

**NHS Foundation Trust** 



## **Diabetes and Steroids**

#### Prof Ketan Dhatariya MSc MD MS FRCP PhD Consultant in Diabetes and Endocrinology Norfolk and Norwich University Hospitals





**NHS Foundation Trust** 

## Glucocorticoids and Diabetes ?Issues

- Is it a problem?
- How to control hyperglycaemia associated with glucocorticoid use?

#### 375 ANDREAE VESALII BRVXELLENSIS

- Q.Q. His chavacteribus finifiræ lateris membrana notatur , quæilli correspondet , quam nuper0, O indicarunt.
- R<sub>2</sub>S Vteri ceruicis anterior pars, inter R & S ea adhuc obduela tunica, quam peritonæi partesil li offerit, quæ ipfiuafa exporrigunt, deducuntig, ac illum peritonæoadneellunt. Cæteriminter uallum inter R & S confiftens, uteri ceruicis amplitudinem quodammodo fignificat. Rugæve rô bic confirienæ, illæ funt quas uteri ceruix in fc collapfa, negs alids diftenta, inter fecandum commonfirat.
- T V esica, cuius posterior factes bic potifimum spectatur.ita enim in figura buius delineatione oca lum direximus, ac si in corpore prostrato, posteriorem uessica scadan qua uterum spectat, postfi mum cernere uolus scans, si cuim prassens muliebre corpus ita uti id quod modo subsequeux, se reclum arbitrateris, etiam secus ates resse babet, uteri fundum multo elatius ipsa uessica delinea tum essenses.
- V V mbilici est portio, à peritonæo inter secadum liberata, co und cum uafis factui peculiaribus bic deor fum reflexa. X Portio uenæ ab umbilico iecur petentis.
- Y Meatu's à ueficæ fundi elatifima fede ad umbilicum pertinens, ac fætus urinam inter fecundum & intimum ipflus inuolucrum deducens.
- Z, et T Due arterie ab umbilico huc fecundim uefice latera prorepentes, atqs hae fede magne arter riæ ramis pubis oßium foramina potifsimum adeuntibus infertæ, feu continuæ.

#### VIGESIMAQVINTA QVINTI LIBRI FIGVRA







## A Bit Of Background

- At any one time, ~0.75% of the UK population is on oral glucocorticoids (0.2% in 20-29 year olds, 2.5% in 70-79 year olds)
- 40% of glucocorticoid use is for respiratory disease, with most of the rest being musculoskeletal and cutaneous diseases and conditions requiring immunosuppression
- Most use is for <5 days, but 22% is for > 6 months and 4.3% for > 5 years





NNUH Audit

Between 10<sup>th</sup> February 2021 and 10<sup>th</sup> September 2021

• 3260 inpatients received oral or IV corticosteroids

 964 (30%) adult inpatients on Oral/IV steroids with blood glucose measurements



**NHS Foundation Trust** 

Number of Patients on Each Type of Corticosteroids



Limbachia V et al Clin Med 2024 ;24(6):100249





Patients with Hyperglycaemia while on steroids



Limbachia V et al Clin Med 2024 ;24(6):100249



# Mean differences in blood glucose concentrations of different steroid classes with 95% confidence interval across seven days

Study Drugs	Mean Difference, mmol/L	95% CI	Ρ
Dexamethasone vs hydrocortisone	0.92	0.45 to 1.38	0.0007
Dexamethasone vs prednisolone	1.11	0.79 to 1.43	<0.0001
Dexamethasone vs methylprednisolone	-0.41	-1.02 to 0.21	0.7216
Hydrocortisone vs prednisolone	0.20	–0.22 to 0.61	0.9283
Hydrocortisone vs methylprednisolone	-1.33	-2.02 to -0.63	0.0011
Methylprednisolone vs prednisolone	1.52	0.91 to 2.13	<0.0001

CBG = Capillary Blood Glucose



# Mean differences in blood glucose concentrations of different steroid classes with 95% confidence interval across seven days

Study Drugs	Mean Difference, mmol/L	95% CI	Р
Dexamethasone vs hydrocortisone	0.92	0.45 to 1.38	0.0007
Dexamethasone vs prednisolone	1.11	0.79 to 1.43	<0.0001
Dexamethasone vs methylprednisolone	-0.41	-1.02 to 0.21	0.7216
Hydrocortisone vs prednisolone	0.20	–0.22 to 0.61	0.9283
Hydrocortisone vs methylprednisolone	–1.33	-2.02 to -0.63	0.0011
Methylprednisolone vs prednisolone	1.52	0.91 to 2.13	<0.0001

CBG = Capillary Blood Glucose CI= confidence interval

Limbachia V et al Clin Med 2024 ;24(6):100249



30% had capillary blood glucose monitoring



Dexamethasone or methylprednisolone use was associated with greater hyperglycaemia



Dexamethasone or methylprednisolone require more vigorous glucose monitoring

Limbachia V et al Clin Med 2024 ;24(6):100249



**NHS Foundation Trust** 

# How do Glucocorticoids Affect Carbohydrate Metabolism?



Geer EB et al Endocrinol Metab Clin North Am 2014;43(1):75-102





## How do Glucocorticoids Affect Carbohydrate Metabolism?

- They promote visceral adipose tissue deposition
- Enhance lipolysis
- Alter levels of adipose tissue derived hormones and cytokines
- Acutely increases hepatic glucose production
- Complex effects on β-cell function



Norfolk and Norwich University Hospitals **NHS Foundation Trust** 



## How do Glucocorticoids Affect Carbohydrate Metabolism?

- In the longer term induces insulin resistance •
  - Diminished ability of insulin to initiate intracellular signalling mechanisms in the liver, adipose, muscle
- Inhibits glucose uptake into muscle and reduced oxidative • phosphorylation
- Induction of hyperinsulinaemia, dyslipidaemia and the metabolic • syndrome

Saltiel AR et al Nature 2001;414:799-806 Hollingdal M et al Diabetologia 2002;45:49-55 Boyle PJ Diabetes Reviews 1993;1:301 Lambillotte C et al J Clin Invest 1997;99:414-423 Petersons CJ et al Diabetes Care 2013;36:2822-2829



**NHS Foundation Trust** 

## Inhibition of Glucose Uptake

- Starts very early after glucocorticoid ingestion
- In (previously well controlled) inpatients the earliest manifestation of this is postprandial hyperglycaemia





## Spectrum of Disease

- The hyperglycaemia may be a transient rise of blood glucose levels or may result in HHS
- The best predictors of glucocorticoid-induced diabetes are family history of diabetes, increasing age, and glucocorticoid dose





## Back to Oral Steroids

- A 52 year old lady who had a liver transplant for antibiotic induced acute liver failure 1 month previously was on 30mg prednisolone as part of her immunosuppressive regimen. The dose had recently been reduced to 20mg
- Her HbA<sub>1</sub>c was 50mmol/mol



**NHS Foundation Trust** 

#### Her Glucose Meter Download

	00:00	01:00	02:00	03:00	04:00	05:00	06:00	07:00	08:00	09:00	10:00	11:00	12:00	13:00	14:00	15:00	16:00	17:00	18:00	19:00	20:00	21:00	22:00	23:00	Daily totals
Su 2/12									6.1					7.2				15.3					9.5		Average (4): 9.5mmc
40 3/12									6.9					8.3				14.5					8.4		Average (4): 9.5mmc
Tu 4/12										5.5				11.7					14.1				12.4		Average (4): 10.9mmc
Ve 5/12									6.4					10.2				13.2					6.8		Average (4): 9.2mm
Th 6/12				8.9					4.8				5.6						18.7				13.0		Average (5): 10.2mm
Fr 7/12			7.0						4.6				7.4						17.7				12.9		Average (5): 9.9mm
Sa 8/12									4.8				6.9						14.4				14.9		Average (4): 10.3mm
Su 9/12									6.2					10.3					13.6					12.7	Average (4): 10.7mm
o 10/12									4.7				9.9						19.2				13.8		Average (4): 11.9mm
u 11/12									4.9					7.7				24.5					11.6		Average (4): 12.2mm
e 12/12								7.8					8.1						19.0				11.8		Average (4): 11.7mm
h 13/12									4.3				6.8						21.4				10.2		Average (4): 10.7mm
r 14/12									5.4					8.0					15.8				14.5		Average (4): 10.9mm
a 15/12									4.8					5.9				20.5					11.2		Average (4): 10.6mm
u 16/12									6.1					9.5					14.7				9.9		Average (4): 10.1mm
o 17/12									6.6				7.0					16.3					7.3		Average (4): 9.3mm
u 18/12									7.7				8.0							16.8				8.0	Average (4): 10.1mm
e 19/12									3.9				12.9						16.3				19.2		Average (4): 13.1mm
h 20/12									5.3					5.8				24.3					12.9		Average (4): 12.1mm
r 21/12										5.4				7.3					16.6						Average (3): 9.8mm
a 22/12										4.8				8.8					19.4				14.4		Average (4): 11.9mm
u 23/12										5.9				7.0				25.9					7.5		Average (4): 11.6mm
o 24/12										5.7				6.1					19.5				7.5		Average (4): 9.7mm
u 25/12										6.1					8.9					33.0			5.6		Average (4): 13.4mm
e 26/12											6.9				9.3					13.3					Average (3): 9.8mm
h 27/12	8.9									5.5				8.7					17.4						Average (4): 10.1mm
r 28/12										6.4				8.0				16.8					14.3		Average (4): 11.4mm
a 29/12										4.6				7.8					19.5						Average (3): 10.6mm
u 30/12										5.2				9.5						24.9				12.9	Average (4): 13.1mm
o 31/12										5.2			8.3												Average (2): 6.8mm
			N	umber	ofvalue	s: 117					v	alues a	bove go	al (9 mi	nol/L):	55			н	ighest	value (r	nmol/L)	: 33.0	(25/	12/2018 19:10)
				Value	e ner da	v. 39					Val	ues with	hin goal	(4-9 m)	nol/L)	61				owest	· value (r	nmol/L		(19/	12/2018 08:21)



# You May Have Seen This

#### Adjunct prednisone therapy for patients with communityacquired pneumonia: a multicentre, double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled trial



**NHS Foundation Trust** 

Claudine Angela Blum\*, Nicole Nigro\*, Matthias Briel, Philipp Schuetz, Elke Ullmer, Isabelle Suter-Widmer, Bettina Winzeler, Roland Bingisser, Hanno Elsaesser, Daniel Drozdov, Birsen Arici, Sandrine Andrea Urwyler, Julie Refardt, Philip Tarr, Sebastian Wirz, Robert Thomann, Christine Baumgartner, Hervé Duplain, Dieter Burki, Werner Zimmerli, Nicolas Rodondi, Beat Mueller, Mirjam Christ-Crain

785 Patients were randomly assigned (1:1 ratio) to receive either prednisone 50 mg daily for 7 days or placebo.

The prednisone group had a higher incidence of in-hospital hyperglycaemia needing insulin treatment (76 [19%] vs 43 [11%]; OR 1.96, 95% CI 1.31-2.93, p=0.0010).





Some Evidence of Harm

- 433 patients admitted with an exacerbation of COPD from St George's in Tooting in 01/02
- Absolute risk of adverse outcomes (death or prolonged stay) increased ~15% per 1 mmol/L increase in glucose

Glucose level (mmol/L)	<6.0	6.0 - 6.9	7.0 - 8.9	>9.0
Mortality (%)	11.6	15.9	21.3	31.0

Baker EH et al Thorax 2006;61(4):284-289

Chakrabarti B Thorax 2009;64(10):857-862



**NHS Foundation Trust** 



PDD: Previous Diagnosis of Diabetes

Limbachia V et al Clin Therapeutics 2024;46(2):e59-63



## Now We Know the Cause, What's the Treatment?

- Education and pre-empting the (almost) inevitable
- Letting teams know that when someone starts glucocorticoid treatment that blood glucose levels are very likely to rise and to watch for it
- When it happens, treat early

# This is likely to meet with quite a lot of resistance – so be prepared!



#### Apart From That, What's the Treatment?

- There is work to shown that the hyperglycaemia associated with long term glucocorticoid use is amenable to treatment with glitazones
- There is a complex interaction between glucocorticoids and PPAR signalling pathways – these are the therapeutic targets for the glitazones





But.....

- They work very slowly so may have been useful in an outpatient setting
- Several controversies abound regarding the use of glitazones, thus their use is declining
  - Increased CV death rates
  - Increased fracture rates
  - Increased rates of macular oedema
  - Bladder cancer

Nissen SE NEJM 2007;356(24):2457-2471 Loke YK et al CMAJ 2009;180(1):32-39 Ryan EH et al Retina 2006; 26(5):562-70 Ferwana M et al Diabetic Med 2013;30(9):1026-1032



NHS Foundation Trust

# Sulphonylureas

- Little published evidence but widely used
- We asked for examples of guidelines used at different hospitals and we got lots!
- All variations around a theme with some minor differences
- Most often used first line





#### **NHS Foundation Trust Don't Incretins Prevent Postprandial** Hyperglycaemia?

- They do, but GLP-1 use is limited by
  - Little experience in this setting
  - It makes people who are already unwell feel nauseated
  - Not appropriate for people who are NBM (??)
  - Safety concerns
- There are limited published data on the use of DPP-IV antagonists in this situation
  - e.g. Umpierrez using sitagliptin in 90 hospitalised patients



**NHS Foundation Trust** 

## The Best Treatment?

- Insulin is recommended in the US as the drug of choice for the treatment of glucocorticoid-induced hyperglycaemia
- Theoretically, prandial insulin should minimise the effects of the postprandial rise in glucose
- For patients receiving high-dose intravenous glucocorticoids, an intravenous insulin infusion may be appropriate





# No Surprises There Then

- The dose needed is difficult to predict
- Intravenous infusions tend to achieve acceptable blood glucose concentrations quicker than MDI
- In hospital, an insulin infusion allows appropriate tapering of insulin infusion rates
  - Glycaemic control is not compromised
  - Hypoglycaemic risks can be minimised especially with pulsed high dose glucocorticoids





## What About Subcutaneous Insulin?

- Clearly iv insulin is not the answer for outpatients
- Subcutaneous insulin needs higher prandial doses than basal
- No work has been done to compare human with analogue insulin



**NHS Foundation Trust** 

## Where's the Evidence?

- Naturally, there isn't any
- But there is evidence that hyperglycaemia in a hospital setting (for any cause) is associated with poor mortality, morbidity, and health economic outcomes
- Improving glycaemic control improves these outcomes

Umpierrez GE et al J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2002; 87:978–982 Bruno A et al Diabetes Care 2008;31(11):2209-2210 Dhatariya K BMJ 2013;346:f134





## What Should the Targets Be?

- Targets similar to those of outpatients are unrealistic in hospital due to the effects of
  - Stress hyperglycaemia
  - Altered nutritional intake
  - Multiple interruptions to medical care
- Aiming for a range of 6.0 10.0 mmol/L with an acceptable range of 4.0 12.0 mmol/L if they can be safely achieved
- For end-of-life care, a range of 6.0 15.0 mmol/L is acceptable



**NHS Foundation Trust** 

**DIABETIC**Medicine

DOI: 10.1111/dme.13675

#### **Diabetes UK Position Statements**

#### Management of hyperglycaemia and steroid (glucocorticoid) therapy: a guideline from the Joint British Diabetes Societies (JBDS) for Inpatient Care group

A. Roberts<sup>1</sup>, J. James<sup>2</sup> and K. Dhatariya<sup>3</sup>, on behalf of the Joint British Diabetes Societies (JBDS) for Inpatient Care\*

<sup>1</sup>Cardiff and Vale University Local Health Board, Cardiff, UK, <sup>2</sup>University Hospitals Leicester NHS Trust, Leicester, UK and <sup>3</sup>Norfolk and Norwich University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Norwich, UK

Accepted 12 May 2018



Roberts A et al Diabetic Medicine 2018;35(8):1011-1017



**NHS Foundation Trust** 



A If unsure at any stage about next steps or want specific advice on how to meet with the individuals needs or expectations please discuss with the team who usually looks after their diabetes (GP/Specialist Team). Discharge - monitoring will need to be continued in people remaining on glucocorticoids post discharge



**NHS Foundation Trust** 

Patients



Sudlow A et al Practical Diabetes 2017;34(4):117-121



**NHS Foundation Trust** 

#### **Specialties**

Surgical speciality	Total number of cases	Number given dex (%)	Mean dose of dex (mg) (±SD)
General	91	66	7.1 (1.5)
Gynaecology	54	27	7.4 (1.0)
ENT	11	8	8.0 (0)
Vascular	20	9	7.1 (1.3)
Ortho	95	60	7.3 (1.4)
Dental	7	7	6.2 (2.3)
Urology	36	24	6.8 (1.8)
Thoracic	6	5	7.2 (0.8)
Paediatric	20	18	3.0 (1.5)
Plastics	11	10	6.9 (1.7)
Cardio	4	0	0 (0)
Totals	355	234 (66)	





#### **Pre-operatively**

- Only 14 of the 24 patients known to have diabetes had a preoperative glucose level measured
- Only 15 of the 24 had a pre-operative HbA1c available within 3 months
  - 1 person who did not have diabetes had an HbA1c measured
- 11 patients were already on long term glucocorticoid therapy





## **Post-operatively**

- Only 16 people (4.5%) had their blood glucose levels checked during the 24 hours post operatively
  - All of these patients had diabetes.
  - 2 patients who had diabetes and who were given dexamethasone did not have a glucose level measured
  - 8 patients with diabetes did not have a post-operative glucose level measured



**NHS Foundation Trust** 

#### One of My Favourite Subjects

Dexamethasone



**NHS Foundation Trust** 

Why?

#### • Possibly because a few years I wrote this...

British Journal of Anaesthesia **110** (5): 674–5 (2013) doi:10.1093/bja/aet010

**EDITORIAL II** 

# Does dexamethasone-induced hyperglycaemia contribute to postoperative morbidity and mortality?

K. Dhatariya\*

Endocrinology and General (Internal) Medicine, Elsie Bertram Diabetes Centre, Norfolk and Norwich University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Colney Lane, Norwich NR4 7UY, UK

\* E-mail: ketan.dhatariya@nnuh.nhs.uk

Dhatariya K BJA 2013;110(5):674-675





#### Which Was Discredited by This

The NEW ENGLAND JOURNAL of MEDICINE

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

#### Dexamethasone and Surgical-Site Infection

# Or was it?

Kate Leslie, M.D., Matthew T.V. Chan, Ph.D., David Story, M.D., Timothy G. Short, M.D., Catherine Martin, Ph.D., Pauline Coutts, P.Grad.Dip.N., and Kwok M. Ho, Ph.D., for the PADDI Investigators, the Australian and New Zealand College of Anaesthetists Clinical Trials Network, and the Australasian Society for Infectious Diseases Clinical Research Network\*

#### Corcoran TB et al NEJM 2021;384(18):1731-1781





#### It Works!

- RR 0.48 for reducing PONV
  - 0.56 for ondansetron
  - 0.67 for cyclazine
  - 0.62 for droperidol
- Effect is additive when given with other anti-emetics

   and it is long acting
- **P**ost-operative pain & swelling = earlier discharge

Carlisle J et al Cochrane Database. http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/14651858.CD004125.pub2/pdf. Henzi I et al Anesthesia and Analgesia 2000;90(1):186-194 Kakodkar PS Anaesthesia 2013;68(9):889-891



NHS Foundation Trust

#### But There May be Problems

- It may impair haemostasis and wound healing
- It is associated with psychological disturbance
- The hypothalamic pituitary adrenal axis may be affected for up to a week (it is a very long half life drug)
- It causes a rise in blood glucose



**NHS Foundation Trust** 







#### Back to Corcoran

# Of these 8725 patients, 1148 (13.2%) had diabetes mellitus, and 1116 (97.2%) had type 2 diabetes (Table 1).

Preoperative laboratory data		
Median glycated hemoglobin level (IQR) — % $ ho$		
Patients without diabetes	5.4 (5.2–5.7)	5.4 (5.2–5.7)
Patients with diabetes	6.8 (6.1–7.5)	6.6 (6.1–7.4)

Corcoran TB et al NEJM 2021;384(18):1731-1781



**NHS Foundation Trust** 

#### So Perhaps This Result is Unsurprising

Subgroup	Dexamethasone	Placebo	Risk Difference (95.6% CI)	
	no. of patien	ts/total no. (%)		
All patients	354/4350 (8.1)	394/4328 (9.1)		-0.9 (-2.1 to 0.3)
Diabetes status				
No	289/3767 (7.7)	314/3757 (8.4)		-0.7 (-2.0 to 0.6)
Yes	65/583 (11.1)	80/571 (14.0)		-2.9 (-6.9 to 1.0)
		_	-8.0 -6.0 -4.0 -2.0 0.0 2.0 4.0	6.0 8.0
			Dexamethasone Better Placebo Be	etter

- They had good pre-op glycaemic control
- They were (probably) being attended to more often

Corcoran TB et al NEJM 2021;384(18):1731-1781



# Have I Been Maliciously Maligning Dexamethasone Unnecessarily?



Peto Odds Ratio

Weight

**NHS Foundation Trust** 

#### 2018 Cochrane Review – Wound Infection

Peto Odds Ratio

		ethasone			-		
		n/N	n/N	Peto, Flxed, 95% CI		Peto, Fixed, 95% CI	
Sindle dose>	1.2.1 Single dose of dexamethasone						
5	Abukawa 2017	0/15	1/8 🔶	•	0.31%	0.06[0,3.46]	
	Backes 2013	0/42	0/37			Not estimable	
	Bisgaard 2003	1/40	1/40		0.67%	1[0.06,16.27]	
	Bjornholdt 2014	0/26	0/22			Not estimable	
	Chol 2013	0/40	0/40			Not estimable	
	Corocan 2017	3/12	3/10		1.55%	0.79[0.12,4.95]	
	Cortes-Flores 2018	0/40	0/40			Not estimable	
	Doksrod 2012	0/40	3/40		196	0.13[0.01,1.27]	
_	DREAMS trial collaborators	69/674	67/676	+	41.82%	1.04[0.73,1.48]	
Favoure	Feroci 2011	0/51	0/51			Not estimable	Lavoure nlacabo
i avouis	Ionescu 2014	0/22	0/20			Not estimable	
	Kawanishi 2014	0/10	0/12			Not estimable	
davamathaaana	Kirdak 2008	0/14	5/13		1.44%	0.09[0.01,0.58]	
uexamemasone	Klelf 2017	3/59	2/57	—— <del>—</del>	1.65%	1.46[0.25,8.7]	
	Koh 2013	1/135	1/134		0.68%	0.99[0.06,15.95]	
	Kurz 2015	50/283	50/272	-	28.05%	0.95[0.62,1.47]	
	Nielsen 2015	7/62	0/50	+	2.24%	6.75[1.46,31.24]	
	Rafiq 2014	1/77	2/74		1.01%	0.49[0.05,4.77]	
	Sanchez-Rodriguez 2010	0/105	0/105			Not estimable	
	Schletroma 2010	1/41	1/41		0.67%	1[0.06,16.27]	
	Wakasugi 2015	7/136	5/134		3.93%	1.39[0.44,4.43]	
•	WornI 2008	0/37	0/35			Not estimable	· · · · · ·
	Zargar-Shoshtari 2009	6/29	10/31		4.07%	0.56[0.18,1.74]	
	Zhou 2012	0/100	0/50			Not estimable	
	Subtotal (95% CI)	2090	1992	$(\uparrow)$	89.11%	0.96[0.75,1.22]	
	Total events: 149 (Dexamethasone), 19	51 (Control)					
	Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =0; Chi <sup>2</sup> =19.21, df=	:13(P=0.12); I <sup>2</sup> =32.32%	16				
	Test for overall effect: Z=0.33(P=0.74)						
Multiple desea							
	1.2.2 Multiple doses of dexamethas	ne					
•	Abdelmalak 2013a	21/193	14/188		10.89%	1.51[0.75,3.02]	
	Lel 2017	0/70	0/70			Not estimable	
	Subtotal (95% CI)	263	258		10.89%	1.51[0.75,3.02]	
	Total events: 21 (Dexamethasone), 14	(Control)					
	Heterogeneity: Not applicable						
	Test for overall effect: Z=1.16(P=0.25)						
Tatal							
	Total (95% CI)	2353	2250		100%	1.01[0.8,1.27]	
	Heterogeneithe Tau <sup>2</sup> =0: Chi <sup>2</sup> =20 CF, df	5 (CONTOI)	16				
	Test for succell effect, 7, 0, 07/7, 0, 01/	-14(r=0.11); r=32.21%	סי				
	Test for overall effect: Z=0.07(P=0.94)						
	rest for subgroup differences: Chl <sup>2</sup> =1.4	14, at=1 (P=0.23), I*=3(	0.74%				

Study or subgroup

Dexam

Polderman et al Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 10.1002/14651858.CD011940.pub3

Favours control



**NHS Foundation Trust** 

#### 2018 Cochrane Review – Wound Healing

#### Favours dexamethasone



b/L         n/N         Peto, Fixed, 95% CI         Peto, Fixed, 95% CI           13.1 Intermediate dose (8 to 10 mg) of dexamethasone Bjolm/04:42814         0/20         Not estimable           Bjolm/04:42814         0/20         Not estimable           Koh 2013         2/135         3/134         40.82%         0.66[0.01,13.87]           Koh 2013         2/135         3/134         40.82%         0.66[0.01,13.87]           Wakasugi 2015         1/136         0/134         10.11%         7.28[0.14,366.99]           Worni 2008         0/37         0/35         80.03%         0.98[0.24,3.56]           Subtotal (95% c1)         462         450         80.03%         0.98[0.24,3.56]           Total events: 4 (Dexamethasone), 4 (Control)         Heterogeneity: Tauf-ep, Chi-12, dic-12% o.55); F=0%         Test for overall effect: 2-0.02(P=0.98)         Not estimable           1.3.2 High dose (12 to 20 mg) of dexamethasone         0/40         19.97%         1[0.06,16.27]           Subtotal (95% c1)         80         80         19.97%         1[0.06,16.27]           Subtotal (55% c1)         80         80         19.97%         1[0.06,16.27]           Subtotal (55% c1)         80         80         19.97%         1[0.06,16.27]           Subtotal (55% c1)	Study or subgroup	Dexam- ethasone	Control	Peto Odds Ratio	Weight	Peto Odds Ratio	
1.1 intermediate dose (\$ to 10 mg) of dexamethasone)       0/51       0/22       Not estimable         Björfhördet seit 4       0/51       0/51       Not estimable         Koh 2013       2/135       3/134       49.82%       0.66[0.11,3.87]         Rafig 2014       1/17       1/14       20.09%       0.98[0.06,15.51]         Worn 2008       0/37       0/35       Not estimable       Not estimable         Worn 2008       0/37       0/35       Not estimable       Not estimable         Total events: 4 (Dexamethasone), 4 (Control)       Heterogeneity: Tau*o; Chi*1.2, df=2(P=0.55); i*-0%       Test for overall effect: 2-0.02[P=0.98]       Not estimable         1.2.2 High dose (12 to 20 mg) of dexamethasone, 1 (Doutrol)       0/40       0/40       Not estimable       placeboo         1.3.2 High dose (12 to 20 mg) of dexamethasone, 1 (Control)       10/40       19.97%       1[0.06,16.27]       placeboo         1.3.2 High dose (12 to 20 mg) of dexamethasone, 1 (Control)       Heterogeneity: Tau*o; Chi*2.12, df=3(P=0.75); i*-0%       Test for overall effect: 2-0.02[P=0.39]       100%       0.99[0.28,3.43]       100%       0.99[0.28,3.43]         Total events: 1 (Dexamethasone), 5 (Control)       Heterogeneity: Tau*o; Chi*2.12, df=3(P=0.75); i*-0%       100%       0.99[0.28,3.43]       100%       0.99[0.28,3.43]       100%       0.9		n/N	n/N	Peto, Fixed, 95% CI		Peto, Fixed, 95% CI	
Bjormodet est.       0/20       Not estimable       Not estimable       Not estimable         Renci 2011       0/51       0/51       Not estimable       Not estimable       Not estimable         Koh 2013       2/135       3/134       49.82%       0.66(0.11,3.87]       Additional (Sectional Sectional Section Sectional Section Sectional Sectional Sectional Sectional Section Sectional Sectional Section Sectional Section Sectional Sectional Section Sectional Sectiona	1.3.1 Intermediate dose (8 to 10	mg) of dexamethasone	>				
Ferod 2011       0/51       0/51       Not estimable         Koh 2013       2/135       3/134       49.82%       0.66[0.11,3.87]         Rafig 2014       1/17       1/14       20.09%       0.96[0.04,15.51]       10.11%       7.28[0.1,365.99]       Not estimable         Worni 2008       0/37       0/35       Not estimable       80.03%       0.98[0.24,3.86]       Favours       placebo         Total events: 4 (Dexamethasone), 4 (Control)       462       450       80.03%       0.98[0.24,3.96]       Not estimable       placebo         Not estimable       80.03%       0.98[0.24,3.96]       Not estimable       placebo         Total events: 10*2-0.02(P=0.98)       0/40       Not estimable       placebo         13.2 High dose (12 to 20 mg) of dexamethasone       0/40       19.97%       1[0.06,16.27]       placebo         Subtotal (95% c1)       80       80       19.97%       1[0.06,16.27]       placebo         Subtotal (95% c1)       542       530       100%       0.99[0.28,3.43]       fold events: 5 (Dexamethasone), 5 (Control)         Heterogeneity: Not applicable       100%       0.99[0.28,3.43]       10.0% (0.99[0.28,3.43]       fold events: 5 (Dexamethasone), 5 (Control)         Heterogeneity: Not applicable       100%       0.	Bjornholdt 2014	0/26	0/22			Not estimable	
Koh 2013       2/135       3/134       49.82%       0.66[0.11,3.87]         Rafiq 2014       1/77       1/74       20.09%       0.96[0.06,15.51]         Wakasugi 2015       1/136       0/134       10.11%       7.28[0.14,366.99]         Worn 2008       0/37       0/35       80.03%       0.98[0.24,3.96]       Favours         Subtat (95% c1)       462       450       80.03%       0.98[0.24,3.96]       Favours         Total events: 4 (Dexamethasone), 4 (Control)       462       450       Not estimable       0.98[0.24,3.96]       Placeboo         1.3.2 High dose (12 to 20 mg) of dexamethasone       0/40       19.97%       1[0.06,16.27]       10.06,16.27]         Subtatal (95% c1)       50       80       80       19.97%       1[0.06,16.27]         Subtatal (95% c1)       542       530       100%       0.99[0.28,3.43]         Total events: 1 (Dexamethasone), 1 (Control)       Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =0; Chi <sup>2</sup> =1.2, df=3[P=0.75]; P=0%       100%       0.99[0.28,3.43]         Total events: 1 (Dexamethasone), 1 (Control)       Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =0; Chi <sup>2</sup> =1.2, df=3[P=0.75]; P=0%       100%       0.99[0.28,3.43]         Total events: 1 (Dexamethasone), 5 (Control)       10.05% (C)       10.05% (C)       10.05%         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =0; Chi <sup>2</sup> =1.2	Ferocl 2011	0/51	0/51			Not estimable	
Rafiq 2014       1/17       1/14       20.09%       0.96[0.06,15.51]         Wakasugi 2015       1/136       0/134       10.11%       7.28[0.14,366.99]       Not estimable         Subtal (95% CI)       462       450       80.03%       0.98[0.24,3.96]       Placeboo         Total events: 4 (Dexamethasone), 4 (control)       Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> -0; Chi <sup>2</sup> =1.2, df=2(P=0.55); l <sup>2</sup> =0%       Test for overall effect: Z=0.02(P=0.98)       Not estimable       placeboo         1.3.2 High dose (12 to 20 mg) of dexamethasone       0/40       0/40       Not estimable       placeboo         Charcoss       0/40       0/40       19.97%       1[0.06,16.27]       placeboo         Subtatal (95% CI)       80       80       19.97%       1[0.06,16.27]       placeboo         Total events: 1 (Dexamethasone), 1 (control)       Heterogeneity: Not applicable       19.97%       1[0.06,16.27]       placeboo         Total events: 5 (Dexamethasone), 5 (Control)       Heterogeneity: Not applicable       100%       0.99[0.28,3.43]       fotal events: 5 (Dexamethasone), 5 (Control)         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> -0; Chi <sup>2</sup> =1.2, df=1(P=0.08); l <sup>2</sup> =00%       Test for overall effect: 2=0.02(P=0.98)       100%       0.99[0.28,3.43]       fotal events: 5 (Dexamethasone), 5 (Control)         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =0; Chi <sup>2</sup> =1.2, df=1.2, 0.15; l <sup>2</sup> =00%       Test for ove	Koh 2013	2/135	3/134		49.82%	0.66[0.11,3.87]	
Wakasugi 2015       1/136       0/134       10.11%       7.28[0.14,366.99]       FaVOURS         Worni 2008       0/37       0/35       Not estimable       Not estimable       placeboo         Subtotal (95% c1)       462       450       80.03%       0.98[0.24,3.96]       placeboo         Total events: 4 (Dexamethasone), 4 (Control)       Heterogenetity: Tau <sup>2</sup> -0; Chi <sup>4</sup> =1.2, df-2(P=0.55); l <sup>2</sup> =0%       Test for overall effect: Z=0.02(P=0.98)       Not estimable       placeboo         1.3.2 High dose (12 to 20 mg) of dexamethasone       0/40       Not estimable       placeboo         Chorzotis       0/40       0/40       19.97%       1[0.06;16.27]         Subtotal (95% c1)       80       80       19.97%       1[0.06;16.27]         Total events: 1 (Dexamethasone), 1 (Control)       Heterogenetly: Not applicable       10.0%       0.99[0.28,3.43]         Total events: 5 (Dexamethasone), 5 (Control)       542       530       100%       0.99[0.28,3.43]         Heterogenetly: Tau <sup>2-</sup> 0; Chi <sup>2-1</sup> .2, df-3(P=0.75); P=0%       Test for overall effect: 2=0.02(P=0.98)       100%       0.99[0.28,3.43]	Rafiq 2014	1/77	1/74		20.09%	0.96[0.06,15.51]	
Worni 2008       0/37       0/35       Not estimable         Subtotal (95% c1)       462       450       80.03%       0.38[0.24,3.96]       Placebo         Total events: 4 (Dexamethasone), 4 (Control)       Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> -0; ch <sup>2</sup> =1.2, df=2(P=0.55); l <sup>2</sup> =0%       Test for overall effect: 2=0.02(P=0.98)       Not estimable       Discrete transmissione       Image: transmissione       Imad	Wakasugi 2015	1/136	0/134		10.11%	7.28[0.14,366.99]	Favours
Subtotal (95% ci)       462       450       80.03%       0.98[0.24,3.96]       PIACEDO         Total events: 4 (Dexamethasone), 4 (Control)       Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =0; Chi <sup>2</sup> =1.2, df=2(P=0.55); f <sup>2</sup> =0%       Test for overall effect: Z=0.02(P=0.98)       PIACEDO         1.3.2 High dose (12 to 20 mg) of dexamethasone       0/40       Not estimable       Image: Chir2e1: 0.02(P=0.98)         1.3.2 High dose (12 to 20 mg) of dexamethasone       0/40       Not estimable       Image: Chir2e1: 0.02(P=0.98)         1.3.2 High dose (12 to 20 mg) of dexamethasone       0/40       Not estimable       Image: Chir2e1: 0.02(P=0.98)         1.3.2 High dose (12 to 20 mg) of dexamethasone       0/40       Not estimable       Image: Chir2e1: 0.02(P=0.98)         1.3.2 High dose (12 to 20 mg) of dexamethasone), 1 (Control)       80       80       Image: Chir2e1: 0.02(P=0.98)         1.0.0.6,16.27]       Subtotal (95% ci)       80       80       Image: Distance (10, 0.06, 16.27)         1.0.1 events: 1 (Dexamethasone), 1 (Control)       Heterogeneity: Not applicable       Image: Distance (10, 0.05, 16.27)       Image: Distance (10, 0.05, 16.27)         1.0.1 events: 5 (Dexamethasone), 5 (Control)       Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =0; (Chi <sup>2</sup> =1.2, df=3(P=0.75); I <sup>2</sup> =0%       Image: Distance (10, 0.05, 16.27)       Image: Distance (10, 0.05, 16.27)         1.0.05% ci)       542       530       Image: Distance (10, 0.05, 16.27)	WornI 2008	0/37	0/35			Not estimable	
Total events: 4 (Dexamethasone), 4 (Control)         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =0; Chi <sup>2</sup> =1.2, df=2(P=0.55); l <sup>2</sup> =0%         Test for overall effect: Z=0.02(P=0.98) <b>1.3.2 High dose (12 to 20 mg) of dexamethasone</b> Chor 2012       0/40         Doksrod 2012       1/40         1/40       19.97%         Subtotal (95% CI)       80         80       80         100%       0.99[0.28,3.43]         Total events: 1 (Dexamethasone), 1 (Control)         Heterogeneity: Not applicable         Test for overall effect: Not applicable         Total events: 5 (Dexamethasone), 5 (Control)         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =0; Chi <sup>2</sup> =1.2, df=3[P=0.75); l <sup>2</sup> =0%         Test for overall effect: 2-0.02[P=0.98)         Total events: 5 (Dexamethasone), 5 (Control)         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =0; Chi <sup>2</sup> =1.2, df=3[P=0.75); l <sup>2</sup> =0%         Test for overall effect: 2-0.02[P=0.98)	Subtotal (95% CI)	462	450		80.03%	0.98[0.24,3.96]	placebo
Heterogenelty: Tau <sup>2</sup> =0; Chi <sup>2</sup> =1.2, df=2(P=0.55); l <sup>2</sup> =0%         Test for overall effect: Z=0.02(P=0.98)         1.3.2 High dose (12 to 20 mg) of dexamethasone         Ch01 2015       0/40         Doksrod 2012       1/40         1/40       19.97%         Subtotal (95% ci)       80         Subtotal (95% ci)       80         Total events: 1 (Dexamethasone), 1 (Control)         Heterogenelty: Not applicable         Test for overall effect: Not applicable         Total events: 5 (Dexamethasone), 5 (Control)         Heterogenelty: Tau <sup>2</sup> =0; Chi <sup>2</sup> =1.2, df=3(P=0.75); l <sup>2</sup> =0%         Test for overall effect: Z=0.02(P=0.98)         Test for overall effect: Z=0.02(P=0.98)         Test for overall effect: Not applicable	Total events: 4 (Dexamethasone),	4 (Control)					F
Test for overall effect: Z=0.02(P=0.98)         1.3.2 High dose (12 to 20 mg) of dexamethasone         Chör 2013       0/40         Doksrod 2012       1/40         1/40       19.97%         Subtotal (95% cl)       80         Subtotal (95% cl)       80         Total events: 1 (Dexamethasone), 1 (Control)         Heterogenelty: Not applicable         Test for overall effect: Not applicable         Total (95% cl)       542         Total events: 5 (Dexamethasone), 5 (Control)         Heterogenelty: Tau <sup>2</sup> =0; Chi <sup>2</sup> =1.2, df=3(P=0.75); i <sup>2</sup> =0%         Test for overall effect: Z=0.02(P=0.98)         Test for subtrough differences: Chi <sup>2</sup> =0.40(P=0.98)         Test for subtrough differences: Chi <sup>2</sup> =0.04(P=0.98)	Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =0; Chl <sup>2</sup> =1.2, d	lf=2(P=0.55); I <sup>2</sup> =0%					
1.3.2 High dose (12 to 20 mg) of dexamethasone       Not estimable         Choir 2013       0/40       Not estimable         Doksrod 2012       1/40       1/40       19.97%         Subtoal (95% Ci)       80       80       19.97%       1[0.06,16.27]         Subtoal (95% Ci)       80       80       19.97%       1[0.06,16.27]         Total events: 1 (Dexamethasone), 1 (Control)       Heterogeneity: Not applicable       19.97%       1[0.06,16.27]         Total events: 5 (Dexamethasone), 5 (Control)       542       530       100%       0.99[0.28,3.43]         Total events: 5 (Dexamethasone), 5 (Control)       100%       0.99[0.28,3.43]       100%       0.99[0.28,3.43]         Total events: 5 (Dexamethasone), 5 (Control)       Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =0; Chi <sup>2</sup> =1.2, df=3(P=0.75); i <sup>2</sup> =0%       100%       0.99[0.28,3.43]         Total events: 5 (Dexamethasone), 5 (Control)       Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =0; Chi <sup>2</sup> =1.2, df=3(P=0.75); i <sup>2</sup> =0%       100%       0.99[0.28,3.43]         Total events: 5 (Decamethasone), 5 (Decamethasone)       100%       0.99[0.28,3.43]       10%         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =0; Chi <sup>2</sup> =1.2, df=3(P=0.75); i <sup>2</sup> =0%       Test for overall effect: 2=0.02(P=0.08)       10%       0.99[0.28,3.43]	Test for overall effect: Z=0.02(P=0.	98)					
1.3.2 High dose (12 to 20 mg) of dexamethasone       0/40       Not estimable         Choir 2013       0/40       1/40       19.97%         Doksrod 2012       1/40       1/40       19.97%         Subtotal (95% CI)       80       80       19.97%         Total events: 1 (Dexamethasone), 1 (Control)       Heterogeneity: Not applicable       19.97%       1[0.06,16.27]         Total events: 1 (Dexamethasone), 5 (Control)       542       530       100%       0.99[0.28,3.43]         Total events: 5 (Dexamethasone), 5 (Control)       Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =0; Chl <sup>2</sup> =1.2, df=3(P=0.75); l <sup>2</sup> =0%       100%       0.99[0.28,3.43]         Total events: 5 (Dexamethasone), 5 (Control)       Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =0; Chl <sup>2</sup> =1.2, df=3(P=0.90), l <sup>2</sup> =0%       100%       0.99[0.28,3.43]         Total events: 5 (Dexamethasone), 5 (Control)       Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =0; Chl <sup>2</sup> =1.2, df=3(P=0.90), l <sup>2</sup> =0%       100%       0.99[0.28,3.43]         Total events: 5 (Dexamethasone), 5 (Control)       Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =0; Chl <sup>2</sup> =1.2, df=3(P=0.90), l <sup>2</sup> =0%       100%       0.99[0.28,3.43]							
Chor 2013       0/40       Not estimable         Doksrod 2012       1/40       1/40       19.97%       1[0.06,16.27]         Subtotal (95% CI)       80       80       90       10.06,16.27]         Total events: 1 (Dexamethasone), 1 (Control)       Heterogeneity: Not applicable       19.97%       1[0.06,16.27]         Total events: 1 (Dexamethasone), 5 (Control)       542       530       0.99[0.28,3.43]         Total events: 5 (Dexamethasone), 5 (Control)       100%       0.99[0.28,3.43]         Test for overall effect: 2=0.02(P=0.98)       100%       100%         Test for overall effect: 2=0.02(P=0.98)       100%       10%	1.3.2 High dose (12 to 20 mg) of	dexamethasone	>				
Doksrod 2012       1/40       1/40       19.97%       1[0.06,16.27]         Subtotal (95% CI)       80       80       19.97%       1[0.06,16.27]         Total events: 1 (Dexamethasone), 1 (Control)       Heterogeneity: Not applicable       19.97%       1[0.06,16.27]         Total events: 1 (Dexamethasone), 5 (Control)       542       530       0.99[0.28,3.43]         Total events: 5 (Dexamethasone), 5 (Control)       100%       0.99[0.28,3.43]         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =0; Chl <sup>2</sup> =1.2, df=3(P=0.75); l <sup>2</sup> =0%       100%       0.99[0.28,3.43]	Choi 2013	0/40	0/40			Not estimable	
Subtotal (95% CI)       80       80       19.97%       1[0.06,16.27]         Total events: 1 (Dexamethasone), 1 (Control)       Heterogenelty: Not applicable       Image: Control of the second	Doksrod 2012	1/40	1/40		19.97%	1[0.06,16.27]	
Total events: 1 (Dexamethasone), 1 (Control) Heterogeneity: Not applicable Test for overall effect: Not applicable <b>Total (95% CI)</b> 542 530 <b>100%</b> 0.99[0.28,3.43] Total events: 5 (Dexamethasone), 5 (Control) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =0; Chl <sup>2</sup> =1.2, df=3(P=0.75); l <sup>2</sup> =0% Test for overall effect: Z=0.02(P=0.98) Test for subgroup differences: Chl <sup>2</sup> =0, df=1 (P=0.90), l <sup>2</sup> =0%	Subtotal (95% CI)	80	80		19.97%	1[0.06,16.27]	
Heterogeneity: Not applicable Test for overall effect: Not applicable Total (95% CI) 542 530 Total events: 5 (Dexamethasone), 5 (Control) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =0; Chl <sup>2</sup> =1.2, df=3(P=0.75); l <sup>2</sup> =0% Test for overall effect: Z=0.02(P=0.98) Test for subgroup differences: Chl <sup>2</sup> =0, df=1 (P=0.99), l <sup>2</sup> =0%	Total events: 1 (Dexamethasone),	1 (Control)					
Test for overall effect: Not applicable Total (95% CI) 542 530 Total events: 5 (Dexamethasone), 5 (Control) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =0; Chl <sup>2</sup> =1.2, df=3(P=0.75); l <sup>2</sup> =0% Test for overall effect: Z=0.02(P=0.98) Test for subgroup differences: Chl <sup>2</sup> =0, df=1 (P=0.90), l <sup>2</sup> =0%	Heterogeneity: Not applicable						
Total (95% CI)         542         530         100%         0.99[0.28,3.43]           Total events: 5 (Dexamethasone), 5 (Control)         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =0; Chl <sup>2</sup> =1.2, df=3(P=0.75); l <sup>2</sup> =0%         Test for overall effect: Z=0.02(P=0.98)           Test for subgroup differences: Chl <sup>2</sup> =0, df=1 (P=0.90), l <sup>2</sup> =0%         Test for subgroup differences: Chl <sup>2</sup> =0, df=1 (P=0.90), l <sup>2</sup> =0%	Test for overall effect: Not applica	ble					
Total (95% CI)       542       530       100%       0.99[0.28,3.43]         Total events: 5 (Dexamethasone), 5 (Control)							
Total events: 5 (Dexamethasone), 5 (Control) Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =0; Chl <sup>2</sup> =1.2, df=3(P=0.75); l <sup>2</sup> =0% Test for overall effect: Z=0.02(P=0.98)	Total (95% CI)	542	530		100%	0.99[0.28,3.43]	
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =0; Chi <sup>2</sup> =1.2, df=3(P=0.75); l <sup>2</sup> =0% Test for overall effect: Z=0.02(P=0.98) Test for subgroup differences: Chi <sup>2</sup> =0, df=1 (P=0.90), l <sup>2</sup> =0%	Total events: 5 (Dexamethasone),	5 (Control)					
Test for overall effect: $Z=0.02(P=0.98)$ Test for subgroup differences: $Ch^{2}=0.0f=1.(P=0.96).1^{2}=0.96$	Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =0; Chl <sup>2</sup> =1.2, d	if=3(P=0.75); I <sup>2</sup> =0%					
Tost for subgroup differences: $Ch^{2}=0.df=1/P=0.001/2=006$	Test for overall effect: Z=0.02(P=0.	98)					
reschor subgroup diferences. Chi =0, di=2 (r=0.39), r=0.90	Test for subgroup differences: Chi	<sup>2</sup> =0, df=1 (P=0.99), I <sup>2</sup> =0%					
Favours [dexamethasone] 0.001 0.1 1 10 1000 Favours [control group]		Favours (	dexamethasone] 0.00	1 0.1 1 10 10	Favours (control grou	nb]	



**NHS Foundation Trust** 

#### 2018 Cochrane Review – Glucose (1)

Study or subgroup	Dexame	ethasone	c	Control	Mean Difference	Weight	Mean Difference
	N	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	Random, 95% CI		Random, 95% Cl
1.4.1 Change from baseline	within 2 to 12 hou	urs after surg	ery				
Abdelmalak 2013b	69	86 (41)	67	58 (45)	_+	12.37%	28[13.52,42.48]
Cowie 2010	7	36 (74)	7	14 (61)		1.04%	22[-49.04,93.04]
Doksrod 2012	40	58 (59)	40	26 (52)	+	6.62%	32[7.63,56.37]
Kalappa 2017	32	-6 (13)	32	-12 (12)	+	20.25%	6[-0.13,12.13]
Karacinar 2009	17	27 (24)	17	15 (27)	++	10.37%	12[-5.17,29.17]
Murphy 2011a	60	19 (46)	49	25 (44)	<b>+</b>	10.53%	-6[-22.95,10.95]
Murphy 2014	33	51 (42)	34	49 (44)	<b>+</b>	8.33%	2[-18.59,22.59]
Nazar 2009	15	97 (31)	15	70 (32)	+	7.39%	27[4.45,49.55]
Tien 2016	20	58 (31)	21	41 (31)	<b></b> •	9.23%	17[-1.98,35.98]
Wang 2009	10	43 (14)	10	29 (15)	-+	13.88%	14[1.28,26.72]
Subtotal ***	303		292			100%	13.31[5.91,20.71]
Heterogeneity: Tau²=60.6; Ch	ni <sup>2</sup> =17.89, df=9(P=0	.04); I <sup>2</sup> =49.7%					
Test for overall effect: Z=3.53	(P=0)						
		Fav	ours [de>	(amethasone] -100	-50 0 50	100 Fayours [co	ntrol group]



**NHS Foundation Trust** 

#### 2018 Cochrane Review – Glucose (2)

#### 1.4.2 Change from baseline 24 hours after surgery

Study or subgroup	Dexai	methasone	C	ontrol	Mean Difference	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	Random, 95% CI		Random, 95% Cl
Corocan 2017	16	22 (23)	15	23 (22)	-+-	18.48%	-1[-16.84,14.84]
Cowie 2010	7	27 (64)	7	10 (70)	+	6.38%	17[-53.26,87.26]
Kalappa 2017	32	40 (21)	32	-11 (12)	-+-	19.94%	51[42.62,59.38]
Murphy 2014	33	23 (31)	34	20 (31)	-•	18.71%	3[-11.85,17.85]
Tien 2016	20	91 (43)	21	49 (31)		16.6%	42[18.96,65.04]
Zhang 2016	103	14 (37)	130	1 (29)	-+-	19.89%	13[4.29,21.71]
Subtotal ***	211		239		-	100%	21.19[-0.17,42.55]
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =577.32; Ch	i²=65.03, df=5	6(P<0.0001); I <sup>2</sup> =92	2.31%				
Test for overall effect: Z=1.94(P=	0.05)						
						I	
		Fay	ours (de)	xamethasone] -10	) -50 0 50	100 Fayours [cor	ntrol group]



**NHS Foundation Trust** 

#### 2018 Cochrane Review – Glucose (3)

1.4.3 Change from baseline 10 to 24 betes											
Nazar 2009	15	97 (31)	15	70 (32)				•		57.66%	27[4.45,49.55]
Tien 2016	20	67 (49)	24	29 (38)			-	-		42.34%	38[11.69,64.31]
Subtotal ***	35		39				•			100%	31.66[14.54,48.78]
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =0; Chi <sup>2</sup> =0.39, df=1	.(P=0.53); I <sup>2</sup> =0	0%									
Test for overall effect: Z=3.62(P=0)											
Test for subgroup differences: Chi <sup>2</sup> =3.9	91, df=1 (P=0.	14), I <sup>2</sup> =48.819	6		1	1					
		Favou	rs <mark>[</mark> dexame	thasone]	-100	-50	0	50	100	Favours [contr	rol group]



**NHS Foundation Trust** 

#### So Is Dexamethasone Safe?

#### • I'd still argue not necessarily

Outcomes	Anticipated absolute effects* (95% CI) Risk with control	Risk with dexametha- sone	Relative effect (95% CI)	№ of partici- pants (stud- ies)	Certain- ty of the evi- dence (GRADE)	Com- ments
Postoperative wound or systemic infection Follow-up: mean 30 days	Study population		OR 1.01	4603 (26 RCTs)	⊕⊕⊕⊙ Moder- ate <sup>a</sup>	
	80 per 1000	81 per 1000 (65 to 100)	1.27)			
Delayed wound healing Follow-up: mean 30 days	Study population 70 per 1000	69 per 1000 (21 to 205)	OR 0.99 (0.28 to 3.43)	642 (8 RCTs)	⊕⊕⊝⊝ Low <sup>b</sup>	
Glycaemic response - change from baseline to 2 to 12 hours postoperatively in patients with- out diabetes Follow-up: 1 day	Mean glycaemic response - change from baseline to 2 to 12 hours postoperatively in patients without diabetes: 48 mg/dL	MD 13 mg/dL higher (6 higher to 21 higher)	-	595 (10 RCTs)	⊕⊕⊝⊝ Low <sup>c</sup>	
Glycaemic response - change from baseline to 10 to 24 hours after surgery in patients with diabetes Follow-up: 1 day	Mean glycaemic response - change from baseline to 10 to 24 hours after surgery in patients with diabetes: 80 mg/dL	MD 32 mg/dL higher (15 higher to 49 higher)	-	74 (2 RCTs)	⊕⊝⊝⊝ Very low <sup>d</sup>	

\*The risk in the intervention group (and its 95% confidence interval) is based on the assumed risk in the comparison group and the relative effect of the intervention (and its 95% CI).

CI: confidence interval; MD: mean difference; OR: odds ratio; RCT: randomized controlled trial.



## I'd Argue The Wrong Question Was Asked

- What they asked was "is dexamethasone use is associated with harm?"
- What they should have asked was "is dexamethasone induced hyperglycaemia associated with harm"
- I'd also suggest that sample sizes have been too small to get a definitive answer





## A Quote to Sum it Up

 If an inpatient is on glucocorticoids... "the design of insulin therapy depends on the timing of the glucocorticoids and challenges the creativity of the caregiver"





**NHS Foundation Trust** 

# **Diabetes and Glucocorticoids**

#### www.norfolkdiabetes.com

ketan.dhatariya@nnuh.nhs.uk

