

Effect of dexamethasone on intelligence and hearing in preterm infants: a meta-analysis

Ruolin Zhang, Tao Bo, Li Shen, Senlin Luo, Jian Li

Department of Pediatrics, Second Xiangya Hospital, Central South University, Changsha, Hunan Province, China

Corresponding author:

Jian Li, M.D., Department of Pediatrics, Second Xiangya Hospital, Central South University, Changsha 410011, Hunan Province, China, juli0802@sina.com.

doi:10.4103/1673-5374.130085 http://www.nrronline.org/

Accepted: 2014-01-28

Abstract

OBJECTIVE: A meta-analysis of published randomized controlled trials investigating the long-term effect of dexamethasone on the nervous system of preterm infants.

DATA SOURCES: Online literature retrieval was conducted using The Cochrane Library (from January 1993 to June 2013), EMBASE (from January 1980 to June 2013), MEDLINE (from January 1963 to June 2013), OVID (from January 1993 to June 2013), Springer (from January 1994 to June 2013) and Chinese Academic Journal Full-text Database (from January 1994 to June 2013). Key words were preterm infants and dexamethasone in English and Chinese.

STUDY SELECTION: Selected studies were randomized controlled trials assessing the effect of intravenous dexamethasone in preterm infants. The quality of the included papers was evaluated and those without the development of the nervous system and animal experiments were excluded. Quality assessment was performed through bias risk evaluation in accordance with Cochrane Handbook 5.1.0 software in the Cochrane Collaboration. The homogeneous studies were analyzed and compared using Revman 5.2.6 software, and then effect model was selected and analyzed. Those papers failed to be included in the meta-analysis were subjected to descriptive analysis. **MAIN OUTCOME MEASURES:** Nervous system injury in preterm infants.

RESULTS: Ten randomized controlled trials were screened, involving 1,038 subjects. Among them 512 cases received dexamethasone treatment while 526 cases served as placebo control group and blank control group. Meta-analysis results showed that the incidence of cerebral palsy, visual impairment and hearing loss in preterm infants after dexamethasone treatment within 7 days after birth was similar to that in the control group (RR = 1.47, 95%CI: 0.97–2.21; RR = 1.46, 95%CI: 0.97–2.20; RR = 0.80, 95%CI: 0.54–1.18; P > 0.05), but intelligence quotient was significantly decreased compared with the control group (MD = -3.55, 95%CI: -6.59 to -0.51; P = 0.02). Prete rm infants treated with dexamethasone 7 days after birth demonstrated an incidence of cerebral palsy and visual impairment, and changes in intelligence quotient similar to those in the control group (RR = 1.26, 95%CI: 0.89–1.79; RR = 1.37, 95%CI: 0.73–2.59; RR = 0.53, 95%CI: 0.32–0.89; RR = 1.66, 95%CI: -4.7 to 8.01; P > 0.05). However, the incidence of hearing loss was significantly increased compared with that in the control group (RR = 0.53, 95%CI: 0.32–0.89; P = 0.02). **CONCLUSION:** Dexamethasone may affect the intelligence of preterm infants in the early stages after birth, but may lead to hearing impairment at later stages after birth. More reliable conclusions

Key Words: nerve regeneration; systematic review; preterm infants; dexamethasone; glucocorticoids; nervous system development; cerebral palsy; hearing impairment; meta-analysis; randomized controlled trials; the Science and Technology Plan Program of Hunan Province; neural regeneration

should be made through large-size, multi-center, well-designed randomized controlled trials.

Funding: This study was supported by the Science and Technology Plan Program of Hunan Province, No. 2011SK3234.

Zhang RL, Bo T, Shen L, Luo SL, Li J. Effect of dexamethasone on intelligence and hearing in preterm infants: a meta-analysis. Neural Regen Res. 2014;9(6):637-645.

Introduction

Dexamethasone, a glucocorticoid, has been widely used in the prevention and treatment of neonatal respiratory distress syndrome, bronchopulmonary dysplasia and other chronic lung diseases in preterm infants to accelerate the withdrawal of breathing machines and shorten time on oxygen therapy^[1]. Acute adverse reactions of glucocorticoids include high blood pressure, high blood sugar and adrenal insufficiency^[2-3], but the majority of these acute adverse effects are transient. However, glucocorticoids, especially dexamethasone, have attracted increasing attention because of the long-term effects on the development of the nervous system in preterm infants. Dexamethasone has been reported to increase the risk of cerebral palsy in preterm infants^[4] and affect motor function, cognitive function^[5-6] and academic performance^[7-8] in children at school age. Owing to these potential and serious adverse reactions, the American Academy of Pediatrics and the Canadian Pediatric Society do not recommend postnatal dexamethasone therapy in preterm infants, with exceptions for maintaining essential oxygenation using large-volume, high concentrations of oxygen^[9]. By contrast, some scholars also found that dexamethasone significantly attenuated lipopolysaccharide-induced inflammation in neonatal rat brain, promoted myelin basic protein expression, inhibited lateral ventricle dilatation, and significantly reduced behavioral abnormalities^[10]. In addition, dexamethasone plays a neuroprotective role through the upregulation of the expression of neurotrophic factors and anti-apoptosis genes, such as nerve growth factor, basic fibroblast growth factor, and vascular endothelial growth factor^[11-12].

We speculate that glucocorticoids have a long-term impact on the development of the nervous system and increase the incidence of cerebral palsy in preterm infants. The existing studies concerning the role of dexamethasone in preterm infants are insufficiently reliable owing to short follow-up periods and small sample sizes in clinical studies, or the absence of randomized controlled trials. The present study aims to quantitatively analyze the long-term effect of dexamethasone on nervous system development in preterm infants through a meta-analysis involving a large sample size in a broader attempt to provide evidence for clinical application of dexamethasone in preterm infants.

Data and Methods

Literature retrieval

A literature search was independently performed by two researchers according to the Handbook RCT search strategy in the Cochrane Collaboration. The searched database included the Cochrane Library (from January 1993 to June 2013), EMBASE (from January 1980 to June 2013), MED-LINE (from January 1963 to June 2013), OVID (from January 1993 to June 2013), and Springer (from January 1994 to June 2013) database. The search terms used were "infant, premature" [MeSH Terms] OR "infant" [All Fields] AND premature" [All Fields] OR "premature infant" [All Fields] OR "preterm" [All Fields] AND "infant" [All Fields] OR "preterm infant" [All Fields] AND "dexamethasone" [MeSH Terms] OR "dexamethasone" [All Fields] AND Randomized Controlled Trial [ptyp]. The Chinese Academic Journal Fulltext database between January 1994 and June 2013 was also retrieved using preterm infants, dexamethasone and randomized controlled trial as the search terms. The presence of bias in the included literature was evaluated by the third researcher. Meanwhile, we manually retrieved all unpublished literature or papers without available full-text, and collected related data from ongoing research or trials. Repetition of the same experiment was excluded.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Inclusion criteria

(1) Literature type: All published or to-be-published studies in international journals addressing randomized controlled trials about the effect of dexamethasone treatment in preterm infants were included, with language and nation not specified. (2) Subjects: Preterm infants (gestational age is less than 37 weeks) suffering from neonatal respiratory distress syndrome, in urgent need of mechanical ventilation for oxygen support, and at a high risk of chronic lung disease, were included. Those with congenital heart disease and sepsis after birth were excluded. (3) Interventions: Literature concerning a dexamethasone treatment and a blank control or placebo group were included. (4) Outcome variable or curative effect assessment index: neurological damage in preterm infants at the end of follow-up after dexamethasone treatment, including cerebral palsy, visual impairment, hearing loss and changes in intelligence quotient values. The outcome variables are odds ratio (OR), relative risk (RR) or mean difference (MD) in treatment and control groups at the end of follow-up.

Exclusion criteria

(1) Repeatedly published literature, only pertaining to one paper with long-term follow-up period, large sample volume and full-scale data. (2) Literature was excluded if they met any of the following criteria: prenatal dexamethasone therapy (at late pregnancy or before childbirth); non-intravenous administration of dexamethasone (such as inhalation); no description of long-term prognosis of the nervous system; or non-randomized controlled trials and animal experiments.

Data extraction

Two independent reviewers inspected the titles and abstracts of the included studies, and screened the selected literature according to inclusion and exclusion criteria. Where disputes arose owing to no subject words found in titles and abstracts, we acquired the full report for more detailed scrutiny to assess their relevance to this review. Again, where disagreement occurred we attempted to resolve this through the third researcher or through discussion. The extracted data included author's name, publication year, sample size, interventions, the number of cases at the final follow-up, outcome variables (cerebral palsy, visual impairment, hearing loss and intelligence quotient values), and follow-up time.

Quality assessment

The quality of methodological reporting of selected studies was assessed using bias analysis of randomized controlled trials. Criteria for quality assessment were based on recommendations from the Cochrane Handbook 5.1.0 software^[22], including selection bias, performance bias, attrition bias, publication bias and other biases. The analysis results were defined as "Yes" (low bias), "No" (high bias) and "Unclear" (bias-related information is not clear or bias can not be determined).

Main outcome measurements

The prevalence of nervous system adverse consequences (cerebral palsy, visual impairment, hearing loss) and the development of intelligence (intelligence quotient values) after dexamethasone treatment were detected.

Statistical analysis

Meta-analysis was performed using RevMan 5.2.6 software (Cochrane Collaboration, 2012, http://ims.cochrane.org/ revman). For binary outcomes, the relative risks of nervous system adverse reactions between treatment and control groups and 95% confidence intervals (*CI*) were calculated. Continuous variables were represented as *MD* and 95%*CI*, and subject to statistical analysis. Heterogeneity was assessed using χ^2 and I^2 tests. When the analysis results showed no heterogeneity ($P \ge 0.10$ or $I^2 < 50\%$), we adopted a fixed-effect model for description of potential publication bias. When the analysis results showed the presence of heterogeneity (P < 0.10 or $I^2 \ge 50\%$), we chose a random-effect mod-

					Outcomes					Follow	
Patien Study (<i>n</i>)		ent	Intervention	Case (<i>n</i>)	Cerebral palsy (<i>n</i>)	Vision damage (<i>n</i>)	Hearing damage (<i>n</i>)	IQ scores (<i>n</i>)	- Follow-up	up rate (%)	
Yeh et al. ^[8] , 2004 T 132		32	0.25 mg/kg, Q12 h×7 d; 0.12 mg/kg, Q12 h×7 d; 0.05 mg/kg, Q12×7 d; 0.02 mg/kg, Q12 h×7 d	72	20	12	18	78.20±15.00	15 years	55.7	
	C 1	30	Placebo	74	14	7	12	84.40 ± 12.60			
Ter Wolbeek et al. ^[13] , 2013	Те	53	0.5 mg/kg per day tapering off to 0.1 mg/kg per day over 21 d	63	Unrecorded	Unrecorded	Unrecorded	86.79±16.16	14–17 years	100.0	
	C	71	Blank control	71	Unrecorded	Unrecorded	Unrecorded	90.28±15.80			
Doyle et al. ^[14] ,	Τ 3	35	(0.89 mg/kg total) tapering	29	4	1	2	Unrecorded	2 years	80.0	
2007	Cŝ	35	Placebo	27	6	0	4				
O'shea et al. ^[15] ,	Τ 5	57	42-d tapering course of dex	50	13	Unrecorded	Unrecorded	Unrecorded	4-11	80.5	
2007	C	51	Blank control	45	4	Unrecorded	Unrecorded	Unrecorded	years		
Gross et al. ^[16] ,	ΤI	12	42-d tapering course of dex	9	0	3	Unrecorded	$85.00 {\pm} 10.00$	15 years	58.3	
2005	C	12	Blank control	5	1	2	Unrecorded	73.00 ± 23.00			
Jones et al. ^[17] ,	Τ1	24	0.6 mg/kg per day×7 d	71	17	3	4	Unrecorded	13-17	61.5	
2005	C 1	20	Placebo	79	12	2	5	Unrecorded	years		
Romagnoli et al. ^[18] , 2002	ΤI	15	0.5 mg/kg per day×6 d; 0.25 mg/kg per day×6 d; 0.125 mg/kg per day×2 d	15	2	3	1	84.20±12.40	3 years	100.0	
	С	15	Blank control	15	3	1	3	83.00±15.60			
Romagnoli et al. ^[19] , 2002	Τ 2	25	0.5 mg/kg per day×3 d; 0.25 mg/kg per day×3 d; 0.125 mg/kg per day×1 d	23	2	2	1	85.80±13.90	3 years	90.0	
	Cź	25	Blank control	22	3	1	4	85.60±16.30			
Shinwell	Τ1	32	0.25 mg/kg, Q12 h×3 d	80	39	17	1	Unrecorded	53±18	64.1	
et al. ^[20] , 2000	C 1	16	Blank control	79	12	12	0	Unrecorded	months		
Jones et al. ^[21] ,	Τ1	45	0.6 mg/kg per day×7 d	100	20	8	11	Unrecorded	3 years	72.8	
1995	C 1	42	Placebo	109	18	8	22	Unrecorded			

Table 1 The characteristics of included studies

T: The number of cases initially recruited in treatment group; C: the number of cases initially recruited in placebo control group; case (n): the number of cases at the end of follow-ups; IQ scores: Wechsler Intelligence test scores, normal 90–109, moderate to fair 110–119, excellent 120–139, extremely excellent over 140, fair to poor 80–89, critical 70–79, mental defect less than 69. d: Days; h: hours.

Table 2 Results of bias risk of included literature

Risk of bias	Interpretation	With in a study	Across studies
Low	Plausible bias unlikely to seriously alter the results	Low risk of bias for all key domains	Most information is from studies at low risk of bias
Unclear	Plausible bias that raise some doubt about the results	Unclear risk of bias for one or more key domains	Most information is from studies at low or unclear risk of bias
High	Plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results	High risk of bias for one or more key domains	The proportion of information from studies at high risk of bias to affect the interpretation of results

el. Meanwhile the sensitivity of analysis results was detected. Meta regression analysis is selected if the heterogeneity could accurately measure and explain all variations, while we applied meta regression analysis + mixed-effect model when the heterogeneity could not explain variations. Only 10 studies were included in this study, so we did not choose meta regression analysis + a mixed-effect model.

Results

Data retrieval

After preliminary retrieval, 1,669 studies addressing dexamethasone treatment in preterm infants were initially identified through electronic and manual searches. After reading their titles, abstracts and full-text, ten randomized controlled trials were considered potentially relevant for further inspection^[8, 13-21]. They were all published in English. Data retrieval procedures are shown in Figure 1.

Characteristics of included studies and methodological quality estimation

Table 1 summarizes the characteristics from each study included. Among 10 studies, random allocation method and random number were introduced in detail in four studies^[14, 17, 20-21]; other documents only mentioned random allocation, leaving the allocation method unclear. Another five studies^[8, 15, 17, 20-21] recorded allocation concealment method. All studies, bar one^[8], gave a description of blinding method. The loss to follow-up, the number of lost cases, and the reasons for dropout were recorded. The loss to follow-up reached over 30% in some studies^[8, 16-17, 20]. According to the Cochrane Handbook 5.1.0 for Interventions in the Cochrane Collaboration^[22] (Table 2),





Figure 2 Distribution of bias in the included studies.

According to the Evaluation Criteria of Bias Risk of Randomized Controlled Trials in Cochrane Handbook, green refers to "yes" (low bias), red refers to "no" (high bias), and yellow refers to "unclear" (bias-related information is not clear or bias cannot be determined).

the quality of random allocation, quality of random concealment, blinding and data integrity were considered the four critical domains. The results showed high biases in five studies^[8, 16-17, 19-20], low bias in one study^[21], and moderate bias in four studies^[13-15, 18] (Figures 2, 3). Ten randomized controlled trials were included in this review, involving 1,038 cases. Among them, 512 cases received dexamethasone treatment (cerebral palsy in 117 cases, visual impairment in 49 cases and hearing loss in 38 cases), while 526 cases served as the control group (cerebral palsy in 73



Figure 3 Risk of bias in the included literature.

According to the Evaluation Criteria of Bias Risk of Randomized Controlled Trials in Cochrane Handbook, green refers to "yes" (low bias)^[21], red refers to "no" (high bias)^[8,16-17,19-20], and yellow refers to "unclear" (bias-related information is not clear or bias cannot be determined)^[13-15,18].

cases, visual impairment in 33 cases and hearing loss in 50 cases). In addition, five studies^[8, 13, 16, 18-19] described changes in intelligence quotient values.

Meta-analysis results

Comparison of the incidence of cerebral palsy in preterm infants after dexamethasone treatment

Nine studies^[8, 14-21] reported the effects of dexamethasone on the incidence of cerebral palsy. The heterogeneity test results showed that $\chi^2 = 14.68$, P = 0.07, $I^2 = 45\%$, indicating significant heterogeneity among studies. The random effect model was used for analysis. Meta-analysis results showed the combined RR = 1.47 and 95% *CI*: 0.97-2.21, indicating that there was no significant difference in the incidence of cerebral palsy in preterm infants between the dexamethasone treatment and the control group (Z = 1.68, P = 0.07; Figure 4A).

Comparison of the incidence of visual impairment in preterm infants after dexamethasone treatmen

Eight studies^[8, 14, 16-21] reported the effects of dexamethasone

on the incidence of visual impairment. The heterogeneity test results showed that $\chi^2 = 1.83$, P = 0.07, $I^2 = 0\%$, indicating no significant heterogeneity among studies. The fixed effect model was used for analysis. Meta-analysis results showed the combined RR = 1.46 and 95% CI: 0.97-2.20, indicating that there was no significant difference in the incidence of visual impairment in preterm infants between the dexamethasone treatment group and the control group (Z = 1.83, P = 0.07; Figure 4B).

Comparison of the incidence of hearing loss in preterm infants after dexamethasone treatment

Seven studies^[8, 14, 17-21] reported the effects of dexamethasone on the incidence of hearing loss. The heterogeneity test results showed that $\chi^2 = 8.01$, P = 0.24, $I^2 = 25\%$, indicating no significant heterogeneity among studies. The fixed effect model was used for analysis. Meta-analysis results showed the combined RR = 0.80 and 95%*CI*: 0.54–1.18, indicating that there was no significant difference in the incidence of hearing loss in preterm infants between the dexamethasone treatment group and the control group (Z = 1.12, P = 0.26; Figure 4C).

Changes in intelligence quotient values in preterm infants after dexamethasone treatment

Five studies^[8, 13, 16, 18-19] reported the effects of dexamethasone on intelligence quotient. The heterogeneity test results showed that $\chi^2 = 4.94$, P = 0.29, $I^2 = 19\%$, indicating no significant heterogeneity among studies. The fixed effect model was used for analysis. Meta-analysis results showed the combined *MD* = -3.55, 95%*CI*: -6.59 to -0.51, indicating that the intelligence quotient of preterm infants after dexamethasone treatment was significantly decreased compared with that in the control group (Z = 2.29, P = 0.02; Figure 4D).

Sensitivity analysis results

The methodology of the included studies was evaluated according to the Cochrane Handbook 5.1.0 software, and bias evaluation results indicate that the risk of bias was the highest in reference 19, which was then excluded. When comparing the treatment group and control group before and after treatment, the incidence of cerebral palsy *RR* (95% *CI*) was 1.47 (0.97–2.21) and 1.53 (1.00–2.33) respectively, whilst the incidence of visual impairment *RR* (95% *CI*) was 1.46 (0.97–2.20) and 1.45 (0.96–2.19). Furthermore, the incidence of hearing loss *RR* (95% *CI*) was respectively 0.80 (0.54–1.18) and 0.85 (0.57–1.27) and the intelligence quotient value *MD* (95% *CI*) was –3.55 (–6.59 to –0.51) and –4.05 (–7.29 to –0.81), suggesting a significant difference in intelligence quotient value between the two groups (P = 0.01; Figure 5).

Meta-analysis on the effect of dexamethasone on the nervous system of preterm infants at a later stage after birth

Ten studies were included in the meta-analysis. Among them, three studies^[8, 13, 20] introduced early use of dexamethasone in preterm infants (within 7 days after birth) and seven studies^[8, 14, 16-19, 21] introduced later use of dexamethasone in preterm infants (after 7 days after birth). Owing to a small number and small sample size of randomized controlled trials addressing early postnatal dexamethasone therapy, we failed to perform subgroup analysis. Therefore, we only analyzed the literature concerning the use of later postnatal dexamethasone (after 7 days). Meta-analysis results showed that when

А								В									
	Experim	nental	Contro	ol		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio		Experime	ental	Contro	k		Risk Ratio	Risk	Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H. Random, 95% Cl	M-H. Random, 95% CI	Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	M-H, Fixe	d, 95% Cl	
Doyle,L W 2007	4	29	6	27	9.4%	0.56 [0.14, 2.25]		Doyle,LW 2007	1	27	0	27	1.5%	3.00 [0.13, 70.53]	(+
Jones,R 1995	20	100	18	109	17.0%	1.26 [0.63, 2.56]	- !- -	Jones,R 1995	8	100	8	109	22.8%	1.09 [0.43, 2.79]		•	
Jones, R A 2005	17	71	12	79	15.5%	1.76 [0.77, 4.00]	+	Jones, R A 2005	3	71	2	79	5.6%	1.67 [0.29, 9.70]		•	+
Romagnoli, C 2002	2	15	3	15	5.9%	0.62 [0.09, 4.34]	·	Romagnoli, C 2002	3	23	1	22	3.0%	2.87 [0.32, 25.55]		· · ·	+
Romagnoli,C 2002	2	23	3	22	6.2%	0.60 [0.09, 4.01]	·	Romagnoli, C 2002	2	15	1	15	3.0%	2.00 [0.20, 19.78]	(+
Shinwell, E S 2000	39	80	12	79	16.4%	5.31 [2.50, 11.30]		Shinwell, ES 2000	17	80	12	79	35.9%	1.40 [0.72, 2.74]	_	-	
Steven J.Gross 2005	0	9	1	5	2.4%	0.16 [0.01, 4.69]	·	Steven J.Gross 2005	3	9	2	5	7.6%	0.83 [0.20, 3.44]	• •		-
T.Michael O'shea 2007	13	50	4	45	11.1%	3.60 [1.08, 12.02]		Yeh,T F 2004	12	72	7	74	20.5%	1.76 [0.74, 4.22]		-	+
Yeh,T F 2004	20	72	14	74	16.1%	1.65 [0.76, 3.59]	+										
								Total (95% CI)		397		410	100.0%	1.46 [0.97, 2.20]			
Total (95% CI)		449		455	100.0%	1.59 [0.92, 2.76]	-	Total events	49		33						
Total events	117		73					Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1	1.83, df = 7 ((P = 0.9	7); I² = 0%				05.07	15.2	_
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.	33; Chi² = '	17.31, df	= 8 (P = 0).03); l²	² = 54%		01.02 05 1 2 5 10	Test for overall effect 2	Z = 1.83 (P =	= 0.07)				Fa	vours (experimental)	Favours [control]	
Test for overall effect: Z	= 1.65 (P =	= 0.10)					avoure [avoarimental] Eavoure [control]										
						F	woors feyberinientali i Lavous feoritroil										
С						- Fa	nons (evbermental) i snons (connol)	D									
С	Eunorim	ontal	Contr	al		Diak Datia	Diale Datia	D	Froerin	nental	Co	ontrol		Mean Difference	Mean	Difference	
C Study or Subgroup	Experim	ental Total	Contre	0 Total	Weight	Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio M H Eived 95% C1	D Shuhu or Suboroun	Experim	nental SD. Tot	Co al Mean	ontrol	intal Wai	Mean Difference	Mean CL IV. Fi	Difference	
C Study or Subgroup	Experim Events	iental <u>Total</u> 27	Contro Events	ol <u>Total</u> 27	Weight	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	D Study or Subgroup	Experim Mean	nental <u>SD Tot</u>	Co al Mean	ontrol SD 1	Total Wei	Mean Difference aht IV, Fixed, 95%	Mean Cl IV, Fio	Difference ted. 95% Cl	
C Study or Subgroup Doyle, L W 2007	Experim Events 2	iental <u>Total</u> 27	Contro Events 4 22	ol <u>Total</u> 27	Weight 8.1%	Risk Ratio <u>M-H, Fixed, 95% C1</u> 0.50 (0.10, 2.50) ⁴ 0.55 (0.28.1.07)	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	D <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Romagnoli, C 2002	Experin Mean 84.2 12	nental <u>SD Tot</u> 2.4 1	Co <u>al Mean</u> 15 83	ontrol <u>SD 1</u> 15.6	T <u>otal Wei</u> 15 9.	Mean Difference aht IV, Fixed, 95% 1% 1.20 [-8.88, 11.2	Mean Cl IV, Fib B]	Difference red, 95% Cl	-
C <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Doyle,L W 2007 Jones,R 1995 Jones & 2005	Experim Events 2 11	ental <u>Total</u> 27 100 71	Contro Events 4 22 5	ol <u>Total</u> 27 109 79	Weight 8.1% 42.8%	Risk Ratio <u>M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl</u> 0.50 (0.10, 2.50) 0.55 (0.28, 1.07) 0.80 0.25, 2.101	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	D <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Romagnoli, C 2002 Romagnoli, C 2002	Experin Mean : 84.2 12 85.8 13	nental <u>SD Tot</u> 2.4 1 3.9 2	Co <u>al Mean</u> 15 83 23 85.6	ontrol <u>SD 1</u> 15.6 16.3	<u>fotal Wei</u> 15 9: 22 11 <i>)</i>	Mean Difference a <u>ht IV. Fixed, 95%</u> 1% 1.20 [-8.88, 11.2 8% 0.20 [-8.67, 9.0	Mean Cl IV, Fib B] 7]	Difference ed. 95% Cl	-
C <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Doyle,L W 2007 Jones,R 1995 Jones,R A 2005 Permanenti C 2002	Experim Events 2 11 4	ental <u>Total</u> 27 100 71 15	Contro Events 4 22 5 3	ol <u>Total</u> 27 109 79 15	Weight 8.1% 42.8% 9.6% 6.1%	Risk Ratio <u>M-H. Fixed, 95% C1</u> 0.50 [0.10, 2.50] 0.59 [0.28, 1.07] 0.89 [0.25, 3.19] 0.33 m 0.4 2.851	Risk Ratio	D <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Romagnoli, C 2002 Romagnoli, C 2002 Steven J.Gross 2005	Experin <u>Mean</u> 84.2 12 85.8 12 85.8 12	nental <u>SD Tot</u> 2.4 1 3.9 2 10	Co <u>al Mean</u> 15 83 13 85.6 9 73	ontrol <u>SD 1</u> 15.6 16.3 23	Total Wei 15 9: 22 11 <i>1</i> 5 2:	Mean Difference aht IV. Fixed. 95% 1% 1.20 [-8.88, 11.2 8% 0.20 [-8.67, 9.0 1% 12.00 [-9.19, 33.1	Mean Cl IV. Fb 8] 7] 9]	Difference red, 95% Cl	
C Study or Subgroup Doyle, L.W 2007 Jones, R 1995 Jones, R A 2005 Romagnoli, C 2002 Bomagnoli, C 2002	Experim Events 2 11 4 1	ental <u>Total</u> 27 100 71 15 23	Contro Events 4 22 5 3 4	ol <u>Total</u> 27 109 79 15 22	Weight 8.1% 42.8% 9.6% 6.1% 8.3%	Risk Ratio M-H. Fixed, 95% CI 0.50 [0.10, 2.50] 0.55 [0.28, 1.07] 0.89 [0.25, 3.19] 0.33 [0.04, 2.85] 0.24 [0.12] 4.98]	Risk Ratio MH_Fixed, 95% CI	D Study or Subgroup Romagnoli, C 2002 Romagnoli, C 2002 Steven J. Gross 2005 Ter Wolbeek, M 2013	Experin <u>Mean</u> 84.2 12 85.8 12 85 86.79 16.	nental <u>SD Tot</u> 2.4 1 3.9 2 10 .16 6	Co <u>al Mean</u> 15 83 13 85.6 9 73 13 90.28	ntrol <u>SD 1</u> 15.6 16.3 23 15.8	(otal Weij 15 9. 22 11) 5 2. 71 31,	Mean Difference <u>aht IV. Fixed. 95%</u> 1% 1.20 [-8.88, 11.2 8% 0.20 [-8.67, 9.0 1% 12.00 [-9.19, 33.1 4% -3.49 [-8.91, 1.9	Mean <u>Cl IV. Fö</u> B] 7] 9] 3]	Difference red, 95% Cl	
C Study or Subgroup Doyle, L W 2007 Jones, R 1995 Jones, R A 2005 Romagnoli, C 2002 Romagnoli, C 2002 Shirowell F S 2000	Experim Events 2 11 4 1 1 1	rental <u>Total</u> 27 100 71 15 23 80	Contro Events 4 22 5 3 4 0	ol <u>Total</u> 27 109 79 15 22 79	Weight 8.1% 42.8% 9.6% 6.1% 8.3% 1.0%	Risk Ratio <u>M-H. Fixed, 95% C1</u> 0.50 [0.10, 2.50] 0.55 [0.28, 1.07] 0.89 [0.25, 3.19] 0.33 [0.04, 2.85] 0.24 [0.03, 1.95]	Risk Ratio	D <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Romagnoli, C 2002 Romagnoli, C 2002 Steven J. Gross 2005 Ter Wolbeek, M 2013 Yeh T F 2014	Experin Mean 3 84.2 12 85.8 12 85 86.79 16. 78.2	nental <u>SD Tot</u> 2.4 1 3.9 2 10 .16 6 15 7	Co al <u>Mean</u> 15 83 13 85.6 9 73 13 90.28 12 84.4	ntrol <u>SD 1</u> 15.6 16.3 23 15.8 12.6	Total Weig 15 9. 22 11) 5 2. 71 31, 74 45	Mean Difference aht IV. Fixed, 95% 1% 1.20 [-8.88, 11.2 8% 0.20 [-8.67, 9.0 12.00 [-9.19, 33.1 4% -3.49 [-8.91, 1.9 7% -6 20 [-10.70 -17	Mean <u>Cl IV. Fi</u> 8] 7] 9] 3]	Difference ed. 95% Cl	
C Study or Subgroup Doyle, LW 2007 Jones, R 1995 Jones, R A 2005 Romagnoli, C 2002 Romagnoli, C 2002 Shirwell, S 2004	Experim Events 2 11 4 1 1 1 1 1	ental <u>Total</u> 27 100 71 15 23 80 72	Contro Events 4 22 5 3 4 0 12	ol <u>Total</u> 27 109 79 15 22 79 74	Weight 8.1% 42.8% 9.6% 6.1% 8.3% 1.0% 24.0%	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 0.50 (0.10, 2.50) 0.59 (0.28, 1.07) 0.89 (0.25, 3.19) 0.33 (0.04, 2.85) 0.24 (0.03, 1.98) 2.96 (0.12, 71.65) 1.54 (0.18, 0.27)	Risk Ratio	D <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Romagnoli, C 2002 Romagnoli, C 2002 Steven J. Gross 2005 Ter Wolbeek, M 2013 Yeh, T F 2004	Experim Mean 3 84.2 12 85.8 12 85.8 12 86.79 16 78.2	nental <u>SD Tot</u> 2.4 1 3.9 2 10 .16 6 15 7	Co al <u>Mean</u> 15 83 13 85.6 9 73 13 90.28 12 84.4	ntrol <u>SD 1</u> 15.6 16.3 23 15.8 12.6	Total Weii 15 9: 22 11) 5 2: 71 31/ 74 45:	Mean Difference ght IV. Fixed, 95% 120 [-8.88, 112 95% 020 [-8.67, 9.0 91% 12.00 [-9.19, 33.1 14% -3.49 [-8.91, 1.9 -3.49 [-8.91, 1.9 7% -6.20 [-10.70, -1.7	Mean CI IV, Fit B] J] J] D]	Difference ed. 95% Cl	-
C Study or Subgroup Doyle, L.W 2007 Jones, R 1995 Jones, R A 2005 Romagnoli, C 2002 Romagnoli, C 2002 Shirwell, E S 2000 Yeh, T F 2004	Experim Events 2 11 4 1 1 1 1 18	Total 27 100 71 15 23 80 72	Contro Events 4 22 5 3 4 0 12	ol <u>Total</u> 27 109 79 15 22 79 74	Weight 8.1% 42.8% 9.6% 6.1% 8.3% 1.0% 24.0%	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 0.50 [0.10, 2.50] 0.50 [0.28, 1.07] 0.89 [0.25, 3.19] 0.33 [0.04, 2.85] 0.24 [0.03, 1.98] 2.96 [0.12, 71.65] 1.54 [0.80, 2.97]	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	D <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Romagnoli, C 2002 Romagnoli, C 2002 Steven J. Gross 2005 Ter Wolbeek, M 2013 Yeh, T F 2004 TeteJ (ISBN CD)	Experin Mean 3 84.2 12 85.8 13 85 86.79 16 78.2	nental <u>SD Tot</u> 2.4 1 3.9 2 10 .16 6 15 7 19	Co al Mean 15 83 13 85.6 9 73 13 90.28 12 84.4 12	ntrol <u>SD 1</u> 15.6 16.3 23 15.8 12.6	Total Weig 15 9. 22 11. 5 2. 71 31. 74 45. 197 400	Mean Difference <u>ht IV, Fixed, 95%</u> 1:20 [-8.88, 11:2 8% 0.20 [-8.67, 9.0 1% 12.00 [-9.19, 33.1 1% -3.49 [-8.91, 1.9 % -6.20 [-10.70, -1.7 pt 255 [-5.6, 0.5	Mean CI IV. Fi B] T] B] B] D] T_	Difference	-
C Study or Subgroup Doyle, L.W 2007 Jones, R 1995 Jones, R A 2005 Romagnoli, C 2002 Romagnoli, C 2002 Shirwell, E S 2000 Yeh, T F 2004 Total (95% CD	Experim Events 2 11 4 1 1 1 1 8	rental 27 100 71 15 23 80 72 388	Contro Events 4 22 5 3 4 0 12	ol <u>Total</u> 27 109 79 15 22 79 74 405	Weight 8.1% 42.8% 9.6% 6.1% 8.3% 1.0% 24.0%	Risk Ratio <u>M-H. Fixed, 95% C1</u> 0.50 [0.10, 25, 0.50] 0.55 [0.28, 1.07] 0.39 [0.25, 3.19] 0.33 [0.04, 2.85] 0.24 [0.03, 1.28] 2.36 [0.12, 71.65] 1.54 [0.80, 2.97] 0.80 [0.54, 1.18]	Risk Ratio MH, Fixed, 95% CI	D <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Romagnoli, C 2002 Romagnoli, C 2002 Steven J.Gross 2005 Ter Wolcek, M 2013 Yeh, T F 2004 Total (95% CI)	Experim Mean 3 84.2 12 85.8 12 85 86.79 16 78.2	nental <u>SD Tot</u> 2.4 1 3.9 2 10 .16 6 15 7 18	Co al <u>Mean</u> 15 83 13 85.6 9 73 13 90.28 12 84.4 12	ntrol <u>SD 1</u> 15.6 16.3 23 15.8 12.6	Total Weii 15 9. 22 11.7 5 2. 71 31.7 74 45. 187 100.	Mean Difference ht. IV. Fixed. 95% 1.20 [-8.88, 11.2 8% 0.20 [-8.67, 9.0 1% 12.00 [-9.19, 33.1 12.00 [-9.19, 33.1 4% -3.49 [-8.91, 1.9 -3.49 [-8.91, 1.9 -3.45 [-6.59, -0.5	Mean C(IV, Fi) B I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	Difference ed. 95% Cl	-
C Study or Subgroup Doyle, L.W 2007 Jones, R 1995 Jones, R A 2005 Romagnoli, C 2002 Romagnoli, C 2002 Shirwell, E S 2000 Yeh, T F 2004 Total (95% CI) Total events	Experim Events 2 11 4 1 1 1 18 38	Total 27 100 71 15 23 80 72 388	Contro Events 4 22 5 3 4 0 12	ol <u>Total</u> 27 109 79 15 22 79 74 405	Weight 8.1% 42.8% 9.6% 6.1% 8.3% 1.0% 24.0% 100.0%	Risk Ratio <u>M-H. Fixed, 95% C1</u> 0.50 [0.10, 2.50] 0.55 [0.28, 1.07] 0.39 [0.25, 3.19] 0.39 [0.25, 3.19] 0.39 [0.12, 3.19] 2.96 [0.12, 71.65] 1.54 [0.80, 2.97] 0.80 [0.54, 1.18]	Risk Ratio	D Study or Subgroup Romagnoli, C 2002 Romagnoli, C 2002 Steven J.Gross 2005 Ter Wolbeek, M 2013 Yeh, T F 2004 Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 4	Experim Mean 3 84.2 12 85.8 12 85.8 12 85.79 16. 78.2 4.94, df = 4 (l	nental <u>SD Tot</u> 2.4 1 3.9 2 10 .16 6 15 7 18 P = 0.29	Co al <u>Mean</u> 15 83 13 85.6 9 73 13 90.28 12 84.4 12 12 [7 = 19%	ontrol <u>\$D 1</u> 15.6 16.3 23 15.8 12.6	Total Weii 15 9. 22 11,7 5 2. 71 31,7 74 45. 187 100.	Mean Difference <u>aht IV. Fixed. 95%</u> 120 [-8.88, 11.2 8% 0.20 [-8.67, 9.0 1% 12.00 [-9.19, 33.1 4% -3.49 [-8.91, 1.9 -3.49 [-8.91, 1.9 -3.49 [-8.91, 1.9 -3.45 [-6.59, -0.5	Mean C(V, Fi) B) 7) 9) 3) 	Difference	- +
C Study or Subgroup Doyle, L W 2007 Jones, R 1995 Jones, R A 2005 Romagnoli, C 2002 Romagnoli, C 2002 Shirwell, E S 2000 Yeh, T F 2004 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² =:	Experim Events 2 11 4 1 1 1 8 8 8.01, df = 6	ental Total 27 100 71 15 23 80 72 388 6 (P = 0.2	Contro Events 4 22 5 3 4 0 12 50 24): ² = 2	ol Total 27 109 79 15 22 79 74 405 5%	Weight 8.1% 42.8% 9.6% 6.1% 8.3% 1.0% 24.0% 100.0%	Risk Ratio <u>M-H, Fixed, 95% C1</u> 0.50 [0.10, 2.50] 4 0.55 [0.28, 1.07] 0.89 [0.25, 3.19] 0.33 [0.04, 2.85] 4 0.24 [0.03, 1.98] 4 2.96 [0.12, 71.65] 4 1.54 [0.80, 2.97] 0.80 [0.54, 1.18]	Risk Ratio	D Study or Subgroup Romagnoli, C 2002 Romagnoli, C 2002 Steven J. Gross 2005 Ter Wolbeek, M 2013 Yeh, T F 2004 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = . Test for overall effect:	Experim <u>Mean</u> 84.2 12 85.8 12 85.8 12 85.79 16. 78.2 4.94, df = 4 (I Z = 2.29 (P =	nental <u>SD Tot</u> 2.4 1 3.9 2 10 .16 6 15 7 18 P = 0.29 = 0.02)	Co al Mean 15 83 13 85.6 9 73 13 90.28 12 84.4 12 12 19%	ontrol <u>\$0 1</u> 15.6 16.3 23 15.8 12.6	(otal Weij 15 9. 22 11) 5 2. 71 31. 74 45. 187 100.	Mean Difference <u>aht IV. Fixed. 95%</u> 1% 120 [-8.88, 11.2 8% 0.20 [-8.67, 9.0 1% 12.00 [-9.19, 33.1 4% -3.49 [-8.91, 1.9 -3.49 [-8.91, 1.9 -3.55 [-6.59, -0.5	Mean C(IV, Fi B) 71 99 91 10 1 1 1 1 1 5 Farmure forverimenta	Difference	_
C Study or Subgroup Doyle, LW 2007 Jones, R 1995 Jones, R A 2005 Romagnoli, C 2002 Romagnoli, C 2002 Shirwell, E S 2000 Yeh, TF 2004 Total (95% Cl) Total events Heterogeneity. Ch ² =: Test for overall effect.	Experim Events 2 11 4 1 1 1 18 38 8.01, df = { Z = 1.12 (F	rental 27 100 71 15 23 80 72 388 6 (P = 0.2 P = 0.26)	Contro Events 4 22 5 3 4 0 12 50 24); ² = 2	ol <u>Total</u> 27 109 79 15 22 79 74 405 5%	Weight 8.1% 42.8% 9.6% 6.1% 8.3% 1.0% 24.0%	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 0.50 (0.10, 2.50) 0.59 (0.28, 1.07) 0.89 (0.25, 3.19) 0.33 (0.04, 2.85) 0.24 (0.03, 1.98) 2.96 (0.12, 71.65) 1.54 (0.80, 2.97) 0.80 (0.54, 1.18)	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	D Study or Subgroup Romagnoli, C 2002 Romagnoli, C 2002 Steven J.Gross 2005 Ter Wolbeek, M 2013 Yeh, T F 2004 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Ch ² = . Test for overall effect:	Experim Mean 3 84.2 12 85.8 12 85.79 16. 78.2 4.94, df = 4 (I Z = 2.29 (P =	nental <u>SD Tot</u> 2.4 1 3.9 2 10 .16 6 15 7 18 P = 0.29 = 0.02)	Co al <u>Mean</u> 15 83 13 85.6 9 73 13 90.28 12 84.4 12 12 1; 1 ² = 19%	ontrol <u>\$0</u> 1 15.6 16.3 23 15.8 12.6	(otal Weij 15 9. 22 11) 5 2. 71 31. 74 45. 187 100.	Mean Difference <u>ht IV, Fixed, 95%</u> 120 [-8.88, 112 9% 0.20 [-8.67, 9.0 1% 12.00 [-9.19, 33, 1 12.00 [-9.19, 33, 1 4% -3.49 [-8.91, 1.9 7% -6.20 [-10.70, -1.7 0% -3.55 [-6.59, -0.5	Mean CI IV. Fi B] 	Difference ed. 95% Cl	

Figure 4 Meta-analysis on the long-term effect of dexamethasone on nervous system development in preterm infants. (A–C) Meta-analysis results on the incidence of cerebral palsy (nine studies^[8,14-21]), visual impairment (eight studies^[8,14,16-21]), and hearing loss (seven studies^[8,14,17-21]) in preterm infants after dexamethasone treatment. There was no significant difference in the incidence of cerebral palsy between treatment and control groups. (D) Meta-analysis results of intelligence quotient value in preterm infants after dexamethasone treatment (five studies^[8,13,16,18-19]). The intelligence quotient value of preterm infants in the treatment group was significantly lower compared with that in the control group.

comparing treatment and control groups, the incidence of cerebral palsy *RR* (95%*CI*) was 1.26 (0.89–1.79), the incidence of visual impairment *RR* (95%*CI*) was 1.37 (0.73–2.59), the incidence of hearing loss *RR* (95%*CI*) was 0.53 (0.32–0.89), and intelligence quotient *MD* (95%*CI*) was 1.66 (–4.7 to 8.01). This is evidence that later postnatal dexamethasone therapy significantly affected the hearing of preterm infants (P = 0.02) while early dexamethasone has no impact on the incidence of cerebral palsy and visual impairment, as well as intelligence quotient values in the treatment group compared with that in the control group (P > 0.05; Figure 6).

Analysis of publication bias

Among the included studies (n = 10), eight studies^[8, 14, 16-21] reported visual impairment, indicating the homogeneity of related studies. The publication bias of these eight papers was analyzed (Figure 7). The obtained funnel plot was asymmetrical on both sides, suggesting the presence of publication bias among the selected studies.

Discussion

Children receiving perinatal glucocorticoids have a high risk of periventricular leukomalacia, cerebral palsy and abnormal behavior, and pubertal motor and cognitive levels may also be reduced^[5-6, 13, 23]. Brain MRI examination detected decreased brain surface area and brain mantle index, with the

642

affected region being mainly gray matter, while white matter, basal ganglia and cerebellum were also involved^[24]. In children with Cushing's syndrome, brain size was significantly reduced, brain ventricles dilated, and reduction of hippocampal size was more apparent. After 1 year of treatment, brain volume recovered, but intelligence quotient was still significantly lower than normal levels^[25-26]. In animal experiments, dexamethasone administration in pregnant rats induced the apoptosis of amygdala neurons in pups^[27]. After newborn rats were treated with dexamethasone, the number of astrocytes in the hippocampus and corpus callosum was significantly reduced. Longterm potentiation of nerve cells in adolescence was also damaged, and long-term depression was enhanced, thus affecting long-term memory and leading to susceptibility to anxiety and fear behavior in response to stress^[28-29]. However, existing clinical observations and follow-up fail to clearly demonstrate the long-term effect of dexamethasone on nervous system development of preterm infants.

Meta-analysis is an evaluation means that focuses on contrasting and combining results from different studies and has the potential to provide the highest level of evidence. This analysis is considered an objective, quantitative method for combining evidence from separate but similar studies in an objective and systematic manner, so statistical test efficacy is improved^[30]. In the present study, we collected the related literature surrounding the application of dexamethasone in preterm infants through meta-analysis, and further detected neurolog-

А										В										
	Experin	nental	Contr	ol		Odds Ratio	Odd	Is Ratio			Expe	rimental	Con	trol		Risk Ratio		Risk F	Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% C	M-H, Ran	idom, 95% Cl		Study or Subgroup	Event	ts Tota	al Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% C	1	M-H, Fixed	1, 95% CI	
Doyle,L W 2007	4	29	6	27	10.1%	0.56 [0.14, 2.25]		<u> </u>		Doyle,LW 2007		1 2	7 () 27	1.5%	3.00 [0.13, 70.53	ı ←			→
Jones,R 1995	20	100	18	109	18.2%	1.26 [0.63, 2.56]	-			Jones,R 1995		8 10	0 8	8 109	23.5%	1.09 [0.43, 2.79	0			
Jones,R A 2005	17	71	12	79	16.5%	1.76 [0.77, 4.00]				Jones, R A 2005		3 7	1 3	2 79	5.8%	1.67 (0.29, 9.70	ı —		•	
Romagnoli, C 2002	2	15	3	15	6.4%	0.62 [0.09, 4.34]				Romagnoli, C 2002		3 1	5 1	15	3.1%	3.00 [0.35, 25.68	ı –			\rightarrow
Shinwell,E S 2000	39	80	12	79	17.4%	5.31 [2.50, 11.30]			-	Shinwell, ES 2000	1	7 8	0 13	2 79	37.0%	1.40 [0.72, 2.74	-I	-	-	
Steven J.Gross 2005	0	9	1	5	2.5%	0.16 [0.01, 4.69]				Steven J.Gross 2005		3	9 2	2 5	7.9%	0.83 (0.20, 3.44	II ———			-
T.Michael O'shea 2007	13	50	4	45	11.8%	3.60 [1.08, 12.02]			'	Yeh,T F 2004	1	2 7	2 1	74	21.2%	1.76 [0.74, 4.22	1	-+	-	
Yeh,T F 2004	20	72	14	74	17.1%	1.65 [0.76, 3.59]													-	
Total (05% CI)		126		422	100.0%	1 70 10 06 2 001				Total (95% CI)		37	4	388	100.0%	1.45 [0.96, 2.19	1	t		
Total (95% CI)	445	420	70	433	100.0%	1.70 [0.90, 3.00]				Total events	4	17	33	2				.		
Total events	110	15 00 46	-7/0-1	0.001.12	- 50%		+ + + +		+	Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	1.81, df	= 6 (P = 0	.94); ²= (1%			0.2	0.5 1	2	- 5
Test for overall effect: 7	34; UNF = - 1 92 /D -	10.90, 01	- / (P - I	0.03); F	- 30%		0.1 0.2 0.5	1 2 5 1	10	Test for overall effect	Z=1.75	(P = 0.08)				Favours (e)	perimental	Favours Icontr	roll
Test for overall effect. 2	- 1.02 (F -	0.01				F	avours [experimental]	Favours [control]										,,		
С										D										
С										D	F			tral		Mars Difference		No. o	1.27 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
С	Experime	ental	Contro	Ы		Risk Ratio	Risk	Ratio		D	Exper	rimental	c	ontrol		Mean Differenc	28	Mean D	Difference	
C Study or Subgroup	Experime Events	ental Total I	Contro Events	ol Total	Weight	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	Risk I M-H, Fixe	Ratio d, 95% Cl		D Study or Subgroup	Exper Mean	rimental SD To	C tal Mean	ontrol SD 1	'otal Weig	Mean Differenc	ce % Cl	Mean D IV, Fixe	Difference ed. 95% Cl	
C <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Doyle,LW 2007	Experime <u>Events</u> 2	ental <u>Total I</u> 27	Contro Events 4	ol <u>Total</u> 27	<u>Weight</u> 8.9%	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 0.50 [0.10, 2.50] ←	Risk M-H, Fixe	Ratio d, 95% Cl		D Study or Subgroup Romagnoli, C 2002	Exper Mean 84.2	rimental <u>SD Tot</u> 12.4	C tal Mean 15 83	ontrol <u>SD T</u> 15.6	<u>'otal Weig</u> 15 10.3	Mean Differenc ht IV. Fixed, 95 13.00 [-8.88, 11	5e <u>% Cl</u>	Mean D IV, Fixe	Difference ed, 95% Cl	
C <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Doyle,LW 2007 Jones,R 1995	Experime Events 2 11	ental <u>Total I</u> 27 100	Contro Events 4 22	ol <u>Total</u> 27 109	<u>Weight</u> 8.9% 46.7%	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 0.50 [0.10, 2.50] ← 0.55 [0.28, 1.07]	Risk M-H, Fixe	Ratio d, 95% Cl		D Study or Subgroup Romagnoli,C 2002 Steven J Gross 2005	Exper Mean 84.2 85	rimental <u>SD Tol</u> 12.4 10	C t <u>al Mean</u> 15 83 9 73	ontrol <u>SD 1</u> 15.6 23	<u>'otal Weig</u> 15 10.3 5 2.3	Mean Difference (<u>ht IV, Fixed, 95</u> 1% 1.20 [-8.88, 11	5e <u>% Cl</u> .28] :19]	Mean D IV, Fixe	ofference ed. 95% Cl	
C <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Doyle,L W 2007 Jones,R 1995 Jones,R A 2005	Experime Events 2 11 4	ental <u>Total I</u> 27 100 71	Contro Events 4 22 5	l Total 27 109 79	Weight 8.9% 46.7% 10.5%	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 0.50 [0.10, 2.50] ← 0.55 [0.28, 1.07] 0.89 [0.25, 3.19]	Risk M-H, Fixe	Ratio d, 95% Cl		D <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Romagnoli,C 2002 Steven J.Gross 2005 Tex Welbook M 2012	Exper Mean 84.2 85	rimental <u>SD Tol</u> 12.4 10	C t <u>al Mean</u> 15 83 9 73	ontrol <u>SD 1</u> 15.6 23	<u>iotal Weig</u> 15 10.3 5 2.3 71 25.6	Mean Difference <u>ht IV, Fixed, 95</u> 13% 1.20 [-8.88, 11 13% 12.00 [-9.19, 33 12.00 [-9.11]	28 .28] .19]	Mean D IV. Fixe - -	oifference ed. 95% Cl	
C <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Doyle, L W 2007 Jones, R 1995 Jones, R A 2005 Romagnoli, C 2002	Experime Events 2 11 4 1	ental <u>Total I</u> 27 100 71 15	Contro Events 4 22 5 3	ol <u>Total</u> 27 109 79 15	Weight 8.9% 46.7% 10.5% 6.6%	Risk Ratio <u>M-H, Fixed, 95% C1</u> 0.50 [0.10, 2.50] ← 0.55 [0.28, 1.07] 0.89 [0.25, 3.19] 0.33 [0.04, 2.85] ←	Risk M-H, Fixe	Ratio d, 95% Cl		D Study or Subgroup Romagnoli, C 2002 Steven J.Gross 2005 Ter Wolbeek, M 2013	Exper Mean 84.2 85 86.79 1	rimental <u>SD Tol</u> 12.4 10 16.16	C tal <u>Mean</u> 15 83 9 73 53 90.28	ontrol <u>SD 1</u> 15.6 23 15.8	iotal Weig 15 10.3 5 2.3 71 35.6	Mean Differenc <u>Int IV. Fixed, 95</u> 120 [-8.88, 11 12.00 [-9.19, 33 35 - 3.49 [-8.91, 1	5e % Cl .28] .19] .93]	Mean D IV, Fixe - - 1	lifference ed. 95% Cl	
C Study or Subgroup Doyle, L W 2007 Jones, R 1995 Jones, R 2005 Romagnoli, C 2002 Shirwell, E S 2000	Experime Events 2 11 4 1 1	ental <u>Total I</u> 27 100 71 15 80	Contro Events 4 22 5 3 0	N Total 27 109 79 15 79	Weight 8.9% 46.7% 10.5% 6.6% 1.1%	Risk Ratio <u>M.H. Fixed, 95% Cl</u> 0.50 [0.10, 2.50] ← 0.55 [0.28, 1.07] 0.89 [0.25, 3.19] 0.33 [0.04, 285] ← 2.96 [0.12, 71.65] ←	Risk M-H, Fixe	Ratio d, 95% Cl 	 +	D <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Romagnoli,C 2002 Steven J.Gross 2005 Ter Wolbeek,M 2013 Yeh,T F 2004	Exper Mean 84.2 85 86.79 1 78.2	rimental <u>SD Tol</u> 12.4 10 16.16 15	C <u>tal Mean</u> 15 83 9 73 53 90.28 72 84.4	ontrol <u>SD 1</u> 15.6 23 15.8 12.6	iotal Weig 15 10.3 5 2.3 71 35.6 74 51.8	Mean Difference ht V. Fixed, 95 120 [-8.88, 11 12.00 [-9.19, 33 3% -3.49 [-8.91, 1 3% -6.20 [-10.70, -1	ce <u>% Cl</u> .28] .19] .93] .70]	Mean D IV, Fixe - 1 1	ofference ed. 95% Cl	
C <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Doyle, L.W.2007 Jones, R. 1995 Jones, R.A. 2005 Romagnoli, C. 2002 Shirwell, E.S. 2004	Experime <u>Events</u> 2 11 4 1 1 18	ental <u>Total 1</u> 27 100 71 15 80 72	Contro Events 4 22 5 3 0 12	l <u>Total</u> 27 109 79 15 79 74	Weight 8.9% 46.7% 10.5% 6.6% 1.1% 26.2%	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 0.50 (0.10, 2.50) ← 0.55 (0.28, 1.07) 0.89 (0.25, 3.19) 0.33 (0.04, 2.85) ← 2.96 (0.12, 71.65) ← 1.54 (0.80, 2.97)	Risk M.H., Fixe 	Ratio d. 95% Cl	 +	D Study or Subgroup Romagnoli, C 2002 Steven J. Gross 2005 Ter Wolbeek, M 2013 Yeh, T F 2004	Exper Mean 84.2 85 86.79 78.2	rimental <u>SD Tol</u> 12.4 10 16.16 15	C tal Mean 15 83 9 73 63 90.28 72 84.4	ontrol <u>SD 1</u> 15.6 23 15.8 12.6	iotal Weig 15 10.3 5 2.3 71 35.6 74 51.8	Mean Differenc <u>Int IV, Fixed, 95</u> 120 [-8.88, 11 12.00 [-9.19, 33 -3.49 [-8.91, 1 -3.49 [-8.91, 1 -6.20 [-10.70, -1	5e <u>% Cl</u> .28] .19] .93] .70]	Mean D IV, Fixe - - H	Difference ed. 95% Cl	
C Study or Subgroup Doyle, L. W 2007 Jones, R 1995 Jones, R A 2005 Romagnoli, C 2002 Shirnwell, E S 2000 Yeh, T F 2004	Experime <u>Events</u> 2 11 4 1 1 18	ental <u>Total 1</u> 27 100 71 15 80 72	Contro Events 4 22 5 3 0 12	l Total 27 109 79 15 79 79 74	Weight 8.9% 46.7% 10.5% 6.6% 1.1% 26.2%	Risk Ratio <u>M.H. Fixed, 95% CI</u> 0.50 [0.10, 2.50] ← 0.55 [0.28, 1.07] 0.89 [0.25, 3.19] 0.33 [0.04, 2.85] ← 2.96 [0.12, 71.65] ← 1.54 [0.80, 2.97]	Risk M.H., Fixe	Ratio 4.95% Cl	 +	D Study or Subgroup Romagnoli,C 2002 Steven J.Gross 2005 Ter Wolbeek,M 2013 Yeh,T F 2004 Total (95% CI)	Exper Mean 84.2 85 86.79 78.2	rimental <u>SD Tol</u> 12.4 10 16.16 15	C t <u>al Mean</u> 15 83 9 73 63 90.28 72 84.4 59	ontrol <u>SD 1</u> 15.6 23 15.8 12.6	iotal Weig 15 10.3 5 2.3 71 35.6 74 51.8 165 100.0	Mean Differenc <u>IN. Fixed, 95</u> 120 [-8.88, 11 12.00 [-9.19, 33 3% -3.49 [-8.91, 1 3% -6.20 [-10.70, -1 3% -4.05 [-7.29, -0	5e <u>% Cl</u> .28] .19] .93] .70] .81]	Mean D IV. Fixe - H II	ifference ed. 95% Cl	
C Study or Subgroup Doyle, LW 2007 Jones, R 1995 Jones, R 2005 Romagnoli, C 2002 Shirwell, E S 2000 Yeh, T F 2004 Total (95% CI)	Experime Events 2 11 4 1 1 18	ental <u>Total </u> 27 100 71 15 80 72 365	Contro Events 4 22 5 3 0 12	ol <u>Total</u> 27 109 79 15 79 74 383	Weight 8.9% 46.7% 10.5% 6.6% 1.1% 26.2% 100.0%	Risk Ratio <u>M.H. Fixed. 95% CI</u> 0.50 [0.10, 2.50] ← 0.55 [0.28, 1.07] 0.88 [0.25, 319] 0.33 [0.04, 2.85] ← 2.96 [0.12, 71.65] ← 1.54 [0.80, 2.97] 0.85 [0.57, 1.27]	Risk M.H. Fixe	Ratio 4.95% Cl	+	D Study or Subgroup Romagnoli, C 2002 Sleven J.Gross 2005 Ter Wolbeek, M 2013 Yeh, T F 2004 Total (95%, CI) Heteropeneity: Chi ² = 4	Exper Mean 84.2 85 86.79 1 78.2	rimental <u>SD Tol</u> 12.4 10 16.16 15 14 8(P = 0.24	C tal Mean 15 83 9 73 63 90.28 72 84.4 59	ontrol <u>SD 1</u> 15.6 23 15.8 12.6	iotal Weig 15 10.3 5 2.3 71 35.6 74 51.8 165 100.0	Mean Difference ht IV. Fixed. 95 120 [-8.88, 11 12.00 [-9.19, 33 3% -3.49 [-8.91, 1 3% -6.20 [-10.70, -1 2% -4.05 [-7.29, -0.	e <u>% Cl</u> .28] .19] .93] .70] .81] 	Mean D IV, Fixe - - 1 I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	Vifference ad, 95% Cl	
C Study or Subgroup Doyle, L W 2007 Jones, R 1995 Jones, R 2005 Romagnoli, C 2002 Shirwell, E 5 2000 Yeh, T F 2004 Total (95% CI) Total events	Experime <u>Events</u> 2 11 4 1 1 18 37	ental <u>Total 1</u> 27 100 71 15 80 72 365	Contro Events 4 22 5 3 0 12 46	ol <u>Total</u> 27 109 79 15 79 74 383	Weight 8.9% 46.7% 10.5% 6.6% 1.1% 26.2% 100.0%	Risk Ratio <u>M.H. Fixed, 95% Cl</u> 0.50 [0.10, 2.50] ← 0.55 [0.28, 1.07] 0.33 [0.04, 2.85] ← 2.96 [0.12, 71.65] ← 1.54 [0.80, 2.97] 0.85 [0.57, 1.27]	Risk M.H., Fixe	Ratio 4,95% Cl 	+	D Study of Subgroup Romagnoli C 2002 Steven J.Gross 2005 Ter Wolbeek, M 2013 Yeh, T F 2004 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Ch ²² = 4	Exper <u>Mean</u> 84.2 85 86.79 1 78.2 1.16, df = 3 7 - 2.45 (f	rimental <u>SD Tol</u> 12.4 10 16.16 15 19 8 (P = 0.24 2 = 0.01)	C tal Mean 15 83 9 73 63 90.28 72 84.4 59 59	ontrol <u>SD 1</u> 15.6 23 15.8 12.6	iotal Weig 15 10.3 5 2.3 71 35.6 74 51.8 165 100.0	Mean Difference ht IV. Fixed. 95 12.00 [-9.19, 33 3.49 [-8.91, 1 3.49 [-8.91, 1 3.49 [-8.91, 1 4.05 [-7.29, -0.	se <u>% Cl</u> .28] .19] .93] .70] .70] .70] .70]	Mean D IV, Fixe - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Vifference ed, 95% Cl	100
C Study or Subgroup Doyle, L W 2007 Jones, R 1995 Jones, R A 2005 Romagnoli, C 2002 Shirwell, E S 2000 Yeh, T F 2004 Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 6	Experime <u>Events</u> 2 11 4 1 1 18 37 .61. df = 5	ental <u>Total I</u> 27 100 71 15 80 72 365 i(P = 0.2)	Contro Events 4 22 5 3 0 12 46 5): P = 24	l 27 109 79 15 79 74 383	Weight 8.9% 46.7% 10.5% 6.6% 1.1% 26.2% 100.0%	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 0.50 [0.10, 2.50] ← 0.55 [0.28, 1.07] 0.89 [0.25, 3.19] 0.33 [0.04, 2.85] ← 2.96 [0.12, 71.65] ← 1.54 [0.80, 2.97] 0.85 [0.57, 1.27]	Risk M-H, Fixe	Ratio 4.95% CI	 +	D Study or Subgroup Romagnoli, C 2002 Steven J, Gross 2005 Ter Wolbeek, M 2013 Yeh, T F 2004 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^o = 4 Test for overall effect. 2	Exper <u>Mean</u> 84.2 85 86.79 1 78.2 1.16, df = 3 Z = 2.45 (F	rimental <u>SD Tol</u> 12.4 10 16.16 15 14 3 (P = 0.24 P = 0.01)	C tal Mean 15 83 9 73 63 90.28 72 84.4 59 59	ontrol <u>SD 1</u> 15.6 23 15.8 12.6	iotal Weig 15 10.3 5 2.3 71 35.6 74 51.8 165 100.0	Mean Differenci ht IV, Fixed, 95 120 [-8.88, 11 12.00 [-9.19, 33 3% -3.49 [-8.91, 1 3% -6.20 [-10.70, -1 3% -6.20 [-7.29, -0.	28 % Cl .28] .19] .93] .70] .81] -100 Favours	Mean D IV. Fixe - - - - - - - - - 50 [experimental]	Vifference ed. 95% C1	
C Study or Subgroup Dofe, LW 2007 Jones, R 1995 Jones, R 4 2005 Romagnoli, C 2002 Shirwell, E S 2000 Yeh, T F 2004 Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 6 Test for overall effect 7 Test for overall effect 7	Experime <u>Events</u> 2 11 4 1 18 37 .61, df = 5 = 0.79 /P	ental <u>Total I</u> 27 100 71 15 80 72 365 5(P = 0.2) = 0.43)	Contro Events 4 22 5 3 0 12 46 5); I ^P = 24	l <u>Total</u> 27 109 79 15 79 74 383	Weight 8.9% 46.7% 10.5% 6.6% 1.1% 26.2% 100.0%	Risk Ratio M.H. Fixed, 95% CI 0.50 [0.10, 2.50] ← 0.55 [0.28, 1.07] 0.89 [0.25, 3.19] 0.33 [0.04, 2.85] ← 2.96 [0.12, 71.65] ← 1.54 [0.80, 2.97] 0.85 [0.57, 1.27]	Risk M-H, Fixe	Ratio 4.95% C1	 +5	D Study or Subgroup Romagnoli,C 2002 Steven J,Gross 2005 Ter Wolbeek,M 2013 Yeh,T F 2004 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 4 Test for overall effect 2	Exper Mean 84.2 85 86.79 1 78.2 1.16, df = 3 Z = 2.45 (F	rimental <u>SD Tot</u> 12.4 10 16.16 15 1 3 (P = 0.24 P = 0.01)	C tal Mean 15 83 9 73 63 90.28 72 84.4 59 59	ontrol <u>SD 1</u> 15.6 23 15.8 12.6	<u>iotal Weig</u> 15 10.3 5 2.3 71 35.6 74 51.8 165 100.0	Mean Differenci IV. Fixed. 95 12.00 [-9.19, 33 3% -3.49 [-8.91, 1 3% -6.20 [-10.70, -1 1% -4.05 [-7.29, -0.	se <u>% Cl</u> .28] .19] .93] .93] .81] 100 Favours	Mean D IV, Fixe - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Nifference ed, 95% Cl	

Figure 5 Sensitivity analysis of meta-analysis results of nervous system development in preterm infants after dexamethasone treatment. (A–C) Sensitivity analysis of meta-analysis results on the incidence of cerebral palsy (eight studies^[8, 14, 18, 20-21]), visual impairment (seven studies^[8, 14, 17-18, 20-21]), hearing loss (six studies^[8, 14, 17-18, 20-21]) in preterm infants after dexamethasone treatment. There was no significant difference in the incidence of hearing loss between treatment group and control group. (D) Sensitivity analysis of meta-analysis results on intelligence quotient value of preterm infants after dexamethasone treatment differences in intelligence quotient values of preterm infants between the treatment and control groups (P = 0.01).

ical impairment index at the end of follow-up: cerebral palsy, visual impairment, hearing loss and intelligence quotient values for statistical analysis. The included 10 studies have listed dexamethasone dosage and administration approach. The results of the selected studies showed that, postnatal dexamethasone affects the development of the nervous system in preterm infants. Early dexamethasone application has long-term impact on intelligence quotient value, while later application produces apparent impact on hearing. This finding is different from other systematic reviews and meta-analysis, which point out that dexamethasone increases the incidence of cerebral palsy in preterm children^[31-32]. This discrepancy can be explained by the difference of inclusion criteria. In addition, there are many types of glucocorticoids and derivatives, which exhibit varied impacts on the nervous system. For example, long term hydrocortisone treatment cannot influence the development of the nervous system^[31]. We suggest distinguishing the impact of different glucocorticoid derivatives on the nervous system, otherwise bias will inevitably occur.

The included 10 studies are all randomized controlled trials, and also adopted blinding methods to evaluate the development of the nervous system at follow-up. Sensitivity analysis of these papers showed no difference, so our results are reliable. Our findings showed that dexamethasone had long-term impact on nervous system development in preterm children, although the available evidence cannot prove that dexamethasone may increase the incidence of cerebral palsy and visual impairment in preterm children. Dexamethasone was shown to affect hearing and intelligence quotient values. After the dexamethasone was withdrawn, assisted ventilation could be reduced by pulmonary surfactant management, nasal ventilation and permissive hypercapnia, but dexamethasone can shorten the time on ventilator in preterm children, correct the incidence of oxygen dependence in preterm children after gestational age of 36 weeks, and lower incidental medical expenses^[4]. In areas with decreased medical treatment options, physicians may selectively prescribe dexamethasone. Increasing evidence confirms that dexamethasone can improve lung function in preterm children within a short period after birth, but the application prospects may be reduced owing to the absence of long-term stability of dexamethasone benefits. Further randomized controlled studies are required to explore certain types of glucocorticoid hormones or a small dosage of dexamethasone in preterm children after birth, which can not only improve lung function but also maintain long-term effects on the nervous system.

The 10 included studies^[8, 13-21] showed that, systematic application of dexamethasone in preterm children exhibits no significant long-term benefits on the nervous system. Some limitations of this study should be noted: (1) Literature of large sample size and positive results are preferentially published, thus inevitably causing publication bias. The included studies also have publication bias, which reduce

/ \								В								
	Experin	nental	Cont	rol		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio		Experir	nental	Cont	rol		Risk Ratio	Risk	Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixe	ed, 95% Cl
Doyle,LW 2007	4	29	6	27	13.2%	0.62 [0.20, 1.96]	· · · · · ·	Doyle,LW 2007	1	27	0	27	3.4%	3.00 [0.13, 70.53]	←	
Jones,R 1995	20	100	18	109	36.5%	1.21 [0.68, 2.15]		Jones,R 1995	8	100	8	109	52.3%	1.09 [0.43, 2.79]		
Jones,R A 2005	17	71	12	79	24.1%	1.58 [0.81, 3.07]		Jones R A 2005	3	71	2	79	12.9%	1.67 10.29. 9.701		
Romagnoli, C 2002	2	15	3	15	6.4%	0.67 [0.13, 3.44]	· · · ·	Romagnoli, C 2002	3	15	1	15	6.8%	3.00 10.35, 25.681		<u> </u>
Romagnoli, C 2002	2	23	2	22	4.3%	0.96 [0.15, 6.21]		Romagnoli, C 2002	2	23	1	22	7.0%	1.91 10.19, 19.631		<u> </u>
Steven J.Gross 2005	0	9	2	5	6.6%	0.12 [0.01, 2.10]	·	Steven J Gross 2005	3	9	2	5	17.6%	0.83 (0.20, 3.44)		
T.Michael O'shea 2007	13	50	4	45	8.9%	2.92 [1.03, 8.32]			· ·	•	-	•		0.00 [0.20] 0.11]		
7-4-1 (05% 05		007		-	400.00	4 22 70 20 4 701		Total (95% CI)		245		257	100.0%	1.37 (0.73, 2.59)	-	
Total (95% CI)	~	297		302	100.0%	1.26 [0.89, 1.78]		Total events	20	210	14	201				-
i otal events	58 05 - 47 - 07	0 - 0 201	4/	,				Heteroneneity Chi?= 1	- 158 df = 1	5/P = 0.0	10): P= 0	96.			+	<u> </u>
Test for everall effect 7	00,01=0 (- 1 20/10 -	r = 0.20)	, F = 229	0			0.5 0.7 1 1.5 2	Test for overall effect 2	7 = 0 0.9 /5	2 = 0.33	0/11 - 0	~			0.2 0.5	12
TESTIOL MEIAILENEUR Z	- 1.29 (F -	0.20)				F	avours (experimental) Favours (control)	restion oreign enect 2	2 - 0.30 fr	- 0.33)				F	avours [experimental]	Favours (control)
C								П								
0																
								D								
	Experime	ntal	Contro	I		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio	D	Experin	nental	Co	ntrol		Mean Difference	Mean C	ifference
Study or Subgroup	Experime Events	ntal Total E	Contro Events 1	l lotal	Weight	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	Risk Ratio M.H. Fixed, 95% Cl	Study or Subgroup	Experim Mean S	nental SD Total	Co Mean	ntrol SD To	otal Weig	Mean Difference ht IV, Fixed, 95%	Mean C Cl N, Fixe	ifference d, 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup Doyle,LW 2007	Experime Events 2	ntal <u>Total E</u> 27	Contro Events 1 4	i Íotal 27	<u>Weight</u> 10.8%	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 0.50 [0.10, 2.50]	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	Study or Subgroup Romagnoli, C 2002	Experim <u>Mean</u> 9 84.2 12	nental <u>SD Total</u> 2.4 15	Co Mean 83	ntrol <u>SD To</u> 15.6	<u>otal Weig</u> 15 39.7	Mean Difference	Mean D Cl IV, Fixe 8]	ifference d, 95% Cl
<u>Study or Subgroup</u> Doyle,LW 2007 Jones,R 1995	Experime Events 2 11	ntal <u>Total E</u> 27 100	Contro Events 1 4 22	i <u>fotal</u> 27 109	<u>Weight</u> 10.8% 57.1%	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 0.50 (0.10, 2.50) 0.55 (0.28, 1.07)	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	<u>Study or Subgroup</u> Romagnoli, C 2002 Romagnoli, C 2002	Experim <u>Mean 9</u> 84.2 12 85.8 13	nental <u>SD Total</u> 2.4 15 3.9 23	Co <u>Mean</u> 83 85.6	ntrol <u>SD To</u> 15.6 16.3	<u>otal Weig</u> 15 39.7 22 51.3	Mean Difference ht <u>N. Fixed, 95%</u> % 1.20 [-8.88, 11.2 % 0.20 [-8.67, 9.0	Mean (Cl N, Fixe 8]	ifference d, 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup Doyle,L W 2007 Jones,R 1995 Jones,R A 2005	Experime Events 2 11 4	ntal <u>Total E</u> 27 100 71	Contro <u>events 1</u> 4 22 5	l <u>fotal</u> 27 109 79	<u>Weight</u> 10.8% 57.1% 12.8%	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl 0.50 [0.10, 2.50] 0.55 [0.28, 1.07] 0.89 [0.25, 3.19]	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	Study or Subgroup Romagnoli, C 2002 Romagnoli, C 2002 Steven J. Gross 2005	Experim <u>Mean</u> 9 84.2 12 85.8 13 85	nental <u>SD Total</u> 2.4 15 3.9 23 10 9	Co <u>Mean</u> 83 85.6 73	ntrol <u>SD To</u> 15.6 16.3 23	<u>otal Weig</u> 15 39.7 22 51.3 5 9.0	Mean Difference ht N, Fixed, 95% % 1.20 (-8.88, 11.2 % 0.20 (-8.67, 9.0 % 12.00 (-9.19, 33.1	Mean C Cl N, Fixe 18] — 7] — 9] —	d, 95% Cl
<u>Study or Subgroup</u> Doyle,L W 2007 Jones,R 1995 Jones,R A 2005 Romagnoli, C 2002	Experime Events 2 11 4 1	ntal <u>Total E</u> 27 100 71 15	Contro Events 1 4 22 5 3	l 27 109 79 15	<u>Weight</u> 10.8% 57.1% 12.8% 8.1%	Risk Ratio M.H, Fixed, 95% Cl 0.50 (0.10, 2.50) 0.55 (0.28, 1.07) 0.89 (0.25, 3.19) 0.33 (0.04, 2.85)	Risk Ratio M.H. Fixed, 95% Cl	<u>Study or Subgroup</u> Romagnoli, C 2002 Romagnoli, C 2002 Steven J.Gross 2005	Experim <u>Mean 9</u> 84.2 12 85.8 13 85.8 5	nental <u>SD Total</u> 2.4 15 3.9 23 10 9	Co <u>Mean</u> 83 85.6 73	ntrol <u>SD Tr</u> 15.6 16.3 23	o <u>tal Weig</u> 15 39.7 22 51.3 5 9.0	Mean Difference Int N. Fixed, 95% % 1.20 [-8.88, 11.2 % 0.20 [-8.67, 9.0 % 12.00 [-9.19, 33.1	Mean C Cl N, Fixe 8) — 7] — 9] —	ifference d, 95% Cl
<u>Study or Subgroup</u> Doyle, L W 2007 Jones, R 1995 Jones, R A 2005 Romagnoli, C 2002 Romagnoli, C 2002	Experime Events 2 11 4 1 1	ntal <u>Total E</u> 27 100 71 15 23	Contro events 1 4 22 5 3 4	1000 109 79 15 22	Weight 10.8% 57.1% 12.8% 8.1% 11.1%	Risk Ratio M.H. Fixed, 95% Cl 0.50 [0.10, 2.50] 0.55 [0.28, 1.07] 0.89 [0.25, 3.19] 0.33 [0.04, 2.85] 0.24 [0.03, 1.98]	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	Study or Subgroup Romagnoli, C 2002 Romagnoli, C 2002 Steven J.Gross 2005 Total (95% CI)	Experim <u>Mean 9</u> 84.2 12 85.8 13 85	nental S <u>D Total</u> 2.4 15 8.9 23 10 9 47	Co <u>Mean</u> 83 85.6 73	ntrol <u>SD T</u> (15.6 16.3 23	otal Weig 15 39.7 22 51.3 5 9.0 42 100.0	Mean Difference (ht N, Fixed, 95%) 1.20 [-8.88, 11.2 1.20 [-8.87, 9.0 12.00 [-9.19, 33.1 1.66 [-4.70, 8.0	Mean C CI N, Fixe 81	ifference d. 95% Cl
<u>Study or Subgroup</u> Doyle, L W 2007 Jones, R 1995 Jones, R A 2005 Romagnoli, C 2002 Romagnoli, C 2002	Experime Events 2 11 4 1 1	ntal <u>Total E</u> 27 100 71 15 23	Contro Events 1 4 22 5 3 4	i <u>otal</u> 27 109 79 15 22	Weight 10.8% 57.1% 12.8% 8.1% 11.1%	Risk Ratio 0.50 (0.10, 2.50) 0.55 (0.28, 1.07) 0.89 (0.25, 3.19) 0.33 (0.04, 2.85) 0.24 (0.03, 1.98)	Risk Ratio	Study or Subgroup Romagnoli, C 2002 Romagnoli, C 2002 Steven J. Gross 2005 Total (95% Cl) Helerogeneity: Chi ² = 1.(Experim Mean 9 84.2 12 85.8 13 85 2 03, df = 2 0	nental S <u>D Total</u> 2.4 15 3.9 23 10 9 47 P=0.60);	Coi <u>Mean</u> 83 85.6 73 F= 0%	ntrol <u>SD Tr</u> 15.6 16.3 23	o <u>tal Weig</u> 15 39.7 22 51.3 5 9.0 42 100. 0	Mean Difference (ht N, Fixed, 95%) 1.20 [-8.88, 11.2 0.20 [-8.67, 9.0 12.00 [-9.19, 33.1 1.66 [-4.70, 8.0	Mean (<u>Cl M, Fixe</u> 8] 9] 1]	ifference d, 95% Cl
Study of Subgroup Doyle, L.W 2007 Jones, R 1995 Jones, R A 2005 Romagnoli, C 2002 Romagnoli, C 2002 Total (95% CI)	Experime Events 2 11 4 1 1	ntal <u>Total E</u> 27 100 71 15 23 236	Contro ivents 1 4 22 5 3 4	1 27 109 79 15 22 252	Weight 10.8% 57.1% 12.8% 8.1% 11.1% 100.0%	Risk Ratio M.H. Fixed, 95% Cl 0.50 [0.10, 2.50] 0.55 [0.28, 1.07] 0.89 [0.25, 3.19] 0.33 [0.04, 2.85] 0.24 [0.03, 1.98] 0.53 [0.32, 0.89]	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	Study or Subgroup Romagnoli, C 2002 Romagnoli, C 2002 Steven J.Gross 2005 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.0 Test for versail effect Z -	Experim <u>Mean</u> <u>9</u> 84.2 12 85.8 13 85.8 3 95 93, df = 2 (1 = 0.51 (P =	nental <u>SD Total</u> 2.4 15 8.9 23 10 9 47 P=0.60); 0.61)	Cor <u>Mean</u> 83 85.6 73 F= 0%	ntrol <u>SD To</u> 15.6 16.3 23	o <u>tal Weig</u> 15 39.7 22 51.3 5 9.0 4 2 100. 0	Mean Difference Int N. Fixed, 95% 1.20 [-8.88, 11.2] 0.20 [-8.67, 9.0] % 12.00 [-9.19, 33.1] 1% 166 [-4.70, 8.0]	Mean D CI M.Fixe 8	ifference d, 95% Cl
Study or Subgroup Doyle, L W 2007 Jones, R 1995 Jones, R A 2005 Romagnoli, C 2002 Romagnoli, C 2002 Total (95% CI) Total events	Experime Events 2 11 4 1 1 1 1	ntal <u>Total E</u> 27 100 71 15 23 236	Contro (vents 1 4 22 5 3 4 38	l 27 109 79 15 22 252	Weight 10.8% 57.1% 12.8% 8.1% 11.1% 100.0%	Risk Ratio M.H. Fixed, 95% Cl 0.50 (0.10, 2.50) 0.55 (0.28, 1.07) 0.89 (0.25, 3.19) 0.33 (0.04, 2.85) 0.24 (0.03, 1.98) 0.53 (0.32, 0.89)	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	Study or Subgroup Romagnoli, C 2002 Romagnoli, C 2002 Steven J.Gross 2005 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 1.0 Test for overall effect Z =	Experim <u>Mean</u> <u>9</u> 84.2 12 85.8 13 85 - 03, df = 2 () = 0.51 (P =	nental S <u>D Total</u> 2.4 15 3.9 23 10 9 47 P=0.60); 0.61)	Co <u>Mean</u> 83 85.6 73 P= 0%	ntrol <u>SD Tr</u> 15.6 16.3 23	o <u>tal Weig</u> 15 39.7 22 51.3 5 9.0 4 2 100. 0	Mean Difference ht N, Fixed, 95% % 1.20 [-8.88, 11.2 % 0.20 [-8.67, 9.0 % 0.20 [-9.19, 33.1 % 1.66 [-4.70, 8.0	Mean D Cl N, Fixe 8] 7] 9] 1] -20 -10 Favours Jexperimental	d, 95% C1 0 10 20 1 Favours (control)
Study or Subgroup Doyle, L W 2007 Jones, R 1995 Jones, R A 2005 Romagnoli, C 2002 Romagnoli, C 2002 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi [#] = 1	Experime <u>Events</u> 2 11 4 1 1 19 .37, df = 4	ntal <u>Total E</u> 27 100 71 15 23 236 (P = 0.85	Contro vents 1 4 22 5 3 4 38 5); P= 09	1 27 109 79 15 22 252	Weight 10.8% 57.1% 12.8% 8.1% 11.1% 100.0%	Risk Ratio M.H. Fixed, 95% C1 0.50 [0.10, 2.50] 0.55 [0.28, 1.07] 0.89 [0.25, 3.19] 0.33 [0.04, 2.85] 0.24 [0.03, 1.98] 0.53 [0.32, 0.89]	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	Study or Subgroup Romagnoli, C 2002 Romagnoli, C 2002 Steren J. Gross 2005 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Ch ² = 1.0 Test for overall effect Z =	Experim <u>Mean</u> <u>9</u> 84.2 12 85.8 13 85.9 13 85.9 13 03, df = 2 (0 = 0.51 (P =	nental S <u>D Total</u> 2.4 15 3.9 23 10 9 47 P = 0.60); 0.61)	Co <u>Mean</u> 83 85.6 73 P= 0%	ntrol <u>SD Tr</u> 15.6 16.3 23	o <u>tal Weig</u> 15 39.7 22 51.3 5 9.0 4 2 100. 0	Mean Difference ht N. Fixed, 95% 1.2018.88,112 12.06 % 0.2018.88,112 % 0.2018.83,112 % 1.2019.833,112 % 1.2019.833,112 % 1.2019.833,112 % 1.2019.833,112 % 1.2019.331	Mean C CI N. Fixe 8) 9) 9] 1] -20 -10 Favours [experimental	d, 95% CI
Study of Subgroup Doyle, L.W. 2007 Jones, R. 1995 Jones, R. A. 2005 Romagnoli, C. 2002 Romagnoli, C. 2002 Total (95% CI) Total events Helterogeneity: Chi ^p = 1 Test for overall effect 2	Experime <u>Events</u> 2 11 4 1 1 19 .37, df = 4 = 2.38 (P:	ntal <u>Total E</u> 27 100 71 15 23 236 (P = 0.85 = 0.02)	Contro 4 22 5 3 4 38 5); P = 09	109 79 15 22 252	Weight 10.8% 57.1% 12.8% 8.1% 11.1% 100.0%	Risk Ratio M.H. Fixed, 95% (1 0.50 [0.10, 2.50] 0.55 [0.28, 1.07] 0.89 [0.25, 3.19] 0.33 [0.04, 2.85] 0.24 [0.03, 1.98] 0.53 [0.32, 0.89]	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	Study or Subgroup Romagnoli, C 2002 Romagnoli, C 2002 Steven J Gross 2005 Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.1 Test for overall effect Z =	Experim <u>Mean</u> 9 84.2 12 85.8 13 85.9 12 03, df = 2 (0 = 0.51 (P =	nental <u>SD Total</u> 2.4 15 3.9 23 10 9 47 P=0.60); 0.61)	Co <u>Mean</u> 83 85.6 73 P= 0%	ntrol <u>SD T</u> (15.6 16.3 23	otal Weig 15 39.7 22 51.3 5 9.0 42 100.0	Mean Difference M. Fixed, 95% V. Fixed, 95% 1.20 [+8.88, 11.2 % 0.20 [+8.67, 9.0 % 12.00 [+9.19, 33.1 1% 1.66 [-4.70, 8.0	Mean C CL N. Fixe 8] 9] 9] 1] _20 .10 Favours [experimental	d, 95% Cl

Figure 6 Meta-analysis on the effect of later postnatal dexamethasone in the nervous system of preterm infants. (A, B, D) Meta-analysis results on the incidence of cerebral palsy (seven studies^[14-19,21]), visual impairment (six studies^[14, 16-19, 21]), and intelligence quotient (three studies^[16,18-19]) in preterm infants after later postnatal dexamethasone treatment. There was no significant difference between treatment and control groups. (C) Meta-analysis results on the incidence of hearing loss in preterm infants after later postnatal dexamethasone treat-ment (five studies^[14,17-19,21]). The incidence of hearing loss in the treatment group was increased compared with that in the control group (P = 0.02).



Figure 7 Funnel plot of the visual impairment incidence among eight studies^[8, 14, 16-21].

The funnel plot was asymmetrical on both sides, suggesting the presence of publication bias among the selected studies. SE: Standard error; RR: relative risk.

the reliability of the results. (2) The follow-up period greatly varied, from 18 months to 17 years, four studies recorded a high loss rate, which lead to bias in the results. (3) The sample size in some randomized controlled trials was relatively small. No grants or sponsors from commercial companies are mentioned, so bias could be avoided to some extent. Large-scale, well-designed randomized controlled trials, as well as follow-up, to evaluate the pros and cons of the use of dexamethasone are further required.

Author contributions: Li J and Bo T were responsible for the study concept and design. Shen L and Luo SL assisted the data retrieval. Zhang RL supervised the included literatures, performed

statistical analysis, and wrote the manuscript. All authors approved the final version of the manuscript.

Conflicts of interest: None declared.

Peer review: This study systemically evaluated the effect of postnatal dexamethasone treatment in preterm infants. The results showed that early dexamethasone treatment exhibited long-term impact on intelligence quotient values, later dexamethasone treatment contributes to the hearing impairment in preterm infants. Our findings will provide evidence for clinical physicians.

References

- [1] Davis PG, Henderson-Smart DJ. Intravenous dexamethasone for extubation of newborn infants. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2001;(4):CD000308.
- [2] Martins LC, Conceicao FL, Muxfeldt ES, et al. Prevalence and associated factors of subclinical hypercortisolism in patients with resistant hypertension. J Hypertens. 2012;30(5):967-973.
- [3] Cummings JJ, D'Eugenio DB, Gross SJ. A controlled trial of dexamethasone in preterm infants at high risk for bronchopulmonary dysplasia. N Engl J Med. 1989;320(23):1505-1510.
- [4] Barrington KJ. The adverse neuro-developmental effects of postnatal steroids in the preterm infant: a systematic review of RCTs. BMC Pediatr. 2001;1:1.
- [5] Halliday HL, Ehrenkranz RA, Doyle LW. Early (< 8 days) postnatal corticosteroids for preventing chronic lung disease in preterm infants. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2010;(1):CD001146.
- [6] Halliday HL, Ehrenkranz RA, Doyle LW. Late (> 7 days) postnatal corticosteroids for chronic lung disease in preterm infants. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2009;(1):CD001145.
- [7] Halliday HL. Use of steroids in the perinatal period. Paediatr Respir Rev. 2004;5 Suppl A:S321-S327.
- [8] Yeh TF, Lin YJ, Lin HC, et al. Outcomes at school age after postnatal dexamethasone therapy for lung disease of prematurity. N Engl J Med. 2004;350(13):1304-1313.

- [9] Committee on Fetus and Newborn. Postnatal corticosteroids to treat or prevent chronic lung disease in preterm infants. Paediatr Child Health. 2002;7(1):20-46.
- [10] Pang Y, Fan LW, Zheng B, et al. Dexamethasone and betamethasone protect against lipopolysaccharide-induced brain damage in neonatal rats. Pediatr Res. 2012;1(5):552-558.
- [11] Menshanov PN, Bannova AV, Bulygina VV, et al. Acute antiapoptotic effects of hydrocortisone in the hippocampus of neonatal rats. Physiol Res. 2013;62(2):205-213.
- [12] Feng Y, Rhodes PG, Bhatt AJ. Dexamethasone pre-treatment protects brain against hypoxic-ischemic injury partially through up-regulation of vascular endothelial growth factor A in neonatal rats. Neuroscience. 2011;179:223-232.
- [13] Ter Wolbeek M, de Sonneville LM, de Vries WB, et al. Early life intervention with glucocorticoids has negative effects on motor development and neuropsychological function in 14-17 year-old adolescents. Psychoneuroendocrinology. 2013;38(7):975-986.
- [14] Doyle LW, Davis PG, Morley CJ, et al. Outcome at 2 years of age of infants from the DART study: a multicenter, international, randomized, controlled trial of low-dose dexamethasone. Pediatrics. 2007;119(4):716-721.
- [15] O'Shea TM, Washburn LK, Nixon PA, et al. Follow-up of a randomized, placebo-controlled trial of dexamethasone to decrease the duration of ventilator dependency in very low birth weight infants: neurodevelopmental outcomes at 4 to 11 years of age. Pediatrics. 2007;120(3):594-602.
- [16] Gross SJ, Anbar RD, Mettelman BB. Follow-up at 15 years of preterm infants from a controlled trial of moderately early dexamethasone for the prevention of chronic lung disease. Pediatrics. 2005;115(3):681-687.
- [17] Jones RA. Randomized, controlled trial of dexamethasone in neonatal chronic lung disease: 13- to 17-year follow-up study: I. Neurologic, psychological, and educational outcomes. Pediatrics. 2005;116(2):370-378.
- [18] Romagnoli C, Zecca E, Luciano R, et al. A three year follow up of preterm infants after moderately early treatment with dexamethasone. Arch Dis Child Fetal Neonatal Ed. 2002;87(1):F55-F58.
- [19] Romagnoli C, Zecca E, Luciano R, et al. Controlled trial of early dexamethasone treatment for the prevention of chronic lung disease in preterm infants: a 3-year follow-up. Pediatrics. 2002;109(6):e85.
- [20] Shinwell ES, Karplus M, Reich D, et al. Early postnatal dexamethasone treatment and increased incidence of cerebral palsy. Arch Dis Child Fetal Neonatal Ed. 2000;83(3):F177-181.

- [21] Jones R, Wincott E, Elbourne D, et al. Controlled trial of dexamethasone in neonatal chronic lung disease: a 3-year follow-up. Pediatrics. 1995;96(5 Pt 1):897-906.
- [22] Higgins JPT, Green S (editors). Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 5.1.0 [updated March 2011]. The Cochrane Collaboration. 2011.
- [23] Seckl JR. Glucocorticoids, developmental 'programming' and the risk of affective dysfunction. Prog Brain Res. 2008;167:17-34.
- [24] Parikh NA, Lasky RE, Kennedy KA, et al. Postnatal dexamethasone therapy and cerebral tissue volumes in extremely low birth weight infants. Pediatrics. 2007;119(2):265-272.
- [25] Toffanin T, Nifosi F, Follador H, et al. Volumetric MRI analysis of hippocampal subregions in Cushing's disease: a model for glucocorticoid neural modulation. Eur Psychiatry. 2011;26(1):64-67.
- [26] Wolkowitz OM, Lupien SJ, Bigler ED. The "steroid dementia syndrome": a possible model of human glucocorticoid neurotoxicity. Neurocase. 2007;13(3):189-200.
- [27] Zuloaga DG, Carbone DL, Hiroi R, et al. Dexamethasone induces apoptosis in the developing rat amygdala in an age-, region-, and sex-specific manner. Neuroscience. 2011;199:535-547.
- [28] Claessens SE, Belanoff JK, Kanatsou S, et al. Acute effects of neonatal dexamethasone treatment on proliferation and astrocyte immunoreactivity in hippocampus and corpus callosum: towards a rescue strategy. Brain Res. 2012;1482:1-12.
- [29] Oliveira M, Rodrigues AJ, Leao P, et al. The bed nucleus of stria terminalis and the amygdala as targets of antenatal glucocorticoids: implications for fear and anxiety responses. Psychopharmacology (Berl). 2012;220(3):443-453.
- [30] Chen YL, Li YP, Du L, et al. Evolution of levels of evidence and strength of recommendation in medical research. Zhongguo Xunzheng Yixue Zazhi. 2008;8(2);127-133.
- [31] Doyle LW, Ehrenkranz RA, Halliday HL. Dexamethasone treatment after the first week of life for bronchopulmonary dysplasia in preterm infants: a systematic review. Neonatology. 2010;98(4):289-296.
- [32] Rademaker KJ, de Vries LS, Uiterwaal CS, et al. Postnatal hydrocortisone treatment for chronic lung disease in the preterm newborn and long-term neurodevelopmental follow-up. Arch Dis Child Fetal Neonatal Ed. 2008;93(1):F58-F63.

Copyedited by Aprico K, Raye W, Mu DZ, Sun RP, Wang J, Yang Y, Li CH, Song LP, Zhao M