



Emollient bath additives for the treatment of childhood eczema (BATHE): multi-centre pragmatic parallel group randomised controlled trial of clinical and cost-effectiveness

Journal:	<i>BMJ</i>
Manuscript ID	BMJ.2017.042841.R1
Article Type:	Research
BMJ Journal:	BMJ
Date Submitted by the Author:	24-Feb-2018
Complete List of Authors:	<p>Santer, Miriam; University of Southampton, Primary Medical Care Ridd, Matthew; University of Bristol, School of Social & Community Medicine Francis, Nick; Cardiff University, Department of Primary Care and Public Health Stuart, Beth; University of Southampton, Primary Care and Population Science Rumsby, Kate; University of Southampton, Primary Care and Population Sciences Division Chorozoglou, Maria; University of Southampton, Faculty of Medicine/Wessex Institute Becque, Taeko; University of Southampton, Primary Medical Care Roberts, Amanda; University of Nottingham, Centre of Evidence-Based Dermatology Liddiard, Lyn; University of Bristol, School of Social & Community Medicine Nollett, Claire; Cardiff University, Department of Primary Care and Public Health Hooper, Julie; University of Southampton, Prude, Martina; University of Southampton, Primary Medical Care Wood, Wendy; University of Southampton, NIHR Research Design Service South Central Thomas, Kim; University of Nottingham, Dermatology Thomas-Jones, Emma; Cardiff University Williams, HC; Department of Dermatology Little, Paul; University of Southampton, Medical School,</p>
Keywords:	eczema, children, emollients, randomised controlled trial, primary care

1
2
3 Title page

4 Title:

5
6
7 **Emollient bath additives for the treatment of childhood eczema**
8 **(BATHE): multi-centre pragmatic parallel group randomised**
9 **controlled trial of clinical and cost-effectiveness**
10
11
12
13
14

15 **Authors:**

16
17
18 Miriam Santer, Associate Professor of Primary Care Research, m.santer@soton.ac.uk¹

19
20 Twitter: @MiriamSanter

21
22 Matthew J Ridd, Consultant Senior Lecturer²

23
24 Nick A Francis, Reader³

25
26 Beth Stuart, Senior Research Fellow¹

27
28 Kate Rumsby, Trial Manager¹

29
30 Maria Chorozioglou, Senior Research Fellow in Health Economics⁴

31
32 Taeko Becque, Research Fellow¹

33
34 Amanda Roberts, Patient and Public Contributor⁵

35
36 Lyn Liddiard, Eczema Trials Research Nurse²

37
38 Claire Nollett, Research Associate⁶

39
40 Julie Hooper, Trial Coordinator¹

41
42 Martina Prude, Clinical Studies Officer¹

43
44 Wendy Wood, Senior Research Adviser⁷

45
46 Kim S Thomas, Professor of Applied Dermatology Research⁵

47
48 Emma Thomas-Jones, Research Fellow³

49
50 Hywel C Williams, Professor of Dermato-Epidemiology⁵

51
52 Paul Little, Professor of Primary Care Research¹

53 **Affiliations:**

54 1 Primary Care & Population Sciences, Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton, Aldermoor
55 Close, Southampton SO16 5ST
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 2 Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, Canynge Hall, 39 Whatley
4 Road, Bristol, BS8 2PS

5
6 3 Division of Population Medicine, School of Medicine, Cardiff University, Neuadd Meirionnydd,
7 Heath Park, Cardiff, CF14 4YS

8
9 4 Southampton Health Technology Assessments Centre, Wessex Institute, University of
10 Southampton, Alpha House, Enterprise Road, Southampton Science Park, Southampton, SO16 7NS

11
12 5 Centre of Evidence Based Dermatology, School of Medicine, University of Nottingham, Kings
13 Meadow Campus, Nottingham, NG7 2NR

14
15 6 Centre for Trials Research, College of Biomedical and Life Sciences, 4th Floor, Neuadd
16 Meirionnydd, Heath Park, Cardiff CF14 4YS

17
18 7 NIHR Research Design Service South Central, Primary Care and Population Sciences, University of
19 Southampton, Southampton General Hospital, Tremona Road, Southampton SO16 6YD

ABSTRACT

Objectives

To determine the clinical and cost-effectiveness of including emollient bath additives in the management of childhood eczema.

Trial design

Pragmatic randomised open-label superiority trial with two parallel groups.

Setting and recruitment

96 UK general practices.

Participants

Children were eligible if aged between 12 months and 12 years, fulfilling UK Diagnostic Criteria for Atopic Dermatitis. Children with very mild eczema and children who bathed less than once weekly were excluded. 483 were randomised; one withdrew, leaving 482 children in the trial: 51% female, 84% white, mean age 5 years.

Interventions

Intervention group were prescribed emollient bath additives by their usual clinical team and were asked to use them regularly for 12 months. Control group were asked to use no bath additives for 12 months. Both groups continued with standard eczema management including leave on emollients.

Primary outcome

Eczema control measured by Patient Oriented Eczema Measure (POEM, range 0-28) weekly for 16 weeks.

Secondary outcomes

Eczema severity over 1 year; number of eczema exacerbations resulting in healthcare consultation; disease-specific quality of life; generic quality of life; resource utilisation; type and quantity of topical corticosteroid/calcineurin inhibitors prescribed.

Randomisation

Online randomisation (1:1) stratified by recruiting centre.

Results

95.6% (461/482) of participants completed at least one post-baseline POEM, so were included in the analysis, and 76.8% (370/482) of participants completed questionnaires for more than 80% of time points for the primary outcome.

The mean Baseline POEM was 9.5 (s.d.5.7) in the bath additives group and 10.1 (s.d.5.8) in the no bath additives group. The mean POEM over the 16-week period was 7.5 (s.d.6.0) in the bath additives group and 8.4 (6.0) in the no bath additives group. There was no statistically significant difference in weekly POEM scores between groups over 16 weeks. After controlling for baseline severity and confounders (ethnicity, topical corticosteroid use, soap substitute use) and allowing for clustering of participants within centres and responses within participants over time, POEM scores in

1
2
3 the no bath additive group were 0.41 points higher than in the bath additive group (95% CI -0.27 to
4 1.10), below the minimal clinically important difference of 3 points.

5
6 There was no difference between groups in secondary outcomes, economic outcomes or adverse
7 effects.

8 9 Conclusions

10 This trial found no evidence of clinical benefit from including emollient bath additives in the
11 standard management of childhood eczema. Further research is needed into regimens for leave-on
12 emollient and soap substitutes.

13
14 Registered on 13th December 2013, ISRCTN: 84102309

17 18 What this paper adds

19 20 What is already known on this subject

21 There are three methods of application of emollients: (1) leave-on emollients; (2) soap substitutes;
22 and (3) emollient bath additives (oil and/or emulsifiers designed to be added to bath water).

23
24 While there is evidence supporting the use of leave-on emollients and clinical consensus around
25 soap substitutes, there is less agreement regarding the benefits of emollient bath additives for the
26 treatment of childhood eczema.

27
28 The effectiveness of emollient bath additives in the treatment of childhood eczema has not been
29 assessed due to lack of adequately powered trials.

31 32 33 What this study adds

34 This is a large, pragmatic randomised controlled trial of children with eczema (aged 1 to 11 years)
35 that recruited through primary care and followed up for 12 months.

36
37 We found no evidence of clinically meaningful benefit from emollient bath additives, when used in
38 addition to standard eczema management

39
40 Questions remain about optimal regimens for leave-on treatments, soap substitutes and frequency
41 of bathing in eczema.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

INTRODUCTION

Childhood eczema (synonyms atopic eczema, atopic dermatitis) is a common condition that can cause substantial impact on quality of life for both the child and their family.(1) Guidelines suggest that 'complete emollient therapy' form the mainstay of treatment for eczema and should be used regularly with topical corticosteroids/calcineurin inhibitors, used in addition for flare-ups.(2)

Emollients are thought to act by providing a barrier over the skin, decreasing moisture loss and protecting against skin irritants. There are three methods of application: (1) leave-on emollients, where emollients are directly applied to the skin; (2) soap substitutes, where emollients are used instead of soap or other wash products; and (3) bath additives, which are oil and/or emulsifiers designed to be added to bath water and thought to leave a film of oil over the skin. Some emollients can be used in more than one way. We therefore use the term 'emollient bath additives' or 'bath additives' rather than 'bath emollients' in order to emphasise the differences between the three methods of application in recognition that products may have more than one method of application.

While there is evidence for the need for leave-on emollients(3) and widespread clinical consensus around soap substitutes, there is less agreement regarding the potential additional benefits of bath additives (4) and there is a dearth of evidence of their effectiveness. Systematic reviews have found no evidence of their effectiveness and one small study suggested they may worsen eczema outcomes.(5) However, bath additives are widely prescribed at a cost of over £23 million per year to the NHS in England.(6)

We sought to determine the clinical and cost-effectiveness of including emollient bath additives in the standard management of childhood eczema.

METHODS

This was a pragmatic, multicentre, randomised open-label superiority trial with two parallel groups allocated in a 1:1 ratio comparing emollient bath additives in addition to standard eczema care versus standard care alone for childhood eczema. We chose a pragmatic design (7) that aimed to test whether bath additives offer additional benefit in real life eczema care rather than in ideal experimental conditions. The study was registered before recruitment of the first participant, and the study protocol has been published.(8) BATHE was approved by the Newcastle & North Tyneside Research Ethics Committee 1 on 8th May 2014 (Ref: 14/NE/0098)

Children eligible for the trial were aged over 12 months and less than 12 years and fulfilled UK Diagnostic Criteria for Atopic Dermatitis.(9) Children with inactive or very mild eczema over the last 12 months were excluded, defined as a score of 5 or less on Nottingham Eczema Severity Scale (scale from 3 to 15, where 3 to 8 is mild; 9 to 11 is moderate; and 12 to 15 is severe).(10) Children who usually bathed less than once a week or whose carers were not willing to accept randomisation were also excluded. Only one child was enrolled per family.

Participants were recruited from 96 general practices in Wales, West of England and Southern England. We used practices' medical records to identify children who had a recorded diagnosis of eczema and who had obtained one or more prescriptions for eczema in the past 12 months. General practice staff also recruited potential participants opportunistically. Parents/carers were asked to return a reply slip to the study team. A brief screening questionnaire included the UK Diagnostic Criteria for Atopic Dermatitis and the Nottingham Eczema Severity Scale. A researcher telephoned parents/carers who expressed an interest in the study to confirm likely eligibility and arrange a

1
2
3 baseline appointment at which time informed consent was sought and baseline questionnaires were
4 completed. Subsequent questionnaires were completed online or by post with no further face-to-
5 face contact between the participants and the trial team. Informed consent was received for trial
6 participants prior to enrolment.
7
8
9

10 Interventions

11 The intervention group were prescribed bath additives by their GP surgery and were asked to use
12 them regularly for 12 months. We encouraged practices to issue the three bath additives most
13 frequently prescribed in the UK: Oilatum (Glaxo SmithKline; 63% light liquid paraffin), Balneum
14 (Allmarall Ltd.; 85% soya oil) or Aveeno (Johnson & Johnson Ltd; no Summary of Product
15 Characteristics available). Other bath additives could be issued, with the exception of products
16 containing antimicrobials, which were excluded as they have been shown to have greater irritant
17 effect than other bath additives.(11) The control group were not prescribed bath additives and were
18 asked not to use any bath additives for 12 months. Both groups were given standardised written
19 advice on how to wash, including the use of leave-on emollient as soap substitute. Both groups were
20 advised to continue with standard eczema management, including regular leave-on emollients and
21 topical corticosteroids when required. On-going clinical care was otherwise unchanged.
22
23
24
25

26 Outcomes

27
28 The primary outcome was eczema severity measured by Patient Oriented Eczema Measure (POEM)
29 reported by parent/carer weekly over 16 weeks.(12, 13) The POEM is a patient-reported outcome
30 which scores symptoms over the previous week. It consists of seven questions which can be
31 completed by the child's parent or carer and provides a severity score on a scale from 0 to 28, where
32 0 to 2 is clear/almost clear; 3 to 7 is mild; 8 to 16 is moderate; and 17 to 28 is severe.(11) The
33 published minimal clinically important difference of the POEM is 3 points.(14, 15) POEM was the
34 only patient-reported outcome measure for eczema to demonstrate validity and repeatability in a
35 systematic review and has been adopted as the preferred patient-reported outcome measure for
36 eczema symptoms internationally.(16, 17)
37
38

39 The relapsing and remitting nature of eczema means that repeated measures is a better reflection of
40 effect than follow-up assessment at a single timepoint.
41

42 Secondary outcomes included

- 43 • Eczema severity measured by POEM every 4 weeks from baseline to 52 weeks
- 44 • Disease-specific quality of life at 16 weeks and 1 year, measured by Dermatitis Family
45 Impact(18)
- 46 • Generic quality of life at 16 weeks and 1 year, measured by Child Health Utility 9D(19)
- 47 • Number of eczema exacerbations resulting in a primary healthcare consultation over 1 year
48 (GP notes review)
- 49 • Type (strength) and quantity of topical corticosteroid/calcineurin inhibitors prescribed over
50 1 year (GP notes review)
- 51 • Resource use from GP notes review and parent/carer questionnaires
52
53

54 Other outcomes:

- Adherence to treatment allocation (parent/carer report)
- Adverse effects, such as stinging, redness, slipping or bath refusal (parent/carer report)

Sample size

The sample size was calculated for repeated measures ANOVA in weekly POEM scores over 16 weeks. Using weekly data from a similar population in the SWET trial(20) we aimed to detect a mean difference of 2.0 (s.d. 7.0) between intervention and control groups. Although the published minimal clinically important difference for POEM is 3,(14, 15) we sought to detect a difference of 2 due to the expectation of low POEM scores at baseline in a population recruited entirely through primary care. An alpha of 0.05 and power 0.9, with a correlation between repeated measures of 0.70, gave a sample size of 338. Allowing for 20% loss to follow-up gave a total sample size of 423 participants.

Early data showed that approximately 80% of participants in both groups reported adherence to treatment allocation. Therefore, in order to allow a per protocol analysis with 90% power, in addition to the primary intention to treat analysis, we sought and obtained approval for an ethics amendment requesting permission to recruit an additional 68 participants, giving a revised target of 491 participants. There were no other protocol changes.

Randomisation

Participants who provided consent were randomly allocated in 1:1 ratio to the intervention or control groups, stratified by co-ordinating centre (Southampton, Bristol, Cardiff). Randomisations were conducted at the end of the recruitment appointment, following completion of consent and baseline questionnaire so that treatment allocation could not be known prior to study entry.

Randomisation was carried out using LifeGuide software hosted at the University of Southampton and automated to ensure concealment. As baseline appointments were sometimes remote from internet access, a back-up randomisation system involved phoning the trial manager. Unique participant identifier was then entered into a spreadsheet that allocated treatment on a 1:1 ratio, stratified by co-ordinating centre, from a MS Excel spreadsheet pre-programmed by the Trial Statistician. 30 randomisations were conducted using this offline method.

It was not possible to make a convincing placebo for emollient bath additives, which add a greasy film to water, and participating families were therefore not blind to treatment allocation. As all outcomes were either participant-reported or collected on clinical record review template, we did not mask Clinical Study Officers/Research Nurses to allocation. Statisticians carrying out the analyses were blind to treatment allocation.

Statistical methods

Analysis was conducted according to CONSORT guidelines, following an analysis plan agreed in advance with the independent Trial Steering/Data monitoring Committee. We used descriptive statistics to compare baseline characteristics of trial participants by allocated group. The primary analysis for the total POEM score was performed using a multilevel mixed model framework with

1
2
3 observations over time from weeks 1 through to 16 (level 1) nested within participants (level 2). Our
4 primary outcome is based on adjusted results, controlling for baseline POEM, recruiting centre and
5 any significant confounders. We also report unadjusted results.
6

7 For all models, participants were analysed in the group to which they were randomised, regardless
8 of their adherence to that allocation (intention to treat analysis). The only exception to this was the
9 per-protocol analysis, where analyses were carried out on the basis of bath additive use as reported
10 by parent/carer.
11

12 The model used all the observed data and made the assumption that missing POEM scores are
13 missing at random given the observed data. The model included a random effect for centre (random
14 intercept) and patient (random intercept and slope on time) to allow for between-patient and
15 between-centre differences at baseline and between-patient differences in the rate of change over
16 time (if a treatment/time interaction was significant), and fixed effects for baseline covariates. An
17 unstructured covariance matrix was used.
18

19 For the analysis of secondary outcomes, repeated measures analysis in line with that used for the
20 primary outcome was used for the monthly POEM measure up to 1 year. For other secondary
21 outcomes, linear regression was used for continuous outcomes if the assumptions were met.
22 Otherwise non-parametric analyses were used. Logistic regression was used for dichotomous
23 outcomes and a suitable count model, as determined by goodness of fit measures, for count data. All
24 analyses controlled for stratification variables and potential confounders. Pre-planned sensitivity
25 analysis and exploratory subgroup analyses were carried out as set out in the Statistical Analysis Plan.
26 The economic evaluation used resource use, cost and effectiveness data collected from participants
27 and GP notes review.
28
29
30
31

32 Patient and public involvement (PPI)

33
34 The James Lind Alliance Priority Setting Partnership for Eczema top 10 included priorities around
35 bathing/washing and around the best ways to use emollients.⁽²¹⁾ This trial was funded by NIHR
36 Health Technology Assessment commissioned call following a topic suggestion form submitted
37 through their website.
38

39 The trial management group included an experienced PPI co-applicant (AR) who participated in all
40 phases of trial design, including planning recruitment and recruitment materials. Members of the
41 Centre of Evidence Based Dermatology Patient Panel were also consulted at trial design stage and
42 additional PPI representation was also sought when planning how to disseminate findings. The
43 independent trial steering committee included a PPI member.
44

45 The results will be emailed to all trial participants and published on the trial website.
46

47 The burden of the intervention was minimal, with many families already familiar with using bath
48 additives with no difficulty.
49

50 RESULTS

51 Participants were recruited between December 2014 and May 2016. Invitations were sent to the
52 parents/carers of 12,504 children and 1,451 responses were received. Of these, 920 expressed a
53 willingness to be contacted and included a completed screening questionnaire. 662 met eligibility
54 criteria and were approached regarding participation and 483 entered the trial. One carer
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

subsequently withdrew permission so analysis was carried out on data from 482 participants (n = 264 intervention group, n = 218 control group) (see Figure 1).

Table 1 shows the characteristics of participants in the trial. It can be seen that they were well balanced at baseline, although there were more participants allocated to the bath additive group than the no bath additive group.

Figure 1: Consort diagram – see PDF

Confidential: For Review Only

Table 1: Baseline characteristics of trial participants

		Bath additive (n=264)	No bath additive (n=218)	Total (n =482)
Child age (years)	Mean (s.d.)	5.4 (2.9)	5.2 (2.9)	5.3 (2.9)
Child gender				
	Male	138/264 (52.3%)	100/218 (45.9%)	238/482 (49.4%)
	Female	126/264 (47.7%)	118/218 (54.1%)	244/482 (50.6%)
Carer age (years)	Mean (s.d.)	36.5 (6.5)	35.9 (6.7)	36.2 (6.5)
Carer gender				
	Male	11/258 (4.3%)	12/212 (5.7%)	23/470 (4.9%)
	Female	247/258 (95.7%)	200/212 (94.3%)	447/470 (95.1%)
Ethnicity				
	White	228/257 (86.0%)	176/215 (81.9%)	397/472 (84.1%)
	Black	6/257 (1.9%)	9/215 (4.2%)	15/472 (3.2%)
	Asian	15/257 (5.8%)	16/215 (7.4%)	31/472 (6.6%)
	Mixed race	10/257 (3.9%)	9/215 (4.2%)	19/472 (4.0%)
	Chinese	2/257 (0.8%)	3/215 (1.4%)	5/472 (1.1%)
	Other	3/257 (1.2%)	2/215 (0.9%)	5/472 (1.1%)
Highest qualification				
	Not answered	6/257 (2.3%)	3/213 (1.4%)	9/470 (1.9%)
	Degree or equivalent	106/257 (41.3%)	90/213 (42.3%)	197/470 (41.7%)
	Diploma or equivalent	56/257 (21.8%)	37/213 (17.4%)	95/470 (19.8%)
	A-level	25/257 (9.7%)	24/213 (11.3%)	49/470 (10.4%)
	GCSE/O-level	50/257 (19.5%)	38/213 (17.8%)	88/470 (18.7%)
	Other	12/257 (4.7%)	16/213 (7.5%)	29/470 (6.0%)
	None	2/257 (0.8%)	5/213 (2.4%)	7/470 (1.5%)
Cost of Living				
	Not answered	7/257 (2.7%)	3/213 (1.4%)	10/470 (2.1%)
	Finding it a strain	11/257 (4.3%)	3/213 (1.4%)	14/470 (3.0%)
	Have to be careful	105/257 (40.9%)	82/213 (38.5%)	187/470 (39.8%)
	Able to manage	99/257 (38.5%)	90/213 (42.3%)	189/470 (40.2%)
	Quite comfortable	35/257 (13.6%)	35/213 (16.4%)	70/470 (14.9%)
Prior belief in bath additives (1-9) ^a		5.1 (2.2)	4.8 (2.3)	5.0 (2.3)
POEM scores (0-28)				
	Mean (sd)	9.5 (5.7)	10.1 (5.8)	9.8 (5.8)
	Mild (0-7)	114 (43.2%)	73 (33.5%)	187 (38.8%)
	Moderate (8-16)	119 (45.1%)	114 (52.3%)	233 (48.3%)
	Severe (17-28)	31 (11.7%)	31 (14.2%)	62 (12.9%)
DFIQ score (0-30)	Median (IQR)	2 (1,6)	3 (1,7)	3 (1,7)
NESS score (3-15)	Mean (sd)	9.5 (2.3)	9.5 (2.3)	9.5 (2.3)
CHU-9D score (Utility values)	Mean (sd)	0.90 (0.1)	0.90 (0.1)	0.90 (0.1)

^a where 1 is 'not at all effective' and 9 is 'very effective'

461/482 (95.6%) participants had completed at least one POEM following baseline and were included in the primary analysis, and 76.8% (370/482) completed more than 80% of the time points for the primary outcome (12/16 weekly questionnaires to 16 weeks).

Parent/carer report of adherence to treatment allocation group at 16 weeks showed 92.7% (216/233) of participants in the bath additive group using bath additive 'every time' or 'more than half the time'. Similarly, 92.1% (176/191) of those in the no bath additive group said that they used bath additive either 'never' or 'less than half the time' (see table 2).

Table 2: Adherence to allocated treatment and frequency of bathing during the 16-week primary outcome period

	Bath additive	No bath additive
Use of bath additives:	(n=233)	(n=191)
Every time	172 (73.8%)	14 (7.3%)
More than half the time	44 (18.9%)	1 (0.5%)
Less than half the time	15 (6.4%)	9 (4.7%)
Never	2 (0.9%)	167 (87.4%)
Number of baths per week:	(n=221)	(n=176)
1-2	70 (31.7%)	54 (30.7%)
3-4	74 (33.5%)	56 (31.8%)
5-6	45 (20.4%)	39 (22.2%)
7 or more	32 (14.5%)	27 (15.3%)

Parent/carer report regarding frequency of bathing were: 31.2% (124/397) fewer than three baths per week; 32.7% (130/397) three or four baths per week; 36.0% (143/397) 5 or more baths per week.

Of participants allocated to receive bath additives, 45.2% (120/265) received Oilatum Junior bath additive, 25.7% (68/265) received Aveeno bath oil, 4.5% (12/265) received Balneum bath oil and 29.8% (79/265) received an other bath additive. (14 received more than one different bath additive during the study).

The Baseline POEM score was 9.5 (s.d. 5.7) in the bath additives group and 10.1 (s.d. 5.8) in the no bath additives group. The mean POEM score over the 16 week period was 7.5 (s.d. 6.0) in the bath additives group and 8.4 (6.0) in the no bath additives group. There was no statistically significant difference in weekly POEM scores between the two groups over the 16-week period. After controlling for baseline severity and confounders (ethnic group, topical corticosteroid use, and soap substitute use) and allowing for the clustering of participants within centres and responses within participants over time, the POEM score in the no bath additive group was 0.41 points higher than in the bath additive group (95% CI -0.27 to 1.10), which is substantially lower than the published minimal clinically important difference of 3 points.(14, 15)

Figure 2: POEM scores during the 16-week primary outcome period – see PDF

Secondary analyses looking at differences between groups based on adherence to treatment allocation (per protocol analysis) similarly showed no statistically significant difference between the groups on POEM 16 weeks repeated measures: 'More than half' or 'every time' vs. 'less than half the time' or 'never' adjusted difference in mean POEM 0.32 (95% CI -0.37 to 1.02).

There were no significant differences between groups in any of the secondary outcomes, such as POEM over 52 weeks (adjusted difference in mean POEM 0.75 (95%CI -0.05 to 1.55), Dermatitis Family Impact, generic quality of life (Child Health Utility 9D), number of eczema exacerbations and type /quantity of topical corticosteroid/calcineurin inhibitors prescribed over 1 year.

Table 3: Secondary outcomes by treatment allocation

	Bath additive Mean (s.d.)	No bath additive Mean (s.d)	Univariate difference in mean POEM (95% CI)	Adjusted difference in mean POEM (95% CI)
Monthly repeated measures				
Over the 52 week period (repeated measures)	7.3 (6.3)	8.4 (6.4)	0.99 (0.03 to 1.96)	0.75 (-0.05 to 1.55)
Secondary outcome – Disease-specific QOL				
	Bath additive Median (IQR)	No bath additive Median (IQR)	Univariate difference in median DFIQ (95% CI)	Adjusted difference in median DFIQ (95% CI)
DFIQ at baseline	2 (1,6)	3 (1,7)		
DFIQ at 16 weeks	2 (0,5)	3 (1,7)	1.00 (0.09 to 1.91)	0.29 (-0.57 to 1.14)
DFIQ at 52 weeks	2 (0,5)	2 (0,6)	0.00 (-0.93 to 0.93)	-0.29 (-1.36 to 0.79)
Secondary outcome – quantity of TCS/TCI* prescribed				
Total number of TCS/TCI prescriptions	325	346		
Median number of TCS/TCI prescriptions	0 (0,2)	1 (0,3)		
Secondary outcome – Exacerbations				
			Univariate RR exacerbations (95% CI)	Adjusted RR (95% CI)
Number of exacerbations	1 (0,2)	1 (0,3)	1.33 (1.02 to 1.75)	1.24 (0.96 to 1.60)

*TCS/TCI denotes topical corticosteroid or topical calcineurin inhibitor

Pre-specified exploratory subgroup analyses suggested the possibility of a small effect of bath additives amongst children aged less than 5 years, as the no bath additive group had a POEM score 1.29 (95% CI 0.33 to 2.25) points higher than the group with bath additives. However, the upper

1
2
3 limit of the confidence interval is below the now widely accepted POEM minimal clinically important
4 difference of 3 points.
5

6 A significant interaction effect was also seen by frequency of bathing as reported at 16 weeks. There
7 was no statistically significant difference in those children who bathed 1 to 4 times per week.
8

9 However, in those children who bathed 5 or more times per week, the POEM score was 2.27 points
10 higher (95% CI 0.63 to 3.91) in the no bath additive group. The upper confidence interval suggests
11 there may be a small clinically meaningful benefit to bath additives in this group. But this is group
12 has only 77 in the bath additive group and 66 in the no bath additive group (See table 4).
13
14

15 Interestingly, there was no apparent difference in outcomes for those with moderate or severe
16 eczema.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 4: POEM scores during the 16-week primary outcome period, by group and subgroup

Primary outcome – 16 week repeated measures	N (%)	Bath additive Mean (sd)	No bath additive Mean (sd)	Interaction term	Adjusted difference in mean POEM ^a (95% CI)
<i>Age:</i>				-1.43 (-2.02 to -0.15)	
Below age 5 years	256 (53.1%)	6.99 (5.67)	9.09 (6.01)		1.29 (0.33 to 2.25)
Age 5+ years	226 (46.9%)	7.97 (6.24)	7.52 (5.92)		-0.29 (-1.21 to 0.63)
<i>Baseline severity:</i>				-0.05 (-1.14 to 1.05)	
Clear/mild (0-7)	187 (38.8%)	4.78 (4.26)	5.22 (4.58)		-0.07 (-1.08 to 0.95)
Moderate (8-16)	233 (48.3%)	8.14 (5.54)	9.18 (5.46)		0.65 (-0.45 to 1.74)
Severe/very severe	62 (12.9%)	14.63 (6.16)	13.03 (6.92)		-1.16 (-3.62 to 1.32)
<i>Use of leave-on emollient:</i>				-0.02 (-2.05 to 2.01)	
0-4 days per week	138 (28.6%)	7.64 (6.68)	6.43 (5.42)		0.26 (-1.34 to 1.86)
5-7 days per week	344 (71.4%)	8.61 (5.74)	7.93 (6.14)		0.69 (-0.39 to 1.76)
<i>Topical corticosteroid use:</i>				0.52 (-1.35 to 2.40)	
Any	241 (50.7%)	8.40 (6.19)	9.35 (6.21)		1.22 (-0.18 to 2.63)
None	234 (49.3%)	6.63 (5.64)	7.39 (5.66)		0.58 (-0.64 to 1.81)
<i>Frequency of bathing at 16 weeks:</i>				2.14 (0.21 to 4.07)	
1-4 times per week	255 (64.1%)	7.93 (5.94)	8.00 (5.82)		-0.26 (-1.38 to 0.87)
5+ times per week	143 (35.9%)	6.30 (5.70)	8.75 (6.12)		2.27 (0.63 to 3.91)
<i>Prior belief in bath additive:</i>				0.85 (-0.52 to 2.21)	
1-3 low belief	106 (29.4%)	7.93 (6.10)	9.27 (6.25)		1.17 (-0.78 to 3.13)
4-6 moderate belief	158 (43.8%)	8.37 (6.06)	8.68 (6.02)		-0.16 (-1.77 to 1.45)
7-9 high belief	97 (26.9%)	5.70 (5.06)	7.09 (6.05)		1.80 (0.04 to 3.56)
<i>Use of soap substitute at 16 weeks:</i>				1.30 (-0.97 to 3.57)	
Any	89 (20.8%)	8.09 (6.10)	9.31 (5.88)		1.72 (-0.44 to 3.88)
None	340 (79.3%)	7.17 (5.82)	7.99 (5.87)		0.36 (-0.63 to 1.35)

^a Adjusted for baseline severity, ethnic group, steroid use and soap substitute use and allowing for the clustering of patients within centres and responses within patients over time

Adverse effects were remarkably similar in both groups, despite slips in the bath, stinging or redness being common side effects reported in Summary of Product Characteristics for emollient bath additives. Over the first 16 weeks, 34.5% in the bath additive group and 35.4% in the no bath additive group reported at least one adverse event on weekly questionnaires (Table 5), with no statistically significant difference between the groups (OR 1.40 95% CI 0.79 to 2.47).

Table 5: Adverse events by treatment allocation

Adverse events – over 16 weeks	Bath additive (n=252)	No bath additive (n=209)
Slips	44 (17.5%)	52 (24.8%)
Stinging	4 (1.6%)	4 (1.9%)
Redness	35 (13.9%)	48 (23.0%)
Refuses a bath	21 (8.3%)	25 (12.0%)
Adverse events – over 52 weeks	Bath additive (n=252)	No bath additive (n=209)
Slips	56 (22.2%)	63 (30.1%)
Stinging	7 (2.8%)	4 (1.9%)
Redness	44 (17.5%)	61 (29.2%)
Refuses a bath	30 (11.9%)	31 (14.8%)

The economic evaluation followed a pre-specified analysis plan and explored resource utilisation from the health system (NHS) and family perspective. The mean annual costs to the NHS were estimated at £180.50 (s.d. 237.0) for the bath additives group and £166.12 (s.d. 293.0) for the no bath additives group. Similarly, the annual results for QALYs were 0.91 (s.d. 0.1) and 0.90 (s.d. 0.1) for the bath additives and the no bath additives group respectively. The difference in cost means was £14.38 (95% CI -33.45 to 62.21) and in QALY means was 0.00 (95% CI -0.01 to 0.02). The family-borne costs showed an annual higher spend within the no bath additives group of £51.37 (95% CI -15.74 to 118.49) and the adjusted difference was £47.56 (95% CI -18.07 to 113.19), none statistically significant. The economic analysis found no benefits that could be used to consider the intervention cost-effective.

DISCUSSION

Principal findings

This trial provides strong evidence that emollient bath additives provide minimal or no additional benefit beyond standard eczema care in the management of childhood eczema.

The BATHE trial was an adequately powered trial, with high follow-up rates and good adherence to trial intervention allocations. The study has strong external validity as it was pragmatic in design to reflect normal practice and, despite the relatively low response rate, participants were broadly reflective of children with eczema seen in primary care. We used a participant-reported outcome measure with good validity that has been accepted by international consensus.⁽¹⁵⁾ A participant-reported outcome could be biased in favour of finding a positive effect of trial intervention due to a perception of benefits of treatment. However, the negative result of the trial suggests that this was not the case.

Strengths and limitations of the study

This is the largest trial on the role of emollient bath additives to date and previous reviews of the literature have not been able to draw conclusions from existing small trials.⁽⁵⁾

1
2
3 We cannot exclude the possibility of a small benefit amongst children bathing more than 5 times per
4 week or amongst children aged less than 5 years but differences are sufficiently small to be unlikely
5 to be clinically useful. Furthermore, caution is needed in interpreting these underpowered subgroup
6 analyses as statistically significant results may arise because the data has been tested multiple times
7 rather than because a genuine difference exists between the groups.
8
9

10 Policy implications

11
12 These findings are timely for clinicians and prescribing advisers, as prescribing guidelines vary widely
13 in their advice regarding bath additive use(22) and pressure on budgets have led to formularies
14 becoming increasingly restrictive. Reviews have estimated that bath additives may contribute to up
15 to a third of the costs of eczema in the UK.(4) Our findings provide evidence that can contribute to
16 effective prescribing in this area, where there is currently very little research evidence to guide
17 decision-making. These findings are also useful for families with eczema as they have more certainty
18 about directing their efforts towards more effective treatments.
19
20
21
22

23 Conclusions

24 Our findings are only relevant to the use of emollient bath additives. More research is needed into
25 optimal regimens for other emollients, although there is strong evidence that regular use of leave-on
26 emollients prevents flare-ups in eczema(3) and there is widespread clinical consensus around the
27 role of emollients as soap substitutes.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Ethical approval

6 BATHE was approved by the Newcastle & North Tyneside Research Ethics Committee 1 on 8th May
7 2014 (Ref: 14/NE/0098)
8
9

10
11 Funding statement:

12 This project is funded by the National Institute for Health Research Health Technology Assessment
13 Programme (11/153/01) with additional financial support from NIHR Clinical Research Network
14 Service Support Costs. This trial will be published in full in the NIHR Journals Library.
15

16
17 The views and opinions expressed therein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect
18 those of the Health Technology Assessment Programme, NIHR, NHS or the Department of Health.
19

20 CC BY licence is required
21
22

23 Competing interests:

24 All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf
25 and declare: no support from any organisation other than the NIHR for the submitted work; no
26 financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in the submitted work; no
27 other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.
28
29
30

31
32 Data sharing statement:

33 Data sharing: no additional data available.
34
35
36

37 Transparency

38
39 The lead author (MS) affirms that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of
40 the study being reported; that no important aspects of the study have been omitted; and that any
41 discrepancies from the study as planned and registered have been explained.
42

43 Copyright Statement

44
45 *"The Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of*
46 *all authors, [a worldwide licence](#) to the Publishers and its licensees in perpetuity, in all forms, formats*
47 *and media (whether known now or created in the future), to i) publish, reproduce, distribute, display*
48 *and store the Contribution, ii) translate the Contribution into other languages, create adaptations,*
49 *reprints, include within collections and create summaries, extracts and/or, abstracts of the*
50 *Contribution, iii) create any other derivative work(s) based on the Contribution, iv) to exploit all*
51 *subsidiary rights in the Contribution, v) the inclusion of electronic links from the Contribution to third*
52 *party material where-ever it may be located; and, vi) licence any third party to do any or all of the*
53 *above."*
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank all PPI contributors, families of participating children, practices, NIHR CRN Wessex, NIHR CRN West of England and NISCHR in Wales.

Contributorship

Research funding was obtained by MS, MJR, NAF, PL, KST, HCW, AR, BS, MC and WW. All authors contributed to the development of the protocol, and to the management of the study. KR led the day-to-day management of the study, supported by MS, MJR, NAF, WW and PL. This paper was drafted by MS, KR and BS with contributions from all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript. MS is guarantor.


Sponsor

The University of Southampton was the research sponsor for this trial


References

1. Chamlin SL, Frieden IJ, Williams ML, Chren M. Effects of atopic dermatitis on young American children and their families. *Pediatrics*. 2004;114(3):607-11.
2. Clinical guideline 57. Atopic eczema in under 12s: diagnosis and management. National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE), 2007.
3. van Zuuren EJ, Fedorowicz Z, Christensen R, Lavrijsen APM, Arents BWM. Emollients and moisturisers for eczema. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2017(2).
4. Bath emollients for atopic eczema: why use them? *Drug and therapeutics bulletin*. 2007;45(10):73-5.
5. Nankervis H, Thomas KS, Delamere FM, Barbarot S, Smith S, Rogers NK, et al. What is the evidence base for atopic eczema treatments? A summary of published randomized controlled trials. *British Journal of Dermatology*. 2017;176(4):910-27.
6. Bulletin 76: Cost effective prescribing of emollients. *Bulletin. PrescQIPP CIC*, 2015 28 May 2015. Report No.
7. Loudon K, Treweek S, Sullivan F, Donnan P, Thorpe KE, Zwarenstein M. The PRECIS-2 tool: designing trials that are fit for purpose. *BMJ : British Medical Journal*. 2015;350.
8. Santer M, Rumsby K, Ridd MJ, Francis NA, Stuart B, Chorozoglou M, et al. Bath additives for the treatment of childhood eczema (BATHE): protocol for multicentre parallel group randomised trial. *BMJ open*. 2015;5(10):e009575.
9. Williams HC, Burney PG, Hay RJ, Archer CB, Shipley MJ, Hunter JJ, et al. The U.K. Working Party's Diagnostic Criteria for Atopic Dermatitis. I. Derivation of a minimum set of discriminators for atopic dermatitis. *British Journal of Dermatology*. 1994;131(3):383-96.
10. Emerson RM, Charman CR, Williams HC. The Nottingham Eczema Severity Score: preliminary refinement of the Rajka and Langeland grading. *British Journal of Dermatology*. 2000;142(2):288-97.
11. Ling TC, Hight AS. Irritant reactions to an antiseptic bath emollient. *Journal of Dermatological Treatment*. 2000;11(4):263-7.
12. Charman C, Venn AJ, Williams HC. The patient-oriented eczema measure: development and initial validation of a new tool for measuring atopic eczema severity from the patients' perspective. *Archives of dermatology*. 2004;140 (12):1513-9.

- 1
2
3 13. Charman CR, Venn AJ, Ravenscroft JC, Williams HC. Translating Patient-Oriented Eczema
4 Measure (POEM) scores into clinical practice by suggesting severity strata derived using anchor-
5 based methods. *British Journal of Dermatology*. 2013;169(6):1326-32.
- 6 14. Schram ME, Spuls PI, Leeftang MM, Lindeboom R, Bos JD, Schmitt J. EASI, (objective)
7 SCORAD and POEM for atopic eczema: responsiveness and minimal clinically important difference.
8 *Allergy*. 2012;67(1):99-106.
- 9 15. Gaunt DM, Metcalfe C, Ridd M. The Patient-Oriented Eczema Measure in young children:
10 responsiveness and minimal clinically important difference. *Allergy*. 2016.
- 11 16. Spuls PI, Gerbens LAA, Simpson E, Apfelbacher CJ, Chalmers JR, Thomas KS, et al. Patient-
12 Oriented Eczema Measure (POEM), a core instrument to measure symptoms in clinical trials: a
13 Harmonising Outcome Measures for Eczema (HOME) statement. *British Journal of Dermatology*.
14 2017;176(4):979-84.
- 15 17. Chalmers J, Simpson E, Apfelbacher C, Thomas K, Kobyletzki Lv, Schmitt J, et al. Report from
16 the fourth international consensus meeting to harmonize core outcome measures for atopic
17 eczema/dermatitis clinical trials (HOME initiative). *British Journal of Dermatology*. 2016;175(1):69-79.
- 18 18. Lawson V, Lewis-Jones MS, Finlay AY, Reid P, Owens RG. The family impact of childhood
19 atopic dermatitis: the Dermatitis Family Impact questionnaire. *British Journal of Dermatology*.
20 1998;138:107-13.
- 21 19. Stevens KJ, Brazier JE, McKenna SP, Doward LC, Cork MJ. The development of a preference-
22 based measure of health in children with atopic dermatitis. *British Journal of Dermatology*.
23 2005;153(2):372-7.
- 24 20. Thomas KS, Dean T, O'Leary C, Sach TH, Koller K, Frost A, et al. A randomised controlled trial
25 of ion-exchange water softeners for the treatment of eczema in children. *PLoS Medicine / Public*
26 *Library of Science*. 2011;8(2):e1000395.
- 27 21. Batchelor JM, Ridd MJ, Clarke T, Ahmed A, Cox M, Crowe S, et al. The Eczema Priority Setting
28 Partnership: a collaboration between patients, carers, clinicians and researchers to identify and
29 prioritize important research questions for the treatment of eczema. *British Journal of Dermatology*.
30 2013;168(3):577-82.
- 31 22. Chan J QP, Ridd M. A comparison of emollient prescribing guidelines for atopic eczema and
32 other dry skin conditions across Clinical Commissioning Groups in England. Society for Academic
33 Primary Care Annual Scientific Meeting; 12-14 July 2017; Warwick, UK2017.
- 34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



Preprint: For Review Only