for binary outcomes, mean and standard deviation for continuous outcomes, number of events and the mean follow-up period for count outcomes and number of participants with events and the mean follow-up period for time-to-event outcomes
 - o Natural logarithm of hazard ratio and its standard error if this was reported rather than the number of participants with events and the mean follow-up period for time-to-event outcomes
- Data on potential effect modifiers:
 - o Participant characteristics such as sex, gestational age, birthweight, use of antenatal steroids
 - o Details of the intervention and control
 - o Length of follow-up
 - o Information related to ‘Risk of Bias’ assessment
- Other data:
 - o Year and language of publication
 - o Country
 - o Year(s) in which the trial was conducted
 - o Inclusion and exclusion criteria

We collected data at maximum follow-up provided and also at shorter (up to three months) and medium-term follow-up (three months to 1 year) where applicable. We attempted to contact trial authors in the case of unclear or missing information. Any differences in opinion were resolved by discussion.

eMethods – Data Synthesis

A network meta-analysis was conducted to compare thresholds of FiO₂ simultaneously for each of the primary and secondary outcomes. Network meta-analysis combines direct evidence within trials and indirect evidence across trials [1]. Our analysis was based on guidance by the National Institute for Clinical Excellence (NICE) Decision Support Unit (DSU).[1-4]

We obtained a network plot to ensure that the trials were connected by interventions [3]. We excluded any trials unconnected to the network from the meta-analysis and reported only the direct pair-wise meta-analysis for such comparisons.

We conducted a Bayesian network meta-analysis using the Markov chain Monte Carlo method.

We used a fixed-effect model and random-effects model for the network meta-analysis. For each pair-wise comparison in a table, we reported the fixed-effect model if the two models reported similar results; otherwise, we reported the more conservative model.

We used a hierarchical Bayesian model using three different initial values, employing codes provided by NICE DSU [5]. We used a normal distribution with large variance (10,000) for treatment effect priors (vague or flat priors). For the random-effects model, we used a prior distributed uniformly (limits: 0 to 5) for between-trial standard deviation but assumed the same between-trial standard deviation across treatment comparisons [5]. We used a 'burn-in' of 10,000 simulations, checked for convergence (of effect estimates and between-study heterogeneity) visually (i.e. whether the values in different chains mix very well by visualisation) and ran the models for another 10,000 simulations to obtain effect estimates. If we did not obtain convergence, we increased the number of simulations for the 'burn-in'.

We estimated the probability that each intervention ranks at one of the possible positions using the NICE DSU codes [5].

Analysis was carried out using OpenBUGS, version 3.2.3

We assessed inconsistency (statistical evidence of the violation of transitivity assumption) by fitting both an inconsistency model and a consistency model. We used inconsistency models employed in the NICE DSU manual, as we used a common between-study standard deviation [2].

In the presence of inconsistency, we assessed whether the inconsistency was due to clinical or methodological heterogeneity.

We performed the direct comparisons using the same codes and the same technical details

Subgroup/sensitivity analysis: Subgroup analysis was planned based on 1) trials at low risk of bias compared to trials at high risk of bias, 2) gestational age, 3) Current best practice – use of antenatal steroids and NCPAP. Due to a paucity of data these could not be carried out. A sensitivity analysis of current best practice was performed. No trials reported only per-protocol analysis results, therefore no best-worst case scenario/worst-best case scenario analyses as sensitivity analyses were required. No imputations were required for mean or standard deviation, therefore sensitivity analysis excluding same was not required.

eResults – Risk of Bias Assessment

eTable 1 – Risk of Bias Assessment

	Bev.	DuW	Dilm	Dunn	Egb	Finer	Kand	Katt	Kend	Lefor	Merr	Roja	Sand	Walti
Randomisation process	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Deviations from intended interventions	Low	SC	High	Low	SC	Low	SC	High	Low	SC	Low	Low	Low	SC
Missing outcome data	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Measurement of the outcome	SC	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Selection of the reported result	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC
Overall risk of bias	SC	SC	High	SC	SC	SC	SC	High	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC

eTable 1a – Risk of bias in each domain for each included study, Author 1. SC some concerns

	Bev.	DuW.	Dilm	Dunn	Egb.	Finer	Kand	Katt.	Kend	Lefor	Merri	Roja	Sand	Walti
Randomisation process	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Deviations from intended interventions	Low	SC	High	Low	SC	Low	SC	High	Low	SC	Low	Low	Low	SC
Missing outcome data	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Measurement of the outcome	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Selection of the reported result	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC
Overall risk of bias	SC	SC	High	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC	SC

eTable 1b – Risk of bias in each domain for each included study, Author 2. SC some concerns

eResults – Excluded Studies

None of the excluded studies met the inclusion criteria.

5 of the studies were identified as review articles or systematic reviews [6-10]. 1 study is an ongoing trial assessing surfactant thresholds for treatment [11]. We were unable to translate 2 studies and the abstracts did not provide sufficient information for inclusion [12,13]. 23 were not randomised control trials [14-36]. 6 trials met the inclusion criteria but did not list an fio2 for treatment with selective surfactant [37-42]. 55 did not meet the inclusion criteria of a trial assessing prophylactic treatment with surfactant vs selective treatment with surfactant [43-96]. 10 of the references are trial register or published abstracts of an included trial: [97-106]. 3 references were abstracts without a published trial found despite attempts to contact the author [107-109].

eResults – Primary Outcome Mortality

A random-effect model was used for the network meta-analysis because it was more conservative.

Deviance Information Criteria (DIC) for fixed model was 171.1, random 172.3.

Median between-study standard deviation for the random-effect model 0.23 (95% CrI 0.011, 0.742), variance 0.055.

Model used for direct comparisons are included in Table 1 with the odds ratio for each comparison.

eTable 2. Odds ratio for both the direct and network comparison of the primary outcome

Mortality	Prophylaxis	Threshold 30%	Threshold 40%	Threshold 50%	Threshold 60%
Prophylaxis		1.88[0.25,16.51] *	1.52[0.87,2.52] *	0.8[0.62,1.04] #	1.1[0.67,1.78] #
Threshold 30%	1.81[1.00,3.44]		-	-	-
Threshold 40%	1.52[0.94,2.40]	0.84[0.37,1.77]		-	-
Threshold 50%	0.82[0.50,1.41]	0.45[0.20,1.01]	0.54[0.28,1.13]		-
Threshold 60%	1.16[0.63,2.29]	0.64[0.27,1.60]	0.76[0.36,1.80]	1.41[0.64,3.31]	

eTable 2. Odds ratio for both the direct and network comparison of the primary outcome

Network Meta-analysis comparisons are below the greyed line, direct comparisons are above the line. Comparisons that did not reach statistical significance (credibility intervals for the odds ratio cross 1) are highlighted in yellow. Comparisons that do reach statistical significance are highlighted in blue.

Most conservative method of analysis was used in each case. * denotes fixed-effect model, # denotes random effect model for direct comparisons.

eResults – Sensitivity Analysis of Current Best Practice

Six studies met the criteria. This included 2554 patients. 1268 were in the combined prophylaxis arm and were compared with 138 (one study) in the 30% threshold arm, 183 (2 studies) in the 40% arm, 727 (two studies) in the 50% arm and 216 (one study) in the 60% arm.

eTable 4 shows the odds ratio for each comparison within the analysis, along with the model of comparison used. Most conservative model was used in each case.

Fixed-effects model was used for all outcomes, except pneumothorax, where random-effects model was used. DIC, between-study variance with 95% CrI and variance where applicable are shown in eTable 5.

There was no statistically significant difference seen in mortality, BPD, pneumothorax, or grade 3/4 IVH.

There was an increased rate of major morbidity in the 60% threshold group– 31 more per 1000 (95% CrI intervals 136 more to 572 more).

Each comparison was deemed to be at very-low quality of evidence.

eTable 3. Odds Ratio for Sensitivity Analysis

Mortality	Prophylaxis	30% Threshold	40% Threshold	50% Threshold	60% Threshold
Prophylaxis		1.02[0.45,2.34] &	1.33[0.69,2.6] *	0.81[0.61,1.07] *	0.55[0.23,1.29] &
30% Threshold	1.03[0.45,2.35]		-	-	-
40% Threshold	1.32[0.69,2.61]	1.30[0.45,3.77]		-	-
50% Threshold	0.81[0.61,1.07]	0.79[0.33,1.90]	0.61[0.29,1.24]		-
60% Threshold	0.56[0.23,1.29]	0.54[0.16,1.77]	0.42[0.14,1.22]	0.69[0.27,1.66]	

eTable 3a. Odds ratio for sensitivity analysis for mortality

Bronchopulmonary Dysplasia	Prophylaxis	30% Threshold	40% Threshold	50% Threshold	60% Threshold
Prophylaxis		1.39[0.87,2.23]	0.83[0.39,1.7]	0.93[0.74,1.16]	1.3[0.84,2.02]
30% Threshold	1.40[0.88,2.24]		-	-	-
40% Threshold	0.83[0.39,1.70]	0.59[0.24,1.40]		-	-
50% Threshold	0.93[0.74,1.16]	0.66[0.39,1.11]	1.12[0.53,2.44]		-
60% Threshold	1.29[0.84,2.02]	0.93[0.49,1.76]	1.57[0.68,3.74]	1.40[0.86,2.30]	

eTable 3b. Odds ratio for sensitivity analysis for bronchopulmonary dysplasia

Pneumothorax	Prophylaxis	30% Threshold	40% Threshold	50% Threshold	60% Threshold
Prophylaxis		4.78[1.42,22.97] &	3.73[0.01,3209.92]#	1.07[0.71,1.62] *	1.73[0.67,4.82] &
30% Threshold	4.99[0.00,6953.50]		-	-	-
40% Threshold	3.09[0.02,2455.29]	0.65[0.00,14472.42]		-	-
50% Threshold	1.52[0.01,324.08]	0.31[0.00,2426.00]	0.48[0.00,754.46]		-
60% Threshold	1.73[0.00,2151.67]	0.36[0.00,8681.94]	0.54[0.00,2972.03]	1.13[0.00,8391.71]	

eTable 3c. Odds ratio for sensitivity analysis for pneumothorax

Major Morbidity	Prophylaxis	30% Threshold	40% Threshold	50% Threshold	60% Threshold
Prophylaxis		1.21[0.87,1.7] &	1.15[0.8,1.66] *	1.06[0.93,1.21] *	2.05[1.45,2.92] &
30% Threshold	1.20[0.86,1.68]		-	-	-
40% Threshold	1.16[0.81,1.66]	0.96[0.58,1.57]		-	-
50% Threshold	1.06[0.93,1.21]	0.88[0.62,1.26]	0.92[0.63,1.34]		-
60% Threshold	2.05[1.46,2.93]	1.70[1.05,2.78]	1.77[1.07,2.95]	1.92[1.34,2.83]	

eTable 3d. Odds ratio for sensitivity analysis for major morbidity

Grade 3 or 4 Intraventricular Haemorrhage	Prophylaxis	30% Threshold	40% Threshold	50% Threshold	60% Threshold
Prophylaxis		1.62[0.24,14.17] &	2.16[0.86,5.88] *	1.28[0.93,1.78] *	0.71[0.23,2.12] &
30% Threshold	1.64[0.24,14.41]		-	-	-
40% Threshold	2.16[0.87,5.98]	1.32[0.12,11.55]		-	-
50% Threshold	1.28[0.93,1.78]	0.78[0.09,5.46]	0.59[0.21,1.56]		-
60% Threshold	0.71[0.23,2.09]	0.43[0.04,3.90]	0.33[0.07,1.36]	0.55[0.17,1.71]	

eTable 3e. Odds ratio for sensitivity analysis for grade 3 or 4 Intraventricular Haemorrhage

eTable 3 (a-e) above shows the odds ratio for the network and direct comparisons for each outcome in the sensitivity analysis.

Network meta-analysis comparisons are below the greyed line, direct comparisons are above the line.

Comparisons that did not reach statistical significance (credibility intervals for the odds ratio cross 1) are highlighted in yellow. Comparisons that do reach statistical significance are highlighted in blue.

Most conservative model of analysis was used in each case.

*denotes fixed-effect model, # denotes random effect model for the direct comparison, & denotes only one study in comparison leading to use of the random effects model,

^ denotes zero events in at least one arm of one study leading to use of the fixed effect model.

eTable 4. Models used for outcomes for sensitivity analysis

Outcome	DIC – Fixed	DIC - Random	Model Used	SD	95% CrI	Variance
Mortality	74.72	76.47	Fixed			
BPD	76.01	76.54	Fixed			
Pneumothorax	75.86	63.82	Random	3.424	1.22, 4.92	11.72
Major Morbidity	89.54	89.58	Fixed			
Grade 3/4 IVH	66.33	67.54	Fixed			

eTable 4. Models used for outcomes for sensitivity analysis

DIC – Deviance Information Criteria, Fixed – Fixed effect model, Random – Random effect model

SD – between study standard deviation, CrI – Credible interval, BPD – bronchopulmonary dysplasia, IVH – intraventricular haemorrhage

eResults – Secondary Outcomes

1. Bronchopulmonary Dysplasia

Network meta-analysis was performed using a fixed-effects model as it was more conservative. DIC for the fixed-effect model was 91.45, random-effect model 92.9.

Model used for the direct comparisons along with odds ratio for each comparison, both network and direct are shown in eTable 3a.

eTable 5. Odds Ratio for Both the Direct and Network Comparisons For Secondary Outcomes

Bronchopulmonary Dysplasia	Prophylaxis	Threshold 30%	Threshold 40%	Threshold 50%	Threshold 60%
Prophylaxis		1.4[0.87,2.23] &	0.77[0.37,1.61] ^	0.93[0.74,1.16] *	1.02[0.71,1.45] *
Threshold 30%	1.39[0.87,2.24]		-	-	-
Threshold 40%	0.77[0.37,1.58]	0.55[0.23,1.30]		-	-
Threshold 50%	0.93[0.74,1.16]	0.66[0.39,1.12]	1.20[0.57,2.61]		-
Threshold 60%	1.02[0.72,1.45]	0.73[0.40,1.32]	1.32[0.60,3.01]	1.10[0.72,1.67]	

eTable 5a. Odds ratio for both the direct and network comparison for the outcome bronchopulmonary dysplasia.

Network meta-analysis comparisons are below the greyed line, direct comparisons are above the line.

Comparisons that did not reach statistical significance (credibility intervals for the odds ratio cross 1) are highlighted in yellow. Comparisons that do reach statistical significance are highlighted in blue.

Most conservative method of analysis was used in each case.

*denotes fixed effect model, # denotes random effect model for direct comparisons, & denotes only one study in comparison with no convergence of random effect model – fixed effect used, ^ denotes zero events in one arm of one study leading to use of the fixed effect model

2. Chronic Lung Disease

Network meta-analysis was performed using a random-effects model, as the most conservative model.

DIC for the fixed-effect model was 109, random-effect model 110.7. Median between-study standard deviation 0.1751 (95% CrI 0.0078, 0.8729), variance 0.031.

Models used in the direct comparisons with odds ratio for each comparison are shown in table 3.

Chronic Lung Disease	Prophylaxis	Threshold 30%	Threshold 40%	Threshold 50%	Threshold 60%
Prophylaxis		1.47[0.07,30.69] #	1.07[0.8,1.43] *	3.97[0.88,30.78] &	0.6[0.33,1.06] *
Threshold 30%	1.48[0.82,2.63]		-	-	-
Threshold 40%	1.05[0.63,1.64]	0.71[0.32,1.48]		-	-

Threshold 50%	4.08[0.77,35.45]	2.75[0.46,25.87]	3.90[0.69,35.98]		-
Threshold 60%	0.59[0.28,1.22]	0.40[0.16,1.01]	0.56[0.23,1.36]	0.14[0.01,0.91]	

eTable 5b. Odds ratio for both the direct and network comparisons for CLD. Description of table as per table 3a

3. Bronchopulmonary Dysplasia or Chronic Lung Disease at maximal follow up

For this outcome, a random-effect model was used for the network meta-analysis as the more conservative choice.

DIC for the fixed model was 152.9, random model 154.7. Median between study deviation 0.1619 (95% CrI 0.0071, 0.678), variance 0.26.

Models used in the direct comparisons along with odds ratio for each comparison are shown in eTable 3c.

CLD or BPD	Prophylaxis	Threshold 30%	Threshold 40%	Threshold 50%	Threshold 60%
Prophylaxis		1.45[1.09,1.93] *	0.94[0.68,1.29] ^	0.93[0.74,1.16] ^	0.91[0.65,1.26] *
Threshold 30%	1.45[0.95,2.21]		-	-	-
Threshold 40%	0.91[0.54,1.41]	0.63[0.32,1.13]		-	-
Threshold 50%	0.96[0.59,2.00]	0.66[0.36,1.58]	1.06[0.57,2.75]		-
Threshold 60%	0.86[0.47,1.34]	0.59[0.28,1.06]	0.94[0.46,1.81]	0.90[0.32,1.64]	

eTable 5c. Odds ratio for the comparisons of both the direct and network comparisons for CLD or BPD. Description of table as per eTable 3a

4. Pneumothorax (or other air-leak)

Network meta-analysis was performed using a random-effects model, as the most conservative model.

DIC for the fixed-effect model was 159.5, random-effect model was 154.3. Between study standard deviation was 0.859 (95% CrI 0.197, 2.115), variance 0.74.

Models used in the direct comparisons along with odds ratio for each comparison are shown in eTable 3d.

Pneumothorax	Prophylaxis	Threshold 30%	Threshold 40%	Threshold 50%	Threshold 60%
Prophylaxis		2.36[0.29,22.15] #	1.38[0.89,2.17] *	0.92[0.63,1.35] *	1.67[0.88,3.19] *
Threshold 30%	2.41[0.61,10.48]		-	-	-
Threshold 40%	1.26[0.42,3.97]	0.52[0.08,3.13]		-	-
Threshold 50%	0.81[0.19,3.47]	0.33[0.04,2.49]	0.64[0.10,3.99]		-
Threshold 60%	2.05[0.50,10.72]	0.85[0.11,7.42]	1.62[0.27,12.07]	2.54[0.35,23.13]	

eTable 5d. Odds ratio for the comparisons of both the direct and network comparisons for pneumothorax. Description of table as per eTable 3a

5. Surfactant Treatment (proportion requiring surfactant)

Network meta-analysis not performed.

Proportions receiving surfactant (binary): 99.07% of the prophylaxis group received any surfactant
 41.54% in the 30% group
 53.82% in the 40% group
 64.42% in the 50% group
 46.22% of 60% group.

6. Number of Surfactant Doses Required

Network meta-analysis was performed using a random-effects model, as the most conservative model.

DIC for the fixed-effect model was 270, random-effect model 269. Between study standard deviation 2.504 (95% CrI 0.1212, 4.879), variance 6.27.

Models used in the direct comparisons along with odds ratio for each comparison are shown in eTable 3f.

Surfactant - Number of Doses	Prophylaxis	Threshold 30%	Threshold 40%	Threshold 50%	Threshold 60%
Prophylaxis		0.51[0.46,0.56] *	0.71[0.63,0.8] *	0.65[0.58,0.73] *	0.26[0.21,0.32] *
Threshold 30%	0.51[0.46,0.56]		-	-	-
Threshold 40%	0.71[0.63,0.81]	1.41[1.20,1.65]		-	-
Threshold 50%	0.65[0.58,0.73]	1.29[1.10,1.51]	0.91[0.77,1.08]		-
Threshold 60%	0.26[0.21,0.32]	0.52[0.41,0.65]	0.37[0.29,0.47]	0.40[0.32,0.51]	

eTable 5e. Odds ratio for the comparisons of both the direct and network comparisons for number of surfactant doses required. Description of table as per eTable 3a

7. Total Number of Major Morbidities

Network meta-analysis was performed using a fixed-effects model, as the most conservative model. DIC for the fixed-effect model was 168.5, random-effect model 168.5.

Models used in the direct comparisons along with odds ratio for each comparison are shown in eTable 3g.

Major Morbidity	Prophylaxis	Threshold 30%	Threshold 40%	Threshold 50%	Threshold 60%
Prophylaxis		1.14[0.93,1.4] *	1.18[0.89,1.56] *	1.04[0.92,1.18] *	1.02[0.81,1.28] *
Threshold 30%	1.14[0.94,1.40]		-	-	-
Threshold 40%	1.18[0.89,1.56]	1.03[0.73,1.45]		-	-
Threshold 50%	1.04[0.92,1.18]	0.91[0.72,1.16]	0.89[0.65,1.20]		-

Threshold 60%	1.02[0.81,1.28]	0.89[0.65,1.21]	0.86[0.60,1.24]	0.97[0.75,1.27]	
----------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	--

eTable 5f. Odds ratio for the comparisons of both the direct and network comparisons for total number of major morbidities. Description of table as per eTable 3a

8. Grade 3 or 4 Intraventricular Haemorrhage

Network meta-analysis was performed using a random-effects model, as the most conservative model.

DIC for the fixed-effect model was 138.3, random-effect model 137.8. Between study standard deviation 0.449 (95% CrI 0.326, 1.281), variance 0.2.

Models used in the direct comparisons along with odds ratio for each comparison are shown in eTable 3h.

Grade 3 or 4 Intraventricular Haemorrhage	Prophylaxis	Threshold 0.3	Threshold 0.4	Threshold 0.5	Threshold 0.6
Prophylaxis		2.16[0.14,34.19] #	1.59[0.91,2.84] *	1.21[0.9,1.63] &	0.67[0.32,1.32] &
Threshold 0.3	2.01[0.83,5.46]		-	-	-
Threshold 0.4	1.69[0.77,4.10]	0.84[0.24,2.93]		-	-
Threshold 0.5	1.11[0.44,2.47]	0.55[0.14,1.75]	0.65[0.18,1.94]		-
Threshold 0.6	0.68[0.22,2.03]	0.34[0.07,1.35]	0.40[0.09,1.52]	0.61[0.16,2.60]	

eTable 5g. Odds ratio for the comparisons of both the direct and network comparisons for grade 3 or 4 intraventricular haemorrhage. Description of table as per eTable 3a

9. Periventricular Leukomalacia

Network meta-analysis was performed using a fixed-effect model, as the most conservative model. DIC for the fixed-effect model was 78.82, random-effect model 80.17.

Models used in the direct comparisons along with odds ratio for each comparison are shown in eTable 3i.

Periventricular Leucomalacia	Prophylaxis	Threshold 30%	Threshold 40%	Threshold 50%	Threshold 60%
Prophylaxis		0.81[0.51,1.28] *	0.63[0.07,4.18] *	0.81[0.22,2.77] *	0.58[0.2,1.5] *
Threshold 30%	0.81[0.51,1.28]		-	-	-
Threshold 40%	0.64[0.07,4.25]	0.79[0.09,5.53]		-	-
Threshold 50%	0.80[0.21,2.81]	0.98[0.25,3.79]	1.26[0.13,14.92]		-
Threshold 60%	0.58[0.19,1.50]	0.71[0.22,2.06]	0.91[0.10,9.56]	0.72[0.14,3.64]	

eTable 5h. Odds ratio for the comparisons of both the direct and network comparisons for periventricular leukomalacia. Description of table as per eTable 3a

10. Necrotising Enterocolitis

Network meta-analysis was performed using a fixed-effects model, as the most conservative model. DIC for the fixed-effect model was 112.5, random-effect model 114.4.

Models used in the direct comparisons along with odds ratio for each comparison are shown in eTable 3j.

Necrotising Enterocolitis	Prophylaxis	Threshold 30%	Threshold 40%	Threshold 50%	Threshold 60%
Prophylaxis		0.86[0.54,1.36] *	1.27[0.81,2] ^	1.27[0.92,1.77] *	1.15[0.61,2.08] &
Threshold 30%	0.86[0.55,1.35]		-	-	-
Threshold 40%	1.27[0.81,2.01]	1.48[0.78,2.80]		-	-
Threshold 50%	1.27[0.91,1.77]	1.48[0.84,2.59]	1.00[0.57,1.74]		-
Threshold 60%	1.15[0.61,2.10]	1.33[0.61,2.84]	0.90[0.41,1.91]	0.90[0.44,1.80]	

eTable 5i. Odds ratio for the comparisons of both the direct and network comparisons for necrotising enterocolitis. Description of table as per eTable 3a

11. Retinopathy of Prematurity

Network meta-analysis was performed using a random-effects model, as the most conservative model.

DIC for the fixed-effect model was 65.68, random-effect model 67.53. Between study standard deviation 0.517 (95% CrI 0.0198, 3.845), variance 0.27.

Models used in the direct comparisons along with odds ratio for each comparison are shown in eTable 3k.

Retinopathy of Prematurity > Stage 2	Prophylaxis	Threshold 30%	Threshold 40%	Threshold 50%	Threshold 60%
Prophylaxis		1.02[0.03,37.98] &	0.9[0.34,2.31] *	1.01[0.72,1.41] *	2.35[1.02,5.42] &
Threshold 30%	1.01[0.01,96.83]		-	-	-
Threshold 40%	0.87[0.09,7.05]	0.85[0.01,117.92]		-	-
Threshold 50%	0.99[0.12,6.96]	0.97[0.01,121.39]	1.14[0.06,23.17]		-
Threshold 60%	2.36[0.13,40.29]	2.31[0.01,464.98]	2.69[0.07,101.80]	2.38[0.07,76.63]	

eTable 5j. Odds ratio for the comparisons of both the direct and network comparisons for retinopathy of prematurity greater than stage 2. Description of table as per eTable 3a

References

1. Mills EJ, Ioannidis JP, Thorlund K, Schünemann HJ, Puhan MA, Guyatt GH (2012) How to use an article reporting a multiple treatment comparison meta-analysis. *Jama* 308 (12):1246-1253. doi:10.1001/2012.jama.11228
2. Dias S, Sutton AJ, Ades AE, Welton NJ (2013) Evidence synthesis for decision making 2: a generalized linear modeling framework for pairwise and network meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Med Decis Making* 33 (5):607-617. doi:10.1177/0272989x12458724
3. Chaimani A, Higgins JP, Mavridis D, Spyridonos P, Salanti G (2013) Graphical tools for network meta-analysis in STATA. *PLoS One* 8 (10):e76654. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0076654
4. Salanti G, Ades AE, Ioannidis JP (2011) Graphical methods and numerical summaries for presenting results from multiple-treatment meta-analysis: an overview and tutorial. *J Clin Epidemiol* 64 (2):163-171. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2010.03.016
5. Dias S, Welton N, Sutton A, Ades A (2016) NICE DSU technical support document 2: a generalised linear modelling framework for pairwise and network meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials (Update Sept 2016). NICE DSU
6. Alallah J (2012) Early CPAP versus surfactant in extremely preterm infants. *Journal of Clinical Neonatology* 1 (1):12-13. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.4103/2249-4847.92233
7. Bahadue FL, Soll R (2012) Early versus delayed selective surfactant treatment for neonatal respiratory distress syndrome. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* (11). doi:10.1002/14651858.CD001456.pub2
8. Bancalari E (2012) Non-invasive neonatal respiratory support. *Journal of Maternal-Fetal and Neonatal Medicine* 25:2. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.3109/14767058.2012.679162
9. Corbet A (1993) CLINICAL-TRIALS OF SYNTHETIC SURFACTANT IN THE RESPIRATORY-DISTRESS SYNDROME OF PREMATURE-INFANTS. *Clin Perinatol* 20 (4):737-760
10. Dani C (2016) Surfactant Treatment Threshold during NCPAP for the Treatment of Preterm Infants with Respiratory Distress Syndrome. *Am J Perinatol* 33 (10):925-929. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1055/s-0036-1582395
11. Carnielli VP, Ancona OR (2020) Medium vs Low Oxygen Threshold for the Surfactant Administration. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT04199364>,
12. Iarukova N, Chernev T, Nikolov A (1998) [The use of Curosurf with premature infants--the prevention or treatment of the neonatal RDS]. *Akush Ginekol (Sofia)* 37 (3):12-14
13. Mostovoï AV, Aleksandrovich I, Sapun OI, Trifonova EG, Tret'iakova EP, Bogdanova RZ, Karpova AL (2009) Effect of surfactant administration time on the outcomes in low and extremely low birth weight neonates. *Anesteziologyia i reanimatologiya* (1):43-46
14. Alba J, Agarwal R, Hegyi T, Hiatt IM (1995) EFFICACY OF SURFACTANT THERAPY IN INFANTS MANAGED WITH CPAP. *Pediatric Pulmonology* 20 (3):172-176. doi:10.1002/ppul.1950200308
15. Billman D, Nicks J, Schumacher R (1994) Exosurf rescue surfactant improves high ventilation-perfusion mismatch in respiratory distress syndrome. *Pediatric pulmonology* 18 (5):279-283
16. Bower LK, Barnhart SL, Betit P, Hendon B, MasiLynch J, Wilson BG (1996) Surfactant replacement therapy (Reprinted from *Respiratory Care*, vol 39, pg 824-829, 1994). *Int Anesthesiol Clin* 34 (1):153-161. doi:10.1097/00004311-199603410-00019
17. Bunt JE, Carnielli VP, Janssen DJ, Wattimena JL, Hop WC, Sauer PJ, Zimmermann LJ (2000) Treatment with exogenous surfactant stimulates endogenous surfactant synthesis in premature infants with respiratory distress syndrome. *Critical care medicine* 28 (10):3383-3388. doi:10.1097/00003246-200010000-00001
18. Dunn MS, Shennan AT, Hoskins EM, Lennox K, Enhorning G (1988) Two-year follow-up of infants enrolled in a randomized trial of surfactant replacement therapy for prevention of neonatal respiratory distress syndrome. *Pediatrics* 82 (4):543-547
19. Egberts J, De Winter JP, Van Sonderen L, Van Den Anker JN (1994) Theoretical calculation of the cost for neonatal care after any prophylaxis or therapeutical administration of surfactant. [Dutch] (Een theoretische berekening van de kosten van de neonatale zorg na een eventueel profylactisch of therapeutisch gebruik van surfactant.). *Tijdschrift voor Kindergeneeskunde* 62 (2):97-103
20. Gore SM (1993) OSIRIS trial. *Lancet (london, england)* 341 (8838):172; author reply 173-174
21. Hanssler L, Zhou C, Roll C, Wiesemann HG (1994) Effects of exogenous surfactant therapy on lung function in mechanically ventilated preterm infants with severe respiratory distress syndrome (RDS). [German] (Effekte der surfactant-substitution auf die lungenfunktion beatmeter fruhgeborener mit schwerem atemnotsyndrom.). *Pediatrics and Related Topics* 32 (1):31-39

22. Hentschel R, Dittrich F, Hilgendorff A, Wauer R, Westmeier M, Gortner L (2009) Neurodevelopmental outcome and pulmonary morbidity two years after early versus late surfactant treatment: does it really differ? *Acta Paediatr* 98 (4):654-659. doi:10.1111/j.1651-2227.2008.01216.x
23. Keller RL, Eichenwald EC, Hibbs AM, Rogers EE, Wai KC, Black DM, Ballard PL, Asselin JM, Truog WE, Merrill JD, Mammel MC, Steinhorn RH, Ryan RM, Durand DJ, Bendel CM, Bendel-Stenzel EM, Courtney SE, Dhanireddy R, Hudak ML, Koch FR, Mayock DE, McKay VJ, Helderman J, Porta NF, Wadhawan R, Palermo L, Ballard RA, Grp TS (2017) The Randomized, Controlled Trial of Late Surfactant: Effects on Respiratory Outcomes at 1-Year Corrected Age. *Journal of Pediatrics* 183:19-+. doi:10.1016/j.jpeds.2016.12.059
24. Keller RL, Rogers E, Eichenwald E, Hibbs A, Black D, Ballard P, Ballard R (2016) One year pulmonary outcomes in the trial of late surfactant (TOLSURF). *Journal of Investigative Medicine* 64 (1):250-251. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/jim-d-15-00013.268
25. Kim SM, Park YJ, Chung SH, Choi YS, Kim CH, Bae CW (2014) Early prophylactic versus late selective use of surfactant for respiratory distress syndrome in very preterm infants: a collaborative study of 53 multicenter trials in Korea. *J Korean Med Sci* 29 (8):1126-1131. doi:10.3346/jkms.2014.29.8.1126
26. Kong X, Cui Q, Hu Y, Huang W, Ju R, Li W, Wang R, Xia S, Yu J, Zhu T, Feng Z (2016) Bovine Surfactant Replacement Therapy in Neonates of Less than 32 Weeks' Gestation: A Multicenter Controlled Trial of Prophylaxis versus Early Treatment in China--a Pilot Study. *Pediatr Neonatol* 57 (1):19-26. doi:10.1016/j.pedneo.2015.03.007
27. Lefort S, Diniz EMA, Vaz FAC (1999) A follow-up clinical trial involving preterm neonates at risk for Respiratory Distress Syndrome (RDS), submitted to prophylactic surfactant of porcine origin comparing two different dosage regimens. 4th World Congress of Perinatal Medicine. Medimond S R L, 40128 Bologna
28. Morley C (1993) OSIRIS trial. *Lancet* 341 (8838):172-173; author reply 173-174
29. Robertson B (1990) European multicenter trials of curosurf for treatment of neonatal respiratory distress syndrome. *Lung* 168 Suppl:860-863. doi:10.1007/bf02718220
30. Robertson B, Curstedt T, Tubman R, Strayer D, Berggren P, Kok J, Koppe J, van Sonderen L, Halliday H, McClure G, et al. (1992) A 2-year follow up of babies enrolled in a European multicentre trial of porcine surfactant replacement for severe neonatal respiratory distress syndrome. Collaborative European Multicentre Study Group. *Eur J Pediatr* 151 (5):372-376. doi:10.1007/bf02113261
31. Robertson B, Speer CP (1993) OSIRIS trial. *Lancet* 341 (8838):172; author reply 173-174
32. Sanghvi KP, Merchant RH (1998) Single dose surfactant rescue therapy in neonatal respiratory distress syndrome. *Indian Pediatr* 35 (6):533-536
33. Svenningsen NW, Saugstad OD (1996) Surfactant treatment of extremely low birth weight (ELBW) infants. *Acp* 6 (1):11-17
34. Tarnow-Mordi W (1993) OSIRIS trial. *Lancet* 341 (8838):174
35. Wagner CL, Kramer BM, Kendig JW, Brooks JG, Cox C, Wagner MT, Phelps DL (1995) SCHOOL-AGE FOLLOW-UP OF A SINGLE-DOSE PROPHYLACTIC SURFACTANT COHORT. *J Dev Behav Pediatr* 16 (5):327-332
36. Ware J, Taeusch HW, Soll RF, McCormick MC (1990) Health and developmental outcomes of a surfactant controlled trial: follow-up at 2 years. *Pediatrics* 85 (6):1103-1107
37. Anonymous (1992) Early versus delayed neonatal administration of a synthetic surfactant - The judgment of OSIRIS. *Lancet* 340 (8832):1363-1369. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0140-6736%2892%2992557-V
38. Anonymous (1992) Early or selective surfactant (colfosceril palmitate, Exosurf) for intubated babies at 26 to 29 weeks gestation. A European double-blind trial with sequential analysis. European Exosurf Study Group. The Online journal of current clinical trials Doc No 28:[3886 words; 3847 paragraphs]
39. Chu GL, Wang J, Xin Y, Zheng J, Zheng RX, Bi DZ (2006) Protective and curative effects of prophylactic administration of pulmonary surfactant on neonatal respiratory distress syndrome. [Chinese]. *National Medical Journal of China* 86 (13):876-880
40. Dunn MS, Shennan AT, Zayack D, Possmayer F (1991) Bovine surfactant replacement therapy in neonates of less than 30 weeks' gestation: A randomized controlled trial of prophylaxis versus treatment. *Pediatrics* 87 (3):377-386
41. Rong ZH, Chang LW, Cheng HB, Wang HZ, Zhu XF, Peng F, Fan QH, Lu W, Pan R, Xiong L, Jiao R, Sun J, Xia SW, Xie JJ (2019) A Multicentered Randomized Study on Early versus Rescue Calsurf Administration for the Treatment of Respiratory Distress Syndrome in Preterm Infants. *Am J Perinatol* 36 (14):1492-1497. doi:10.1055/s-0039-1678530

42. Verder H, Robertson B, Greisen G, Ebbesen F, Albertsen P, Lundstrom K, Jacobsen T (1994) Surfactant therapy and nasal continuous positive airway pressure for newborns with respiratory distress syndrome. Danish-Swedish Multicenter Study Group. *N Engl J Med* 331 (16):1051-1055. doi:10.1056/nejm199410203311603
43. Anonymous (2004) Early surfactant for neonates with mild to moderate respiratory distress syndrome: A multicenter, randomized trial. *Journal of Pediatrics* 144 (6):804-808. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jpeds.2004.03.024
44. Bevilacqua G, Halliday H, Parmigiani S, Robertson B (1993) Randomized multicentre trial of treatment with porcine natural surfactant for moderately severe neonatal respiratory distress syndrome. *Journal of Perinatal Medicine* 21 (5):329-340
45. Bevilacqua G, Parmigiani S, Robertson B (1996) Prophylaxis of respiratory distress syndrome by treatment with modified porcine surfactant at birth: A multicentre prospective randomized trial. *Journal of Perinatal Medicine* 24 (6):609-620. doi:10.1515/jpme.1996.24.6.609
46. Centre Hospitalier Universitaire A (2011) Surfactant Versus Nasal Continuous Positive Airway Pressure (nCPAP) for Respiratory Distress Syndrome in the Newborn \geq 35 Weeks of Gestation. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT01306240>,
47. Chen JY (1990) Exogenous surfactant for treatment of respiratory distress syndrome in premature infants. *Journal of the Formosan Medical Association / Taiwan yi zhi* 89 (2):110-114
48. Chile PUCd (2007) Early CPAP in Respiratory Distress Syndrome. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT00368680>,
49. Chile PUCd, Pediatría SCd (2006) Two Strategies of RDS Treatment in Newborns With Birth Weight > 1500 Grams. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT00277030>,
50. China Medical University C, Hospital NTU, Hospital TMU, Hospital CG, Hospital CGM (2009) Prevention of Chronic Lung Disease (CLD) in Preterm Infants. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT00883532>,
51. Cologne Uo, Schleswig-Holstein Uo, Hospital ACs, Bochum RUo, Datteln VK-uJ, Leverkusen Ho, Kliniken der Stadt Koeln KR, Heinrich-Heine University D, Aschaffenburg-Alzenau K, GmbH AKH, Stuttgart K, Siegen DK, University Hospital B, Charite University B, Germany, Cologne TCTC, Education GFMo, Research (2009) Surfactant Application During Spontaneous Breathing With Continuous Positive Airway Pressure (CPAP) in Premature Infants < 27 Weeks. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT00751959>,
52. CTRI/2008/091/000234 (2009) Early Surfactant Therapy to prevent need for ventilation for preterm infants(gestation <34weeks)on Bubble CPAP. (trans: No sponsor N).
53. CTRI/2015/07/005968 (2015) Exogenous surfactant obtained from goat lungs for treating respiratory difficulty due to lack of surfactant in preterm neonates (trans: All India Institute of Medical Sciences New Delhi Y).
54. Escobedo MB, Gunkel JH, Kennedy KA, Shattuck KE, Sanchez PJ, Seidner S, Hensley G, Cochran CK, Moya F, Morris B, Denson S, Stribley R, Naqvi M, Lasky RE, Texas Neonatal Res G (2004) Early surfactant for neonates with mild to moderate respiratory distress syndrome: A multicenter, randomized trial. *Journal of Pediatrics* 144 (6):804-808. doi:10.1016/j.jpeds.2004.03.024
55. Finer NN, Carlo WA, Duara S, Fanaroff AA, Donovan EF, Wright LL, Kandefer S, Poole WK, Natl Inst Child Hlth Human Dev N (2004) Delivery room continuous positive airway pressure/positive end-expiratory pressure in extremely low birth weight infants: A feasibility trial. *Pediatrics* 114 (3):651-657. doi:10.1542/peds.2004-0394
56. Gopel W, Kribs A, Laux R, Hohn T, Wieg C, Kattner E, Avenarius S, Von der Wense A, Vochem M, Groneck P, Weller U, Moller J, Roth B, Herting E (2010) SURFACTANT TREATMENT OF SPONTANEOUSLY BREATHING PRETERM INFANTS TO AVOID MECHANICAL VENTILATION - A RANDOMIZED CONTROLLED TRIAL. *Pediatric Research* 68:21-21
57. Gortner L, Bernsau U, Hellwege HH, Hieronimi G, Jorch G, Reiter HL (1990) A multicenter randomized controlled clinical trial of bovine surfactant for prevention of respiratory distress syndrome. *Lung* 168 (SUPPL.):864-869
58. Gortner L, Wauer RR, Hammer H, Stock GJ, Heitmann F, Reiter HL, Kuhl PG, Moller JC, Friedrich HJ, Reiss I, Hentschel R, Jorch G, Hieronimi G, Kuhls E (1998) Early versus late surfactant treatment in preterm infants of 27 to 32 weeks' gestational age: a multicenter controlled clinical trial. *Pediatrics* 102 (5):1153-1160. doi:10.1542/peds.102.5.1153
59. Goto A (1988) Surfactant replacement therapy in neonatal RDS. Multicentre, randomized controlled trial. *Yokohama Medical Bulletin* 39 (5-6):211-217
60. Hascoet JM, ARAIRLOR, S.p.A. CF, Universitaire MR (2009) Exogenous Surfactant in Very Preterm Neonates in Prevention of Bronchopulmonary Dysplasia. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT01039285>,

61. Horn AR, Pieper C, Els I, Holgate S (2009) Early surfactant therapy and nasal continuous positive airways pressure for mild respiratory distress syndrome - A pilot study. *SAJCH South African Journal of Child Health* 3 (2):48-54
62. Hospital D, University tRiOsoTMM (2016) Surfactant Administration in Preterm Infants. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT02821273>,
63. Hospital D, University tRiOsoTMM (2017) Surfactant for Neonate With Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS). <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT03217162>,
64. Institute OHR (2013) A Multi-center Trial to Determine if Curosurf® Reduces the Duration of Mechanical Ventilation in Very Preterm Infants. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT01709409>,
65. IRCT138905104486N1 (2010) Effect of prophylactic surfactant on outcome of premature neonate (trans: Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences N).
66. IRCT201205213512N2 (2012) The effect of the use of surfactant administration during NCPAP treatment on complications of RDS (trans: Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences N).
67. IRCT20120728010430N8 (2019) Investigating CPAP in Treatment of RDS (trans: Esfahan University of Medical Sciences N).
68. Kattwinkel J, Bloom BT, Delmore P, Glick C, Brown D, Lopez S, Willett L, Egan EA, Conaway M, Patrie J (2000) High-versus low-threshold surfactant retreatment for neonatal respiratory distress syndrome. *Pediatrics* 106 (2 Pt 1):282-288. doi:10.1542/peds.106.2.282
69. Keller RL, Merrill JD, Black DM, Steinhorn RH, Eichenwalds EC, Durand DJ, Ryan RM, Truog WE, Courtney SE, Ballard PL, Ballard RA (2012) Late administration of surfactant replacement therapy increases surfactant protein-B content: a randomized pilot study. *Pediatric Research* 72 (6):613-619. doi:10.1038/pr.2012.136
70. Kendig JW, Ryan RM, Sinkin RA, Maniscalco WM, Notter RH, Guillet R, Cox C, Dweck HS, Horgan MJ, Reubens LJ, et al. (1998) Comparison of two strategies for surfactant prophylaxis in very premature infants: a multicenter randomized trial. *Pediatrics* 101 (6):1006-1012. doi:10.1542/peds.101.6.1006
71. Konishi M, Fujiwara T, Chida S, Maeta H, Shimada S, Kasai T, Fuji Y, Murakami Y (1992) A prospective, randomized trial of early versus late administration of a single dose of surfactant-TA. *Early Human Development* 29 (1-3):275-282. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0378-3782%2892%2990164-C
72. Mahmoud I, Raheleh D, Manijeh K, Azizollah A (2013) Comparison of Nasal Continuous Positive Airway Pressure Therapy with and without Prophylactic Surfactant in Preterm Neonates. *Iranian Journal of Neonatology* 4 (3):26-34
73. Manitoba Uo (2012) Early CPAP And Large Volume Minimally Invasive Surfactant (ECALMIST) in Preterm Infants With RDS. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT01553292>,
74. Manitoba Uo (2013) ECALMIST Versus InSurE in Preterm Infant < 32 Weeks, Multicenter, Multinational RCT. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT01848262>,
75. Morley CJ, Davis PG, Doyle LW, Brion LP, Hascoet JM, Carlin JB (2008) Nasal CPAP or intubation at birth for very preterm infants. *New England Journal of Medicine* 358 (7):700-708. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa072788
76. Nakhshab M, Tajbakhsh M, Khani S, Farhadi R (2015) Comparison of the effect of surfactant administration during nasal continuous positive airway pressure with that of nasal continuous positive airway pressure alone on complications of respiratory distress syndrome: a randomized controlled study. *Pediatr Neonatol* 56 (2):88-94. doi:10.1016/j.pedneo.2014.05.006
77. Nct (2005) SURFAXIN® Treatment for Prevention of Bronchopulmonary Dysplasia (BPD) in Very Low Birth Weight (VLBW) Infants. <https://clinicaltrials.gov/show/NCT00215540>
78. Nct (2007) Curosurf and Survanta Treatment(CAST)of RDS in Very Premature Infants. <https://clinicaltrials.gov/show/NCT00767039>
79. NCT03217162 (2017) Surfactant for Neonate With Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS) (trans: Daping H, the Research Institute of Surgery of the Third Military Medical University Y).
80. Okulu E, Arsan S, Akin IM, Atasay B, Alan S, Kilic A, Turmen T (2011) COMPARISON OF TWO STRATEGIES FOR SURFACTANT PROPHYLAXIS IN PREMATURE INFANTS: PRELIMINARY DATA OF A RANDOMIZED TRIAL. *Pediatric Research* 70:535-535. doi:10.1038/pr.2011.760
81. Okulu E, Arsan S, Akin IM, Kilic A, Alan S, Atasay B (2012) The timing of surfactant prophylaxis in very-low-birth-weight preterms: Is earlier better? *Early Human Development* 88:S110
82. Okulu E, Arsan S, Akin IM, Kilic A, Alan S, Atasay B (2012) The timing of surfactant prophylaxis in very-lowbirth-weight preterms: Is earlier better? *Archives of Disease in Childhood* 97:A67. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/archdischild-2012-302724.0232

83. Okulu E, Arsan S, Mungan Akin I, Alan S, Kilic A, Atasay B (2015) Early or later prophylactic INSURE in preterm infants of less than 30 weeks' gestation. *Turk J Pediatr* 57 (1):1-8
84. Plavka R, Kopecky P, Sebron V, Leiska A, Svihovec P, Ruffer J, Dokoupilova M, Zlatohlavkova B, Janus V, Keszler M (2002) Early versus delayed surfactant administration in extremely premature neonates with respiratory distress syndrome ventilated by high-frequency oscillatory ventilation. *Intensive Care Med* 28 (10):1483-1490. doi:10.1007/s00134-002-1440-1
85. Research ZTBWsH, Hospital E (2010) Surfactant Administration During Spontaneous Breathing. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT01329432>,
86. Stevenson D, Walther F, Long W, Sell M, Pauly T, Gong A, Easa D, Pramanik A, LeBlanc M, Anday E, et al. (1992) Controlled trial of a single dose of synthetic surfactant at birth in premature infants weighing 500 to 699 grams. The American Exosurf Neonatal Study Group I. *J Pediatr* 120 (2 Pt 2):S3-12. doi:10.1016/s0022-3476(05)81226-0
10.1016/s0022-3476(05)81226-0.
87. Tapia JL, Urzua S, Bancalari A, Meritano J, Torres G, Fabres J, Toro CA, Rivera F, Cespedes E, Burgos JF, Mariani G, Roldan L, Silvera F, Gonzalez A, Dominguez A (2012) Randomized Trial of Early Bubble Continuous Positive Airway Pressure for Very Low Birth Weight Infants. *The Journal of Pediatrics* 161 (1):75-80.e71. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpeds.2011.12.054>
88. Therapeutics W (2005) SURFAXIN® Treatment for Prevention of Bronchopulmonary Dysplasia (BPD) in Very Low Birth Weight (VLBW) Infants. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT00215540>,
89. Uk C, Trust LTHNHS, London IC (2018) The Effect of Surfactant Dose on Outcomes in Preterm Infants With RDS. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT03808402>,
90. University A (2010) Comparison of Two Strategies for Surfactant Prophylaxis in Premature Infants. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT01294852>,
91. University of California SF, National Heart L, Institute B (2010) Trial of Late Surfactant for Prevention of Bronchopulmonary Dysplasia. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT01022580>,
92. University XHoCS (2007) Early NCPAP Before Surfactant Treatment in Very Preterm Infants With RDS. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT01996670>,
93. Verder H, Albertsen P, Ebbesen F, Greisen G, Robertson B, Bertelsen A, Agertoft L, Djernes B, Nathan E, Reinholdt J (1999) Nasal continuous positive airway pressure and early surfactant therapy for respiratory distress syndrome in newborns of less than 30 weeks' gestation. *Pediatrics* 103 (2):E24.
doi:10.1542/peds.103.2.e24
94. Verder H, Ebbesen F, Fenger-Gron J, Henriksen TB, Andreasson B, Bender L, Bertelsen A, Bjorklund LJ, Dahl M, Esberg G, Eschen C, Hovring M, Kreft A, Kroner J, Lundberg F, Pedersen P, Reinholdt J, Stanchev H (2013) Early surfactant guided by lamellar body counts on gastric aspirate in very preterm infants. *Neonatology* 104 (2):116-122. doi:10.1159/000351638
10.1159/000351638. Epub 2013 Jul 9.
95. Wauer RR, Schmalisch G, Abel, Arandt, Eckert, Hock S, Jahrig D, Klaube, Meier, Plath, Rustow, Schmalisch, Schwerecke, Thummler, Tiller, Topke B, Vogtmann, Wauer (1996) Retrospective analysis of a preterm stopped controlled randomized multicentre rescue trial of neonatal respiratory distress syndrome using bovine surfactant. [German] (Retrospektive analyse einer vorzeitig abgebrochenen klinischen kontrollierten studie zur therapie des neonatalen atemnotsyndroms mit einem bovinen surfactant-preparat.). *Pediatrics and Related Topics* 34 (5):337-352
96. Yekta M, Research ZTBWsH, Hospital E (2012) Comparison of Effectiveness of Nasal CPAP and Nasal IMV in Early Rescue Surfactant Treatment in Preterm Infants. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT01741129>,
97. Ctri (2009) Early Surfactant Therapy to prevent need for ventilation for preterm infants(gestation <34weeks)on Bubble CPAP (trans: No sponsor N).
98. Finer NN (2011) SUPPORT trial: Focussing on ROP and BPD. Early CPAP vs. surfactant in extremely preterm infants. *Monatsschrift fur Kinderheilkunde* 159:22. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00112-011-2453-z>
99. Network NNR, National Heart L, Institute B, Resources NCfR, Health EKSNIoC, Development H (2005) Surfactant Positive Airway Pressure and Pulse Oximetry Trial. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT00233324>,
100. Network NNR, Resources NCfR (2000) Early Surfactant to Reduce Use of Mechanical Breathing in Low Birth Weight Infants. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT00005774>,
101. Network VO (2003) Delivery Room Management Trial of Premature Infants at High Risk of Respiratory Distress Syndrome. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT00244101>,
102. Rojas MA, Lozano JM, Rojas MX, Rondon MA, Charry L, Laughon M, Bose C, Bastidas J, Ovalle O, Perez LA, Rojas C, Garcia J, Celis A, Jaramillo ML (2007) Very early surfactant without mandatory ventilation

- in premature infants treated with early continuous positive airway pressure. A randomized controlled trial. *Acta Paediatr* 96:235-235
103. S.p.A. CF (2007) Efficacy of Combining Prophylactic Curosurf With Early Nasal CPAP in Delivery Room: the Curpap Study. <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT00501982>,
104. Sandri F, Ancora G, Lanzoni A, Tagliabue P, Colnaghi M, Ventura ML, Rinaldi M, Mondello I, Gancia P, Salvioli GP, Orzalesi M, Mosca F, Italian Soc N (2004) Prophylactic nasal continuous positive airways pressure in newborns of 28-31 weeks gestation: multicentre randomised controlled clinical trial. *Archives of Disease in Childhood* 89 (5):F394-F398. doi:10.1136/adc.2003.037010
105. Sandri F, Plavka R, Simeoni U (2008) The CURPAP study: An international randomized controlled trial to evaluate the efficacy of combining prophylactic surfactant and early nasal continuous positive airway pressure in very preterm infants. *Neonatology* 94 (1):60-62. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1159/000113060>
106. Simeoni U, Sandri F, Plavka R (2009) CURPAP study - An international randomised controlled trial to evaluate the efficacy of combining prophylactic surfactant and early nasal continuous positive airway pressure in extremely low gestational age neonates. *Neonatology* 95 (4):378. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1159/000209304>
107. Imani M, Derafshi R, Arbabisarjou A (2013) Comparison of nasal continuous positive airway pressure therapy with and without prophylactic surfactant in preterm neonates. *Intensive Care Medicine* 39:S138. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00134-013-2950-8>
108. Merritt TA, Hallman M, Bloom BT, Berry C, Benirschke K, Sahn D, Key T, Edwards D, Jarvenpaa AL, Pohjavuori M, et al. (1986) Prophylactic treatment of very premature infants with human surfactant. *N Engl J Med* 315 (13):785-790. doi:10.1056/nejm198609253151301
109. Thomson MA, Grp IS (2002) Early nasal continuous positive airways pressure (nCPAP) with prophylactic surfactant for neonates at risk of RDS. The IFDAS multi-centre randomised trial. *Pediatric Research* 51 (4):379A-379A

