SYSTEMATIC REVIEW

Tight glycemic control in critically ill pediatric patients: a meta-analysis and systematic review of randomized controlled trials

Yiyang Zhao¹, Yang Wu¹ and Bo Xiang¹

BACKGROUND: There still are controversies in the impact of tight glycemic control (TGC) in critically ill children. The aim of this study was to assess the benefits and risks of TGC compared with conventional glycemic control (CGC) in critically ill pediatric patients admitted to the pediatric intensive care unit (PICU) by using data retrieved from randomized controlled trials (RCTs).

METHOD: EMBASE, CNKI, PubMed, and the Cochrane Database were searched for RCTs comparing TGC with CGC in critically ill children in PICU.

RESULT: The meta-analysis included five RCTs representing 3933 patients and compared TGC with CGC. Our result revealed that TGC did not reduce the 30-day mortality rates (OR 0.99, 95% CI 0.74–1.32, $P = 0.95$) and was not associated with decreasing health care-associated infections (OR 0.80, 95% CI 0.64–1.00, $P = 0.05$) compared with CGC, but significantly increased the incidence of hypoglycemia (OR 6.37, 95% CI 4.41–9.21, $P < 0.001$).

CONCLUSION: Tight glycemic control was not associated with reducing the 30-day mortality rates and acquired infections compared with CGC in critically ill children. Significant increase of the incidence of hypoglycemia was revealed in TGC group. The conclusion should be interpreted with caution for the methodological heterogeneity among trials.

Pediatric Research (2018) 84:22–27; <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41390-018-0002-3>

INTRODUCTION

Hyperglycemia is a common phenomenon in critically ill patients.^{1–5} Persistent hyperglycemia state during critical illness may induce increased oxidative damage, pro-inflammatory response, and tissue impairment.^{6–8} Several studies have showed that hyperglycemia is associated with poor prognosis in critically ill patients.^{1, 2, 9–15} Considering the potential benefits of tight glycemic control (TGC) in critically ill patients, several trials of TGC in adult intensive care units had been carried out and some of them showed advantages of TGC in reducing morbidity or mortality,^{16, 17} while other trials did not.^{18–20} However, two meta-analyses were not able to show a benefit.^{21, 22} By now there were a few randomized control trials (RCTs) comparing TGC with conventional glycemic control (CGC) involving critically ill pediatric patients with different outcomes that had been published.^{23–27} Because of the controversies of TGCs in critically ill children, we performed this meta-analysis and systematic review to evaluate the benefits and adverse effects of TGC compared with CGC.

METHODS

Eligibility criteria

We included studies fulfilling the following criteria in the present systemic review: RCTs, studies that evaluated clinical outcomes in critically ill children who had received tight glycemic control with insulin therapy. There was no limit on the publication status or the language. The primary outcome of the analysis was the 30-day

mortality rate of the patients. If 30-day mortality was not reported, we used 28-day mortality or ICU mortality, as reported. The secondary outcomes were the rates of occurrence of health care-associated infections during ICU stay and incidence of hypoglycemia. Hypoglycemia is defined as <40 mg/dl; in case this is missing, the incidence of hypoglycemia with a cutoff closest to 40 mg/dl is used. The incidence of hypoglycemia was defined as the proportion of patients experiencing at least one single episode of hypoglycemia during ICU stay. Exclusion criteria were: non-RCT studies, non-human subjects, impossible to extract data from the articles, and overlapping authors, institutes, or patients in the published literatures. We also excluded RCTs related with glycemic control in low-birth-weight neonates and adults.

Search strategy and selection of studies

We systemically searched MEDLINE (PubMed as the search engine), EMBASE, Ovid, ISI Web of Science, and the Cochrane Library from 1 January 1964 to 12 May 2017, by two independent reviewers (Yiyang Zhao and Yang Wu). Search terms were selected as: hyperglycemia, glycemic control, insulin, glucose control, hypoglycemia, pediatric and children, and critical and intensive care. For PubMed, the Medical Subject Heading (MeSH) and textword search were adopted. For EMBASE, Ovid, and the Cochrane Library, searches using key word headings were performed (<http://links.lww.com/MPG/A418>). References of the previous reviews were also searched for related studies. Two reviewers (Yiyang Zhao and Yang Wu) independently evaluated all the retrieved articles using the

¹Department of Pediatric Surgery, Sichuan University West China Hospital, Chengdu, Sichuan, People's Republic of China

Correspondence: Bo Xiang (xb_scu.edu@hotmail.com)

These authors contributed equally: Yiyang Zhao, Yang Wu.

Received: 23 May 2017 Revised: 2 November 2017 Accepted: 19 November 2017

Published online: 24 May 2018

Fig. 1 PRISMA flow diagram of literature search

reported eligibility criteria. In case of disagreement, a consensual decision was made. All relevant studies were first scanned with title and abstracts. Selected full articles were then scanned and assessed. We also searched references, related book chapters, and conference presentations. Studies that met the selection criteria were finally included and analyzed.

Data extraction

Two previous reviewers had extracted data from the included RCTs into RevMan 5.0 software independently. These data included characteristics of studies, patient demographic information, patterns of interventions, and clinical outcomes and complications. The corresponding author would be contacted to obtain the supplementary data when there were missing information or inaccuracies.

Quality assessment

Methodological quality of the included studies was assessed by using the Jadad scale including a maximum of 7 points to randomization, double blinding, dropouts and withdrawals, and allocation concealment. Two authors examined the studies independently. Same consensus process mentioned above was used to resolve disagreements.

Statistical analysis

Meta-analysis was performed in line with the recommendations from the Cochrane Collaboration and the Quality-of-Reporting of

meta-analyses guidelines.^{28, 29} Statistical analyses were carried out using Review Manager version 5.0 (Cochrane Collaboration, Oxford, UK). Dichotomous variables were analyzed with the Mantel-Haenszel statistical method using odds ratio (OR) as the summary statistic, and both were reported with 95% confidence interval (CI). Clinical heterogeneity was tested by means of the I^2 value, and a value exceeding 50% was considered to represent a significant difference. A random-effects model was used to report the results of the heterogeneous data; otherwise, a fixed-effects model was used. The OR was considered to be statistically significant at $P < 0.05$ if the 95% CI did not include the value "1." Funnel plots were constructed to detect and assess publication bias and any association between the treatment estimates and the sample sizes.

RESULTS

Evaluations of qualities of trials

Figure 1 illustrated the detailed information of literature search and PRISMA flowchart. Initial search yielded 58 relevant articles. No additional studies had been identified by cross-referencing the bibliographies of relevant articles. We checked the title and the abstract of each article, and seven of the total included studies had been selected for further reviews. Finally, a total of five RCTs had been included in the meta-analysis. All the included studies were classified as high quality (Jadad score ≥ 4 , Table 1).

Characteristics and baseline information of the included trials
A total of 3933 patients had been included in this study. The number of patients in each trial varied from 186 to 1369. These trials were performed in pediatric patients (containing severely burned, cardiac surgical, mixed critically ill). It should be noted that these studies had different glycemic targets and achieved different glucose levels in the TGC and the CGC groups. Table 1 showed characteristics and baseline information of the included trials.

Study outcomes

The primary outcome of this study was the 30-day mortality rate of admission of the patients. Three trials reported mortality rates within 30 days,^{23, 25, 26} the HALF-PINT trial reported 28-day mortality,²⁷ and Jeschke trial only reported ICU mortality.²⁴ If 30-day mortality was not reported, we used 28-day mortality or ICU mortality, as reported. Analysis with pooled data showed that TGCsin critically ill children had not reduced the mortality rates (OR 0.99, 95% CI 0.74–1.32, $P = 0.95$) (Fig. 2a). The secondary outcome was the infection rate of patients between the TGC and the CGC groups. It was illustrated that TGC may be associated with decrease in the acquired infection, but there was no statistical difference (OR 0.80, 95% CI 0.64–1.00, $P = 0.05$). (Fig. 2b). Hypoglycemia as a major complication of glucose control was reported in all of the five studies. Four trials defined severe hypoglycemia as blood glucose level <40 mg/dl, except trial by Macrae et al., which defined severe hypoglycemia as blood glucose level <36 mg/dl.²⁶ Our study showed that TGC in critically ill children increased the incidence of hypoglycemia (OR 6.37, 95% CI 4.41–9.21, $P < 0.001$) (Fig. 2c).

Publication bias

The funnel plot of this study based on mortality was shown in Fig. 3. All of the included studies lay inside the limits of the 95% CI and distributed evenly about the vertical, showing no evidence of publication bias.

DISCUSSION

The present meta-analysis showed that currently there were no obvious benefits of TGC, compared with CGC in critically ill children. TGC did not reduce mortality rates (OR 0.99, 95% CI 0.74–1.32, $P = 0.95$) and was not associated with decreasing infection rates (OR 0.80, 95% CI 0.64–1.00, $P = 0.05$). Significantly increased incidence of hypoglycemia was revealed in the TGC groups (OR 6.37, 95% CI 4.41–9.21, $P < 0.001$). Although the trial by Vlasselaers et al. showed that TGC had benefits of reducing the lengths of PICU stay and mortality in critically ill children (75% patients receiving cardiac surgery).²³ Jeschke et al. showed advantages of TGC compared with CGC on improving organ functions and alleviating post-burn insulin resistance in severely burned children, but found no significant differences in the mortality rates between the TGC and CGC groups.²⁴ The study by Macrae et al., involving a mixed population of critically ill children, was unable to show any statistically positive effects on major clinical outcomes with TGC.²⁶ But in the subgroup of non-cardiac surgical patients, the mean 12-month cost was significantly lower in the TGC group than in the CGC group. The other two studies did not show benefits on the mortality or the lengths of PICU stay.^{25, 27}

The study by Vlasselaers et al. indicated that mortality was lower in the TGC group, possibly due to prevention of infection and pulmonary damage, and protect effects of the heart.²³ They also stated that their sample size was not large enough to confirm these benefits. Our study analyzed 3933 pediatric patients and intended to expand the trial volume. Both in vitro and in vivo studies revealed that insulin therapy had positive effects of improving organ functions and alleviating inflammatory

Study	Year	Country	Design	Jadad scores	Setting	Glucose monitoring	No. of patients		Glycemic targets mg/dl		Blood glucose mg/dl	
							TGC	CGC	TGC	CGC	TGC	CGC
Agus ²⁷	2017	America	Multiple-center RCT	5	Mixed (non-cardiac surgery)	Continuous glucose-monitoring	349	349	80–110	150–180	109	123
Macrae ²⁶	2014	Britain	Multiple-center RCT	5	Mixed (60% cardiac surgery)	Discontinuous glucose-monitoring	694	675	72–126	180–215	107	114
Agus ²⁵	2012	America	Two-center RCT	5	Cardiac surgery	Continuous glucose-monitoring	490	490	80–110	NR	112	121
Jeschke ²⁴	2010	America	Single-center RCT	5	Burns	Discontinuous glucose-monitoring	49	137	80–110	140–180	NR	NR
Vlasselaers ²³	2009	Belgium	Single-center RCT	5	Mixed (75% cardiac surgery)	Discontinuous glucose-monitoring	349	351	Infants: 50–80, children: 70–100	180–215	Infants: 86.4, children: 95.4	Infants: 115.2, children: 147.6
TGC tight glycemic control, CGC conventional glycemic control, NR no record, RCT randomized controlled trial

Fig. 2 Forest plots of pool data analysis comparing TGC with CGC in critically ill pediatric patients. **a** Forest plot of 30-day mortality. **b** Forest plot of health care-associated infections. **c** Forest plot of hypoglycemia [defined as blood glucose concentration ≤ 40 mg/dl (≤ 2.2 mmol/l)]. TGC tight glycemic control, CGC conventional glycemic control, df degrees of freedom, M-H Mantel-Haenszel, SD = standard deviation

Fig. 3 Funnel plot of mortality showing no publication bias

responses.^{30–32} Although TGC may bring clinical benefits in theory, the pooled analysis of the present study did not show obvious survival benefits of TGC compared with CGC in critically ill children. The heterogeneity of critical degrees of patients may partially explain the result. Several trials had small differences in the achieved blood glucose levels, this may explain why the mortality rate was not significantly different. There were benefits with a minor difference in the blood glucose levels, which would likely be very small.

Two of the included studies revealed benefits of reducing the infection rates with TGC,^{23, 24} another two studies showed no significance in the infection rates between the TGC and CGC

groups.^{25, 26} The recent trial by Agus et al. indicated that the TGC group had higher rates of health care-associated infections compared with CGC group.²⁷ Studies had showed that insulin-induced expression of endothelial NO synthase suppressed intracellular adhesion molecule-1 and monocyte chemoattractant protein-1 expression, and played anti-inflammatory and antioxidant roles.^{33–35} While our study did not show benefit of reducing the infection rates with TGC, it probably was due to the complicated condition of critically ill pediatric patients. For example, insulin therapy may exert more obvious anti-inflammatory effect in obese or diabetic patients.^{36–38} Discrepancy of susceptibility to infection and different antibiotic regimens of trials may also contribute to this result.

Hypoglycemia is a major complication of TGC and is associated with clinical outcomes, particularly in pediatric patients.^{19, 39, 40} Although the SPECS trial by Agus et al. showed a low rate of severe hypoglycemia in the TGC group compared with the CGC group (3% vs. 1%), all of the included studies indicated that TGC can significantly increase the incidence of hypoglycemia, despite the use of insulin-dosing algorithm and continuous subcutaneous glucose monitoring. Partly, different designs of the trials may influence the incidence of hypoglycemia. Vlasselaers trial used lower target in the intervention group, had relatively higher risk of hypoglycemia.²³ Hypoglycemia may impact the brain and the physical development in pediatric patients, especially in neonates.^{41, 42} Several studies revealed that hyperglycemia and glucose fluctuation or rapid correction of hypoglycemia also may cause neurosensory impairment.^{43–45} The follow-up study by Vlasselaers et al. evaluated neurodevelopmental outcomes in the critically ill children, who enrolled in the randomized trial of TGC vs. CGC 4 years later.^{43, 46} The result revealed that TGC with high

rates of hypoglycemia did not impact neurodevelopment, possibly have benefits on neurodevelopment.^{43, 46} Sathwani et al. assessed the impact of TGC and hypoglycemia on neurodevelopmental outcomes in patients included in study by Agus et al.²⁵ when they were 1 year old.⁴⁷ The study showed that TGC did not impact neurodevelopment compared with CGC, while moderate to severe hypoglycemia may be associated with poorer neurodevelopmental outcomes at 1 year of age.⁴⁷ Considering the potential risk of hypoglycemia, long-term follow-up to assess the association of TGC and hypoglycemia with neurodevelopmental outcomes is needed.

The present study has limitations due to heterogeneity of the included population existing among trials. Although different types of patients may have dissimilar critical degrees or clinical outcomes, we failed to perform subgroup-analysis because of too many missing data. The observation periods of the mortality rates were not exactly the same. If we exclude mortality of Jeschke trial²⁴ that reported ICU mortality, there still was no statistical difference in the mortality rates (OR 0.95, 95% CI 0.57–1.58, $P = 0.84$). Besides, the trials reported no incidence of health care-associated infections in a uniform way. This meta-analysis probably underestimated the incidence of acquired infections. These trials had different antibiotic regimens that also may have an impact on the incidence of infections. The glycemic targets and glycemic control strategies varied among trials, the achieved glucose levels of each trial also differed.

CONCLUSION

This meta-analysis was not able to demonstrate any superiority of TGCs compared with CGCs in critically ill children. Besides, TGC can significantly increase the incidence of hypoglycemia. In view of the heterogeneity of the included studies, the conclusion of this meta-analysis should be interpreted with caution.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Competing interests: The authors declare no competing interests.

Publisher's note: Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

REFERENCES

- Capes, S. E., Hunt, D., Malmberg, K. & Gerstein, H. C. Stress hyperglycaemia and increased risk of death after myocardial infarction in patients with and without diabetes: a systematic overview. *Lancet* **355**, 773–778 (2000).
- Capes, S. E., Hunt, D., Malmberg, K., Pathak, P. & Gerstein, H. C. Stress hyperglycemia and prognosis of stroke in nondiabetic and diabetic patients: a systematic overview. *Stroke* **32**, 2426–2432 (2001).
- Faustino, E. V. & Apkon, M. Persistent hyperglycemia in critically ill children. *J. Pediatr.* **146**, 30–34 (2005).
- Yates, A. R. et al. Hyperglycemia is a marker for poor outcome in the post-operative pediatric cardiac patient. *Pediatr. Crit. Care Med.* **7**, 351–355 (2006).
- Yung, M. et al. Glucose control, organ failure, and mortality in pediatric intensive care. *Pediatr. Crit. Care Med.* **9**, 147–152 (2008).
- Dufour, S., Lebon, V., Shulman, G. I. & Petersen, K. F. Regulation of net hepatic glycogenolysis and gluconeogenesis by epinephrine in humans. *Am. J. Physiol. Endocrinol. Metab.* **297**, E231–E235 (2009).
- Kulp, G. A., Herndon, D. N., Lee, J. O., Suman, O. E. & Jeschke, M. G. Extent and magnitude of catecholamine surge in pediatric burned patients. *Shock* **33**, 369–374 (2010).
- Srinivasan, V. Stress hyperglycemia in pediatric critical illness: the intensive care unit adds to the stress! *J. Diabetes Sci. Technol.* **6**, 37–47 (2012).
- McCowan, K. C., Malhotra, A. & Bistrian, B. R. Stress-induced hyperglycemia. *Crit. Care Clin.* **17**, 107–124 (2001).
- Falciglia, M. Causes and consequences of hyperglycemia in critical illness. *Curr. Opin. Clin. Nutr. Metab. Care* **10**, 498–503 (2007).
- Wintergerst, K. A. et al. Association of hypoglycemia, hyperglycemia, and glucose variability with morbidity and death in the pediatric intensive care unit. *Pediatrics* **118**, 173–179 (2006).

- Srinivasan, V. et al. Association of timing, duration, and intensity of hyperglycemia with intensive care unit mortality in critically ill children. *Pediatr. Crit. Care Med.* **5**, 329–336 (2004).
- Branco, R. G. et al. Glucose level and risk of mortality in pediatric septic shock. *Pediatr. Crit. Care Med.* **6**, 470–472 (2005).
- Piper, H. G. et al. Real-time continuous glucose monitoring in pediatric patients during and after cardiac surgery. *Pediatrics* **118**, 1176–1184 (2006).
- Falcão, G. et al. Impact of postoperative hyperglycemia following surgical repair of congenital cardiac defects. *Pediatr. Cardiol.* **29**, 628–636 (2008).
- van den Berghe, G. et al. Intensive insulin therapy in critically ill patients. *New Engl. J. Med.* **345**, 1359–1367 (2001).
- Van den Berghe, G. et al. Intensive insulin therapy in the medical ICU. *New Engl. J. Med.* **354**, 449–461 (2006).
- The NICE-SUGAR Study Investigators, Finfer, S. et al. Intensive versus conventional glucose control in critically ill patients. *New Engl. J. Med.* **360**, 1283–1297 (2009).
- The NICE-SUGAR Study Investigators, Finfer, S. et al. Hypoglycemia and risk of death in critically ill patients. *New Engl. J. Med.* **367**, 1108–1118 (2012).
- Preiser, J. C. et al. A prospective randomised multi-centre controlled trial on tight glucose control by intensive insulin therapy in adult intensive care units: the Glucontrol study. *Intensive Care Med.* **35**, 1738–1748 (2009).
- Griesdale, D. E. et al. Intensive insulin therapy and mortality among critically ill patients: a meta-analysis including NICE-SUGAR study data. *CMAJ* **180**, 821–827 (2009).
- Wiener, R. S., Wiener, D. C. & Larson, R. J. Benefits and risks of tight glucose control in critically ill adults: a meta-analysis. *JAMA: J. Am. Med. Assoc.* **300**, 933–944 (2008).
- Vlasselaers, D. et al. Intensive insulin therapy for patients in paediatric intensive care: a prospective, randomised controlled study. *Lancet* **373**, 547–556 (2009).
- Jeschke, M. G. et al. Intensive insulin therapy in severely burned pediatric patients: a prospective randomized trial. *Am. J. Respir. Crit. Care Med.* **182**, 351–359 (2010).
- Agus, M. S. et al. Tight glycemic control versus standard care after pediatric cardiac surgery. *New Engl. J. Med.* **367**, 1208–1219 (2012).
- Macrae, D. et al. A randomized trial of hyperglycemic control in pediatric intensive care. *New Engl. J. Med.* **370**, 107–118 (2014).
- Agus, M. S. et al. Tight glycemic control in critically ill Children. *New Engl. J. Med.* **376**, 729–741 (2017).
- Clarke, M. & Horton, R. Bringing it all together: Lancet-Cochrane collaborate on systematic reviews. *Lancet* **357**, 1728 (2001).
- Stroup, D. F. et al. Meta-analysis of observational studies in epidemiology: a proposal for reporting. Meta-analysis of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) group. *JAMA* **283**, 2008–2012 (2000).
- Gielen, M. et al. Effect of tight glucose control with insulin on the thyroid axis of critically ill children and its relation with outcome. *J. Clin. Endocrinol. Metab.* **97**, 3569–3576 (2012).
- Jonassen, A. K. et al. Insulin administered at reoxygenation exerts a cardioprotective effect in myocytes by a possible anti-apoptotic mechanism. *J. Mol. Cell Cardiol.* **32**, 757–764 (2000).
- Tune, J. D., Mallet, R. T. & Downey, H. F. Insulin improves contractile function during moderate ischemia in canine left ventricle. *Am. J. Physiol.* **274**, H1574–H1581 (1998).
- Aljada, A. & Dandona, P. Effect of insulin on human aortic endothelial nitric oxide synthase. *Metab. Clin. Exp.* **49**, 147–150 (2000).
- Grover, A. et al. Insulin attenuates norepinephrine-induced vasoconstriction. *Ultrasound Study Hypertens.* **25**, 779–784 (1995).
- Aljada, A., Ghanim, H., Saadeh, R. & Dandona, P. Insulin inhibits NFκB and MCP-1 expression in human aortic endothelial cells. *J. Clin. Endocrinol. Metab.* **86**, 450–453 (2001).
- Dandona, P. et al. Insulin inhibits intranuclear nuclear factor kappaB and stimulates IkappaB in mononuclear cells in obese subjects: evidence for an anti-inflammatory effect? *J. Clin. Endocrinol. Metab.* **86**, 3257–3265 (2001).
- Aljada, A., Ghanim, H., Mohanty, P., Kapur, N. & Dandona, P. Insulin inhibits the pro-inflammatory transcription factor early growth response gene-1 (Egr)-1 expression in mononuclear cells (MNC) and reduces plasma tissue factor (TF) and plasminogen activator inhibitor-1 (PAI-1) concentrations. *J. Clin. Endocrinol. Metab.* **87**, 1419–1422 (2002).
- Malmberg, K. et al. Intense metabolic control by means of insulin in patients with diabetes mellitus and acute myocardial infarction (DIGAMI 2): effects on mortality and morbidity. *Eur. Heart J.* **26**, 650–661 (2005).
- Hirschberg, E., Lacroix, J., Sward, K., Willson, D. & Morris, A. H. Blood glucose control in critically ill adults and children: a survey on stated practice. *Chest* **133**, 1328–1335 (2008).
- Branco, R. G. et al. Prospective operationalization and feasibility of a glycemic control protocol in critically ill children. *Pediatr. Crit. Care Med.* **12**, 265–270 (2011).

41. Duvanel, C. B., Fawer, C. L., Cotting, J., Hohlfeld, P. & Matthieu, J. M. Long-term effects of neonatal hypoglycemia on brain growth and psychomotor development in small-for-gestational-age preterm infants. *J. Pediatr.* **134**, 492–498 (1999).
42. Lucas, A., Morley, R. & Cole, T. J. Adverse neurodevelopmental outcome of moderate neonatal hypoglycaemia. *BMJ* **297**, 1304–1308 (1988).
43. Mesotten, D. et al. Neurocognitive development of children 4 years after critical illness and treatment with tight glucose control: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA* **308**, 1641–1650 (2012).
44. McKinlay, C. J. et al. Neonatal glycemia and neurodevelopmental outcomes at 2 years. *New Engl. J. Med.* **373**, 1507–1518 (2015).
45. McKinlay, C. J. D. et al. Association of neonatal glycemia with neurodevelopmental outcomes at 4.5 years. *JAMA Pediatr.* **171**, 972–983 (2017).
46. Tasker, R. C. Pediatric critical care, glycemic control, and hypoglycemia: what is the real target? *JAMA* **308**, 1687–1688 (2012).
47. Sadhwani, A. et al. Impact of tight glycemic control on neurodevelopmental outcomes at 1 year of age for children with congenital heart disease: a randomized controlled trial. *J. Pediatr.* **174**, 193–198 (2016).