



King's Research Portal

DOI:

[10.1183/13993003.01215-2022](https://doi.org/10.1183/13993003.01215-2022)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Sivakumar, P., Fitzgerald, D. B., Ip, H., Rao, D., West, A., Noorzad, F., Wallace, D., Haris, M., Prudon, B., Hettiarachchi, G., Jayaram, D., Goldring, J., Maskell, N., Holme, J., Sharma, N., Ismail, I., Kadwani, O., Simpson, S., Read, C. A., ... Ahmed, L. (2024). The impact of outpatient *versus* inpatient management on health-related quality of life outcomes for patients with malignant pleural effusion: the OPTIMUM randomised clinical trial. *European Respiratory Journal*, 63(2), Article 2201215. <https://doi.org/10.1183/13993003.01215-2022>

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

1 The impact of outpatient vs inpatient management on health-related
2 quality of life outcomes for patients with malignant pleural effusion –
3 the OPTIMUM randomized clinical trial.

4 Authors

5 **Parthipan Sivakumar, FRCP,**

6 Department of Thoracic Medicine, Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Trust, London, United Kingdom

7 King's College London, London, United Kingdom

8 **Deirdre B Fitzgerald, MRCPI,**

9 Pleural Medicine Unit, Institute for Respiratory Health, Western Australia, Australia

10 Respiratory Department, Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital, Western Australia, Australia

11 **Hugh Ip, MRCP,**

12 Respiratory Department, Royal Free Hospital NHS Trust, London, United Kingdom

13 **Deepak Rao, FRCP,**

14 Department of Thoracic Medicine, Princess Royal University Hospital (King's College Hospital NHS

15 Foundation Trust), Orpington, United Kingdom

16 **Alex West, MRCP,**

17 Department of Thoracic Medicine, Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Trust, London, United Kingdom

18 **Farinaz Noorzad, BSc,**

19 St George's Hospital, London, United Kingdom

20 **Deirdre Wallace, BSc,**

21 Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Trust, London, United Kingdom

22 **Mohamed Haris, FRCP,**

23 University Hospital of North Midlands NHS Trust, Stoke-on-Trent, United Kingdom

24 **Benjamin Prudon, FRCP Edin,**

25 Department of Respiratory Medicine, North Tees and Hartlepool NHS Foundation Trust, Stockton-

26 on-Tees, United Kingdom

- 27 **Gihan Hettiarachchi, MRCP,**
28 Medway NHS Foundation Trust, Gillingham, United Kingdom
- 29 **Deepak Jayaram, MRCP,**
30 Surrey and Sussex Healthcare NHS Trust, Redhill, United Kingdom
- 31 **James Goldring, MSc,**
32 Centre for Respiratory Medicine, Royal Free Hospital, London, United Kingdom
- 33 **Nick Maskell, DM,**
34 Academic Respiratory Unit, University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom
- 35 **Jayne Holme, MD,**
36 North West Lung Centre, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust, Manchester, United
37 Kingdom
- 38 **Neel Sharma, MRCP,**
39 Respiratory Medicine, East Sussex NHS Trust, Eastbourne, United Kingdom
- 40 **Iyad Ismail, FRCP,**
41 University Hospitals Birmingham NHS Foundation Trust, Birmingham, United Kingdom
- 42 **Owais Kadwani, MRCP,**
43 Guys and St Thomas NHS Foundation Trust, London, United Kingdom
- 44 **Sanchez Simpson, MSc,**
45 Department of Thoracic Medicine, Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Trust, London, United Kingdom
- 46 **Catherine A Read, BSc (Hons),**
47 Pleural Medicine Unit, Institute for Respiratory Health, Western Australia, Australia
- 48 **Xiaohui Sun, MPH,**
49 King's College London, School of Population Health and Environmental Sciences, London, United
50 Kingdom
- 51 **Abdel Douiri, PhD,**

52 King's College London, School of Population Health and Environmental Sciences, London, United
53 Kingdom

54 **YC Gary Lee, PhD,**

55 Institute for Respiratory Health, University of Western Australia, Australia

56 Respiratory Department, Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital, Western Australia, Australia

57 **Liju Ahmed, FRCP,**

58 Department of Thoracic Medicine, King Faisal Specialist Hospital and Research Centre, Madinah,
59 Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

60

61 Dr Parthipan Sivakumar and Dr Liju Ahmed are joint first author and corresponding authors

62

63 **Corresponding author**

64 Parthipan Sivakumar

65 Department of Thoracic Medicine

66 Chest Clinic

67 St Thomas' Hospital

68 London

69 SE1 7EH

70 deepan.sivakumar@kcl.ac.uk

71

72 Abstract word count : 226

73 Total word count: 3173 excluding figures, tables and references

74

75 *Abstract*

76

77 *Background*

78 The principal aim of malignant pleural effusion (MPE) management is to improve health related
79 quality of life (HRQoL) and symptoms.

80 *Methods*

81 In this open-label randomised controlled trial, patients with symptomatic MPE were randomly
82 assigned to either IPC insertion with the option of talc pleurodesis or chest drain and talc
83 pleurodesis. The primary endpoint was global health status, measured with the EORTC QLQ-C30
84 questionnaire at 30 days post-intervention. 142 participants were enrolled from July 2015 to
85 December 2019.

86 *Results*

87 Of participants randomly assigned to IPC (n=70) and chest drain (n=72), primary outcome data were
88 available in 58 and 56 patients, respectively. Global health status improved in both groups at day 30
89 compared to baseline: IPC (mean difference 13.11 $p=0.001$) and chest drain (mean difference 10.11
90 $p=0.001$). However, there was no significant between-group difference at day 30 (mean inter-group
91 difference in baseline-adjusted global health status of 2.06 ([95% CI -5.86 to 9.99]; $p = 0.61$), day 60
92 or day 90. No significant differences were identified between groups in breathlessness and chest
93 pain scores. All chest drain arm patients were admitted (median length of stay 4 days); 7 in the IPC
94 arm required intervention-related hospitalization.

95 *Conclusion*

96 While HRQoL significantly improved in both groups, there were no differences in patient reported
97 global health status at 30 days. The outpatient pathway using an IPC was not superior to inpatient
98 treatment with a chest drain.

99 *Trial Registration*

100 ISRCTN registration:15503522.

101

102 Introduction

103 Malignant pleural effusions (MPE) result in breathlessness, reduced function and impaired health-
104 related quality-of-life (HRQoL), often representing an advanced terminal illness with a median
105 survival of 3-12 months[1].

106 Two definitive management options for MPE include hospital admission for a chest drain insertion
107 with talc slurry pleurodesis or outpatient ambulatory management with an indwelling pleural
108 catheter (IPC). Over the last decade, IPCs have increasingly become a first-line intervention for MPE
109 with recent advances incorporating talc pleurodesis[2] or a daily drainage strategy[3]. These
110 approaches may stop fluid production via pleural symphysis. However, these two options may exert
111 distinct influences on patients' quality of life. For example, an IPC shifts the burden of care to the
112 community, patient and their carers, and involves a period of repeated drainage and frequent
113 healthcare visits, whilst a chest drain and talc pleurodesis entails a median hospital stay of 4 days[4].

114 Although improving HRQoL is a central treatment goal, a systematic review has identified limited
115 comparative data on HRQoL outcomes to guide best practice[5]. This trial tests the hypothesis that
116 outpatient management of MPE utilising an IPC with the option of talc pleurodesis improves HRQoL
117 compared to usual inpatient management with a chest drain and talc pleurodesis.

118 This is the first randomised controlled study to evaluate HRQoL as a primary outcome measure in
119 MPE intervention.

120

121

122 Methods

123 *Trial Design*

124 The Out Patient Talc Slurry via Indwelling Pleural Catheter for Malignant Pleural Effusion Vs Usual
125 Inpatient Management (OPTIMUM) trial is a randomised, two-arm, open-label superiority trial
126 conducted at 11 hospitals in the United Kingdom and one hospital in Australia. UK ethics approval
127 was obtained from the National Research Ethics Service (NRES) Committee South East Coast,
128 Brighton and Sussex (15/LO/1018). For Australia, approval was obtained from the Sir Charles
129 Gairdner Group Human Research Ethics Committee. The trial protocol has been published[6]
130 (Supplement 1).

131 *Participants*

132 All participants were adults diagnosed with MPE made either by histocytological confirmation or
133 clinical and radiological features of metastatic pleural disease in patients with histologically proven
134 primary cancers. Participants were required to have a WHO performance status of two or less,
135 unless a performance status of three was likely to improve with pleural drainage. Participants also
136 needed an expected survival of greater than three months. The exclusion criteria were age less than
137 18 years old; pregnant or lactating; known allergy to talc or lidocaine; lack of symptomatic relief
138 from effusion drainage; district nurse/carers/hospital team unable to carry out at least twice weekly
139 IPC drainage; underlying lymphoma or small cell carcinoma except if chemotherapy had failed or the
140 patient was to be referred for palliative management; non-malignant effusions; loculated pleural
141 effusion; and patients unable to provide written informed consent to trial participation. Participants
142 were screened from both the outpatient and inpatient setting.

143 *Randomization*

144 Participants were randomised 1:1 to either IPC insertion or chest drain and talc slurry pleurodesis.
145 Permuted block randomisation (block sizes 4, 6, 8) was performed with allocation concealment
146 maintained using a web-based randomisation service (www.sealedenvelope.com). Treatment
147 allocation was unblinded and stratified to the following factors: age (<65 years, ≥65 years),
148 malignancy subtype (lung, mesothelioma, breast, other) and WHO performance status (0, 1, 2, 3).
149 Patient blinding was not practical due to inherent differences between the interventions.

150

151 *Procedures*

152 Supplementary figures s1-s2 (section 3 in Supplement 2) provides further detail of the trial
153 interventions.

154 Participants randomised to the IPC group underwent catheter insertion as a day case under local
155 anaesthesia using a percutaneous Seldinger technique. Following insertion, an attempt was made to
156 evacuate the fluid completely, using pleural manometry where available, to enable safe large-
157 volume drainage and reduce the risk of re-expansion pulmonary oedema. Patients then returned
158 after three days for review and a further attempt at maximal pleural fluid drainage. If the fluid
159 removed at this visit averaged less than 150mls/day since IPC insertion and non-expandable lung
160 was ruled out by ultrasound or X-ray, talc pleurodesis was attempted through the IPC. The protocol
161 was amended in October 2016 to remove the <150mls/day drainage criteria as feedback from
162 recruiting centres suggested incomplete drainage at insertion made fluid estimation at the day 4 visit
163 difficult. Four grams of sterile talc was then administered as a slurry (section 1.1.1 in Supplement 2)
164 and participants observed for 1 hour following instillation. Patients or district nurses were advised to
165 perform daily IPC drainages as an 'aggressive' drainage strategy using 1 litre bottles and return at
166 day 7 for review, chest X-ray and repeat drainage. If satisfactory pleural apposition with absence of
167 pleural sliding was seen on ultrasound in 5 of 6 areas (Figure s3 in Supplement 2), repeated drainage
168 was halted. Participants returned on day 14 for review and the IPC removed if pleural apposition was
169 maintained with evidence of minimal fluid on ultrasound.

170 In cases where talc instillation was either not attempted or in participants that did not meet the
171 criteria for IPC removal at day 14, regular IPC drainage was continued throughout the study follow
172 up period. The frequency of drainage was at the discretion of the treating physician. For these
173 participants, the recommended approach was early assessment in the clinic if they experienced
174 three consecutive drainages of less than 50mls of fluid. If either a chest x-ray or ultrasound showed
175 no significant residual pleural collection, then the IPC could be removed.

176 Participants randomised to chest drain and talc pleurodesis underwent management as per the 2010
177 British Thoracic Society (BTS) pleural disease guidelines[7]. A 12F-14F chest drain was inserted using
178 ultrasound guidance under local anaesthesia, and the patient was admitted to hospital. After 24hrs,
179 if the chest X-ray ruled out an non-expandable lung, 4 grams of talc slurry was instilled. The drain
180 was then removed when the pleural fluid output dropped below 250mls/day. Patients with non-
181 expandable lung or any other contraindication to talc slurry pleurodesis (such as an air leak) could be
182 managed using an alternative strategy and continued their follow up in the study.

183 *Follow-up*

184 All participants underwent follow up until 90 days after intervention or death, whichever occurred
185 first. Trial visits were conducted at the outpatient clinic on day 4 for the IPC group and 7, 14, 30, 60
186 and 90 days after the intervention for both groups. If fluid recurrence or complications developed,

187 the trial clinicians were permitted to perform further tests and procedures (e.g. IPC insertion or
188 referral for thoracic surgery) as part of usual clinical care.

189 *Outcomes*

190 *Primary Outcome*

191 The primary outcome was global health status, at 30 days post-intervention measured with the
192 European Organisation for Research and Treatment of Cancer Quality of Life Questionnaire–Cancer
193 30 (EORTC QLQ C-30). This is a validated, cancer specific, multidimensional instrument that asks
194 participants to report on aspects of their health-related quality of life over the previous week. It is
195 suitable for all cancer diagnoses[8] and can be repeated at frequent intervals to monitor quality of
196 life over time[9].

197 *Secondary Outcomes*

198 Secondary outcomes included global health status at day 60 and day 90 post-intervention, adverse
199 event rates, breathlessness, chest pain scores and pleurodesis failure rate. Pleurodesis failure was
200 defined as chest X-ray opacification greater than 25% on the side of intervention or the need for
201 subsequent pleural intervention on the same side as pleurodesis at 30, 60 and 90 days post-
202 intervention. Breathlessness and chest pain scores at 30, 60 and 90 days post-intervention were
203 measured using the 0-100mm visual analogue scale.

204 *Statistical analysis*

205 Using an analysis of covariance model (ANCOVA), adjusting for baseline global health status, a
206 sample size of 142 (71 vs 71) would detect a clinically significant difference of 8 points in global
207 health status with 80% power and a 5% significance level. This assumes a common standard
208 deviation of 23.6 in Stage III-IV cancer[8]. The covariate has an R-squared of 0.49. An interim analysis
209 was planned once 50% of patients were enrolled to determine if the recruitment target needed
210 amendment.

211 At this interim analysis, a blinded assessment of data demonstrated a 14% loss to follow-up at 30
212 days. The trial steering committee agreed that given funding, recruitment rates and the nature of
213 the patient population, increasing the sample size would not be feasible and agreed to continue
214 recruitment until December 2019 to achieve the original trial objective.


215 Data were analysed on an intention-to-treat basis in all patients in whom outcome data were
216 available. The primary efficacy analysis was based on ANCOVA. Regression analyses were adopted to
217 compare estimates for secondary efficacy analyses.

218 Data attrition for the complete case analysis prompted a post-hoc sensitivity analysis. Multiple
219 imputation by chained equations was used to impute the missing data[10]. Using mice (Multivariate
220 Imputation by Chained Equations) R package[11], 300 simulated datasets were generated, and an
221 ANCOVA analysis was performed on all of the imputed datasets with the results pooled. All analyses
222 were conducted using R version 4.0. The trial statistical analysis plan is outlined in Supplement 3.

223 The trial was registered on the ISRCTN registry (Identifier: 15503522).

224 Results

225 After screening a total of 548 patients for eligibility, 142 participants were recruited between July
226 2015 and November 2019. Four patients withdrew, and one died before undergoing the randomised
227 intervention. They were excluded from the analyses (Figure 1).



228

229 Figure 1: Consort diagram for OPTIMUM Study.

230 Abbreviations: HRQoL – health related quality of life; IPC – indwelling pleural catheter.

231

232 *Baseline characteristics*

233 Of the 142 randomised patients, two patients that withdrew following randomisation did not
234 consent to baseline data collection. Baseline data for both groups are presented in Table 1.

235

237 Table 1: Summary of baseline characteristics

	IPC (n=70)	Chest Drain (n=70)
Age, mean (SD), yr	69.0 (12.5)	66.5 (12.7)
Female : Male	38 : 32	42 : 28
Tobacco smoking status (%)		
Current smoker	6 (8.6%)	5 (7.1%)
Former smoker	36 (51.4%)	45 (64.2%)
Never smoked	28 (40%)	19 (27.1%)
Unknown	-	1 (1.4%)
Side of intervention (%)		
Right	48 (68.6%)	39 (55.7%)
Left	22 (31.4%)	31 (44.3%)
Bilateral pleural effusion (%)	12 (17.1%)	13 (18.6%)
WHO performance status		
0	9 (12.8%)	5 (7.1%)
1	32 (45.8%)	32 (45.8%)
2	23 (32.9%)	26 (37.1%)
3	6 (8.6%)	7 (10%)
Malignancy		
Lung	22 (31.4%)	21 (30%)
Breast	18 (25.7%)	15 (21.4%)
Mesothelioma	9 (12.9%)	12 (17.1%)
Renal	5 (7.1%)	4 (5.7%)
Ovarian	5 (7.1%)	3 (4.3%)
Unknown Primary	4 (5.7%)	4 (5.7%)
Colorectal	2 (2.9%)	2 (2.9%)
Upper gastrointestinal	1 (1.4%)	2 (2.9%)
Uterine	1 (1.4%)	3 (4.3%)
Other	3 (4.3%)	4 (5.7%)
Duration of cancer diagnosis at the time of recruitment, mean (SD), months	26.1 (40.8)	15.6 (28.3)
Treatment at enrolment		
Chemotherapy	n=29	n=27
Targeted (e.g. HER2, ALK, EGFR, multikinase)	13 (18.6%)	13 (18.6%)
Hormonal	9 (12.9%)	6 (8.6%)
Immunotherapy	4 (5.7%)	5 (7.1%)
	3 (4.3%)	3 (4.3%)
Steroid therapy at baseline	9 (12.9%)	5 (7.1%)

Size of effusion on chest radiograph		
<25% hemithorax	7 (10%)	12 (17.1%)
25-50% hemithorax	25 (35.7%)	29 (41.4%)
>50% hemithorax	34 (48.6%)	25 (35.7%)
EORTC QLQ-C30 global health status at baseline, mean (SD)	n=70 37.3 (25.4)	n=69 37.8 (25.4)
100mm VAS breathlessness score at baseline, mean (SD)	n=68 60.8 (26.0)	n=67 50.3 (28.4)

238

239 Abbreviations: WHO – World Health Organization; HER2 - human epidermal growth factor receptor 2, ALK - anaplastic
 240 lymphoma kinase; EGFR - epidermal growth factor receptor; EORTC QLQ-C30 - European Organisation for Research and
 241 Treatment of Cancer Quality-of-life Questionnaire Core 30; VAS – Visual Analogue Scale.

242

243 *Primary Outcome*

244 Data were available in 58 and 56 patients in the IPC and chest drain groups, respectively. Global
 245 health status improved significantly at day 30 post-intervention (compared with the baseline) in
 246 both the IPC group (mean difference 13.11 [95% CI 5.6 to 21.1]; $p = 0.001$) and the chest drain group
 247 (mean difference 10.11 [95% CI 4.5 to 15.7]; $p = 0.001$). 57% (33 of 58) of patients in the IPC group
 248 and 54% (30 of 56) in the chest drain group experienced a greater than 8 point improvement in
 249 global health status. Mean global health status at day 30 (primary endpoint) was 52.0 (SD 24.1) in
 250 the IPC group and 50.9 (SD 24.1) in the chest drain group with an observed mean difference at 30
 251 days of 2.06 ([95% CI -5.86 to 9.99]; $p = 0.61$) when adjusted for baseline global health status as a
 252 covariate.

253 Findings from the sensitivity analysis remained consistent with the primary analysis; at 30 days, a
 254 mean difference (IPC vs drain) in global health status of 2.18 ([95% CI -5.62 to 9.99]; $p = 0.59$) was
 255 observed.

256 *Secondary Outcomes*

257 Secondary outcome data are summarised in Table 2, Figures 2, and 3.

258 *Quality of Life at 60 and 90 days*

259 At 60 days after the intervention, global health status data were available in 46 patients in the IPC
 260 group and in 45 patients in the chest drain group. The mean change in global health status from
 261 baseline at day 60 was 15.6 (SD 26.4) in the IPC arm ($n = 46$), and 7.96 (SD 26.9) in the chest drain
 262 arm ($n = 45$). The ANCOVA, (adjusted for baseline global health status) indicated an observed mean
 263 difference of 4.82 ([95% CI -4.59 to 14.23]; $p = 0.31$).

264 At day 90 after the intervention, 43 patients completed follow up in the IPC arm versus 39 in the
265 chest drain group. The mean change in global health status from baseline at day 90 was 13.4 (SD
266 30.6) in the IPC arm, and 14.93 (SD 25.1) in the chest drain arm. The ANCOVA (adjusted for baseline
267 global health status) indicated an observed mean difference of -3.12 ([95% CI -13.76 to 7.51]; $p =$
268 0.56).

269 *Pleurodesis Failure*

270 Figure 3 summarises outcomes related to talc pleurodesis and subsequent pleural intervention in
271 both treatment arms.


272 Twenty-nine of 65 patients (44.6%) in the IPC arm received talc slurry vs 49 of 67 patients (73.1%) in
273 the chest drain arm. The incidence of non-expandable lung (defined as <50% pleural apposition
274 following drainage) was similar in both groups (IPC 15 (23.0%) vs chest drain 16 (23.9%)).

275 Thirteen participants in the IPC and talc instillation subgroup were eligible for IPC removal at Day 14,
276 however 10 participants underwent IPC removal with the remaining three electing not to have the
277 IPC removed. The rate of pleurodesis failure at 30 days in the IPC group (*defined as IPC remaining in*
278 *situ, need for subsequent pleural intervention or chest x-ray opacification of >25% hemithorax*) was
279 64.3% (18 of 28), which includes the 3 participants that declined catheter removal at day 14. 4 IPCs
280 were removed after day 30 due to pleurodesis: 1 IPC was removed after day 30 and 3 IPCs were
281 removed after day 60. The pleurodesis failure rate at day 60 was 64.3% (18 of 28). At day 90, this
282 was 57.1% (16 of 28).

283 Pleurodesis failure in the chest drain group (*defined as a need for subsequent pleural intervention or*
284 *chest x-ray opacification of >25% hemithorax*) at 30 days was 18.4% (9 of 49). At day 60 this was
285 24.5% (12 of 49). At day 90 this was 26.5% (13 of 49).

286 A summary of patients that underwent an additional pleural intervention is provided in section 2.1
287 of Supplement 2.

Global Health Status



IPC	70	58	46	43
Chest Drain	69	56	45	39

288

289 Figure 2: Global health status scores measured using the EORTC QLQ C-30 over the 90-day follow-up
 290 period. Points represent the mean, and bars represent standard deviation. Higher values indicate
 291 better global health status. Table below graph denotes the number of patients with global health
 292 status data at each time point. IPC – indwelling pleural catheter.

293

294 Table 2: Secondary outcome results

	Chest drain arm (n = 72)^a	IPC arm (n = 70)^a	Treatment effect estimate (95% CI)	p-value
Change in global health status from baseline, mean (SD)	(n = 69 with ≥ 1 measurement)	(n = 70 with ≥ 1 measurement)	Absolute difference ^b	
Baseline	37.8 (25.4)	37.3 (25.4)		
Day 60	8.0 (26.9)	15.6 (26.4)	4.82 (-4.59 to 14.23)	0.31
Day 90	14.9 (25.1)	13.4 (30.6)	-3.12 (-13.76 to 7.51)	0.56
Change in VAS breathlessness score from baseline, mean (SD), mm	(n = 67 with ≥ 1 measurement)	(n = 68 with ≥ 1 measurement)	Absolute difference ^c	
Baseline	50.3 (28.4)	60.8 (26.0)		
Day 30	-19.9 (30.4)	-34.3 (28.4)	-6.8 (-15.97 to 2.41)	0.15
Day 60	-14.4 (32.3)	-30.3 (30.3)	-5.3 (-16.67 to 6.15)	0.37
Day 90	-17.3 (33.0)	-23.1 (41.4)	9.6 (-3.88 to 23.11)	0.17
Change in VAS chest pain score from baseline, mean (SD), mm	(n = 67 with ≥ 1 measurement)	(n = 68 with ≥ 1 measurement)	Absolute difference ^c	
Baseline	20.7 (27.1)	22.1 (27.1)		
Day 30	-1.9 (24.1)	-7.5 (24.7)	-2.84 (-9.69 to 4.02)	0.42
Day 60	-0.6 (22.0)	0.6 (30.0)	3.7 (-5.01 to 12.44)	0.41
Day 90	-4.27 (25.3)	2.8 (34.1)	8.7 (-2.79 to 20.17)	0.14
Pleurodesis failure, number (%)	(n = 49)	(n = 28)	Unadjusted odds ratio	
Day 30	9 (18.4%)	18 (64.3%)	8.0 (2.77 to 23.1)	<0.001
Day 60	12(24.5%)	18 (64.3%)	5.55 (2.02 to 15.25)	<0.001
Day 90	13 (26.5%)	16 (57.1%)	3.7 (1.38 to 9.8)	0.01

295

296 VAS – visual analogue scale.

297 a: Unless otherwise stated.

298 b: ANCOVA adjusted for baseline global health status as a covariate.

299 c: Adjusted regression model for the stratification factors: (age [≤65years, >65years], WHO performance status [0,1,2 or 3],
300 underlying malignancy [mesothelioma, breast cancer, lung cancer or other]).

301

302

303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333





Figure 3a: Pleurodesis failure in the IPC group. IPC – indwelling pleural catheter.

334
 335
 336
 337
 338
 339
 340
 341
 342
 343
 344
 345
 346
 347
 348
 349
 350
 351
 352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364



Chest drain + talc – 13/49 (26.5%) patients were classified as pleurodesis failure at day 90: 8 had an ipsilateral intervention; 5 met pleurodesis failure criteria on the basis of chest x-ray opacification alone.

Chest drain and no talc – 8/18 (44.4%) underwent an ipsilateral pleural intervention before day 90.

Figure 3b: Talc pleurodesis, additional pleural interventions and pleurodesis failure in the chest drain group.

Adverse Events

Adverse events are shown in Table 4, with more information in eTable S1 (Supplement 2). 83 events were recorded in the IPC group and 63 in the chest drain group occurring in 48 and 43 patients, respectively. There were more trial-related adverse events in the IPC group (26) vs the chest drain group (13).

365 Median per protocol hospitalization for chest drain patients was 4 days. There were 26 additional
 366 hospitalizations in the chest drain arm; none of these hospitalizations was related to the trial
 367 intervention. There were an additional 40 hospitalizations in the IPC arm; 7 of 40 were deemed
 368 intervention related. Two patients in the IPC arm were admitted primarily due to anxiety related to
 369 their indwelling catheter.

370 Thirty-six patients died (20 in the chest drain arm and 16 in the IPC arm). One patient died in the IPC
 371 arm due to pleural infection on a background of advanced malignancy. The odds ratio for death was
 372 0.71 (95% CI, 0.33 to 1.52, p=0.39).

373 Table 4: Reported adverse events

Adverse Event	No. of events	
	Chest Drain (n=63)	IPC (n=83)
Intervention related serious adverse event	0	7
Hospital admission for drain related anxiety	-	2
Hospital admission for drain related pain	-	1
Hospital admission with pleural infection	-	1
Hospital admission with pleurodesis related pain	-	1
Pre-pleurodesis steroid withdrawal	-	1
Post insertion oxygen requirement	-	1
Intervention related adverse event	13	19
Pleurodesis related pain	1	1
Drain related pain	-	4
Hydropneumothorax with air leak	1	2
Pleurodesis related fever	1	-
Cutaneous infection	2	5
Pleural infection	1	1
Tube displacement	1	2
Drain blockage	5	2
Tract metastasis	-	1
Vasovagal syncope during insertion	1	-
Failed drain insertion	-	1
Events not related to intervention	50	57
Death	20	16
Admission for symptom control / cancer progression (non-intervention related)	9	10
Other (see eTable S1)	21	31

374

375

376 *Post-hoc analysis*

377 Data were examined on physical, social, emotional, cognitive and role functional domains. These
378 results are summarised in Supplement 2 (Figure S4 and eTable S4).

379

380 Discussion

381

382 To the best of our knowledge, this is the first multicentre, open-label randomised controlled trial to
383 investigate the impact of management of MPE on HRQoL as a primary outcome.

384 Within the limits of the study, our findings suggest that the outpatient IPC pathway was not superior
385 to inpatient treatment with a chest drain and talc slurry in improving global health status, as
386 measured by the EORTC QLQ C-30 questionnaire at 30 days post-intervention. However, both
387 treatment approaches delivered sustained improvements in global health status at 60 and 90-days.
388 These findings align closely with HRQoL outcomes observed in the TIME2 trial, where both
389 approaches yielded similar EORTC QLQ C-30 outcomes in a smaller patient cohort[12]. Additionally,
390 another interventional study assessing HRQoL as a secondary measure, did not identify any
391 significant differences between the outpatient and inpatient treatment pathways over 1 year of
392 follow up when utilising the EQ 5D-5L and the 100mm VAS tools[4].

393 IPCs are increasingly being used as a first line treatment in the management of symptomatic, recurrent
394 malignant pleural effusion in some parts of the world, despite a lack of trial data to support its
395 superiority over chest drain and talc pleurodesis in symptom control and hospital length of stay in the
396 year after intervention[4]. A key goal of treatment is to improve health-related quality of life, and
397 given our findings, we advocate that patients select a treatment pathway best suited for their overall
398 health, psychological and social circumstances. However, the outpatient pathway is a multifaceted
399 intervention, requiring a secure framework of community healthcare support. In regions where this
400 may not be viable, we recommend opting for a chest drain and talc pleurodesis.

401 Our study also examined pleurodesis failure as a secondary outcome. This was significantly higher in
402 the IPC arm than in the chest drain arm (69% vs 26.5% at 90 days, respectively). Several reasons may
403 explain this finding. The definition of talc pleurodesis failure in the outpatient arm included patients
404 in whom the IPC remained in situ despite successful pleurodesis; chosen because a key aim of offering
405 pleurodesis via an IPC is to promote expeditious catheter removal. Three of 13 (23%) eligible patients
406 chose not to have their IPCs removed following successful pleurodesis, highlighting the anxiety
407 surrounding fluid recurrence. Patients in the IPC group had larger effusions, and more were receiving
408 systemic steroid therapy at the time of trial recruitment; which may have had an effect.[13, 14]

409 The IPC-PLUS trial, which primarily examined pleurodesis outcomes via an IPC, reported a 43%
410 pleurodesis success rate at 35 days post-talc insufflation,[2] which is slightly higher than the rate of
411 pleurodesis success at Day 30 (35%) in this study. However, differences in drainage protocols
412 (affecting the degree of pleural apposition) and patient selection may account for this disparity.

413 Of note, there were significantly more intervention related adverse events in the outpatient treatment
414 arm, particularly hospitalization due to an intervention-related adverse event (7 vs 0). Given the lack
415 of superiority of outpatient management for the primary outcome measure and similar outcomes,
416 these findings may suggest that chest drain and talc pleurodesis may be the preferred treatment
417 option in some patients.. Therefore, we advocate careful consideration and counselling of the
418 potential risks before offering management with an IPC.

419 The main limitation is the data attrition for the primary outcome. Despite this, the findings still
420 contribute valuable insights into HRQoL outcomes. Significant improvements in global health status
421 were seen in both treatment arms with the observed difference well below clinically significant levels,
422 and these findings are also supported by the sensitivity analysis. This study reflects the considerable
423 practical challenges faced in conducting studies in this population, particularly when implementing
424 complex interventions in a real-world context. Strategies to mitigate attrition in future studies in this
425 area may include utility of a scoring tool for prognostication or delivery of the study follow-up within
426 the patient's home setting.

427 The EORTC QLQ-C30 questionnaire used to assess overall HRQoL was selected due to its validation in
428 the cancer population. However, the minimal important difference (MID) for the EORTC QLQ-C30
429 global health status scale varies in different cancer populations. The MID chosen for the primary
430 outcome analysis was selected based on a combination of previously published data in the lung and
431 breast cancer population. More importantly, this has not been specifically defined in the MPE
432 population and to the best of our knowledge, there is no HRQoL questionnaire that is specifically
433 designed and validated for patients with MPE. A bespoke questionnaire focused on a combination of
434 physical, emotional and social functions in patients within the last year of life may be useful in
435 understanding outcomes in these other domains. Only patients with a performance status of less than
436 3 and an expected prognosis of 3 months were included, as assessed by the treating clinician. This was
437 to ensure patients committed to the outpatient treatment pathway would be ambulant and well
438 enough to undertake the requirements of the study. Therefore these results may not be applicable to
439 a key group of patients with poorer performance status and shorter life expectancy.

440 The outpatient pathway is resource intensive, especially concerning community nursing assistance,
441 expenses linked to drainage bottles, and the hospital resources required for administering outpatient

442 talc treatment. Despite the promotion of ambulatory management approaches by policymakers, these
443 demands might not be achievable in every setting.

444 To summarise, this study suggests that treatment using an IPC and managing as outpatient is not
445 superior to inpatient chest drain and pleurodesis at improving HRQoL. However, the IPC pathway is
446 associated with an increased rate of adverse events. An informed treatment choice should be made
447 based on patient preferences, acceptability of risk, social circumstances, values, affordability and
448 treatment accessibility.

449

450

451 *Contributors*

452 Sivakumar, Douiri and Ahmed had full access to all of the data in the study and take responsibility for
453 the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

454 Concept and design: Ahmed, Sivakumar, Rao, Douiri

455 Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data: All authors

456 Drafting of the manuscript: Sivakumar, Ahmed

457 Critical revision of the manuscript: All authors

458 Statistical analysis: Douiri, Sun

459 Obtained funding: Ahmed

460 Administrative, technical, or material support: Wallace, Noorzad, West, Simpson, Sivakumar, Ahmed

461

462 *Declaration of interests*

463 Dr. Ahmed reported receiving grants from GE outside the submitted work.

464 Dr. Sivakumar reported receiving grants from Rocket Medical outside the submitted work.

465 Dr. Fitzgerald reports grants from European Respiratory Society outside the submitted work.

466 Professor. Maskell reports grants and personal fees from Beckton Dickinson and Company outside of
467 the submitted work.

468 Professor. Lee reports non-financial support from Rocket Med Plc, grants from Rocket Med PLC,
469 outside the submitted work.

470 No other disclosures were reported.

471

472 *Acknowledgments*

473 This trial was funded by an unrestricted research grant from Becton Dickinson, which also supplied
474 PleurX catheters and drainage bottles for use in the study. The trial was sponsored by Guy's and St
475 Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust who provided trial oversight for both national and international
476 recruitment centres

477 *Role of the Funder/Sponsor*

478 Neither the funder nor the sponsor had a role in the design and conduct of the study; collection,
479 management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the
480 manuscript; or decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

481

482

483

485

- 486 1. Clive AO, Kahan BC, Hooper CE, et al. Predicting survival in malignant pleural effusion:
487 development and validation of the LENT prognostic score. *Thorax* 2014; 69(12): 1098-1104.
- 488 2. Bhatnagar R, Keenan EK, Morley AJ, et al. Outpatient talc administration by indwelling
489 pleural catheter for malignant effusion. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2018; 378(14): 1313-1322.
- 490 3. Wahidi MM, Reddy C, Yarmus L, et al. Randomized trial of pleural fluid drainage frequency in
491 patients with malignant pleural effusions. The ASAP trial. *American journal of respiratory and critical*
492 *care medicine* 2017; 195(8): 1050-1057.
- 493 4. Thomas R, Fysh ET, Smith NA, et al. Effect of an indwelling pleural catheter vs talc
494 pleurodesis on hospitalization days in patients with malignant pleural effusion: the AMPLE
495 randomized clinical trial. *Jama* 2017; 318(19): 1903-1912.
- 496 5. Sivakumar P, Saigal A, Ahmed L. Quality of life after interventions for malignant pleural
497 effusions: a systematic review. *BMJ Supportive & Palliative Care* 2020; 10(1): 45-54.
- 498 6. Sivakumar P, Douiri A, West A, et al. OPTIMUM: a protocol for a multicentre randomised
499 controlled trial comparing Out Patient Talc slurry via Indwelling pleural catheter for Malignant
500 pleural effusion vs Usual inpatient Management. *BMJ open* 2016; 6(10).
- 501 7. Roberts ME, Neville E, Berrisford RG, et al. Management of a malignant pleural effusion:
502 British Thoracic Society pleural disease guideline 2010. *Thorax* 2010; 65(Suppl 2): ii32-ii40.
- 503 8. Scott NW, Fayers P, Aaronson NK, et al. EORTC QLQ-C30 reference values manual. 2008.
- 504 9. Fayers P, Aaronson NK, Bjordal K, et al. EORTC QLQ-C30 scoring manual. European
505 Organisation for Research and Treatment of Cancer, 1995.
- 506 10. Azur MJ, Stuart EA, Frangakis C, et al. Multiple imputation by chained equations: what is it
507 and how does it work? *International journal of methods in psychiatric research* 2011; 20(1): 40-49.
- 508 11. Buuren Sv, Groothuis-Oudshoorn K. mice: Multivariate imputation by chained equations in
509 R. *Journal of statistical software* 2010; 1-68.
- 510 12. Davies HE, Mishra EK, Kahan BC, et al. Effect of an indwelling pleural catheter vs chest tube
511 and talc pleurodesis for relieving dyspnea in patients with malignant pleural effusion: the TIME2
512 randomized controlled trial. *Jama* 2012; 307(22): 2383-2389.
- 513 13. Xie C, Teixeira LR, McGovern JP, et al. Systemic corticosteroids decrease the effectiveness of
514 talc pleurodesis. *American journal of respiratory and critical care medicine* 1998; 157(5 Pt 1): 1441-
515 1444.
- 516 14. Hassan M, Gadallah M, Mercer RM, et al. Predictors of outcome of pleurodesis in patients
517 with malignant pleural effusion: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Expert review of respiratory*
518 *medicine* 2020; 14(6): 645-654.

519