BMJ Open

Paediatric Early Warning Systems for detecting and responding to clinical deterioration in children: a systematic review

Journal:	*BMJ Open*
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2016-014497
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	28-Sep-2016
Complete List of Authors:	Lambert, Veronica; Dublin City University, School of Nursing and Human Sciences Matthews, Anne; Dublin City University, School of Nursing and Human Sciences MacDonell, Rachel; Health Service Executive Fitzsimons, John; Health Service Executive
Primary Subject Heading:	Paediatrics
Secondary Subject Heading:	Communication
Keywords:	PEWS, Paediatric early warning system, clinical deterioration, children, systematic review

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Paediatric Early Warning Systems for detecting and responding to clinical deterioration in children: a systematic review

Authors: Veronica Lambert[1], Anne Matthews[1], Rachel MacDonell[2], John Fitzsimons[2]

[1]School of Nursing and Human Sciences, Dublin City University, Dublin, Ireland
[2]Health Service Executive, Ireland

Corresponding author:
Veronica Lambert
School of Nursing and Human Sciences
Dublin City University
Dublin, Ireland
Tel: +353 1 7007161
Email: veronica.lambert@dcu.ie

Word Count: 4,565

Key words: PEWS; paediatric early warning system; clinical deterioration; children; systematic review

Abstract

Objective: To systematically review the available evidence on paediatric early warning systems (PEWS) for use in acute paediatric healthcare settings for the detection of, and timely response to, clinical deterioration in children.

Method: A comprehensive search methodology was employed to retrieve published and unpublished evidence internationally; including electronic databases, grey literature and clinical guideline resources. Results were narratively synthesised.

Results: From a total screening of 2,742 papers, 89 papers, of varied designs, were identified as eligible for inclusion in the review. Findings revealed that PEWS are extensively used internationally in paediatric inpatient hospital settings. However, robust empirical evidence on which PEWS is most effective was limited. The studies examined did however highlight some evidence of positive directional trends in improving clinical and process based outcomes for clinically deteriorating children. Favourable outcomes were also identified for enhanced multi-disciplinary team work, communication and confidence in recognising, reporting and making decisions about child clinical deterioration.

Conclusion: Despite many studies reporting on the complexity and multi-faceted nature of PEWS, no evidence was sourced which examined PEWS as a complex health-care intervention. Future research needs to investigate PEWS as a complex multi-faceted socio-technical system that is embedded in a wider safety culture influenced by many organisational and human factors. PEWS should be embraced as one piece of a larger multi-faceted safety framework that will develop and grow over time with strong governance and leadership, targeted training, on-going support and continuous improvement.

Strengths and limitations of this study

- This review is the first to systematically synthesise the available evidence on the multiple components of PEWS collectively in one review.

- The review highlights that PEWS should be embraced as one piece of a larger multi-faceted safety framework.

- Future research needs to investigate PEWS as a complex multi-faceted socio-technical system embedded in a wider safety culture.

- Due to heterogeneous research designs assessing quality across eligible studies was limited.

- While no strong evidence underpinning any one PEW system was available emerging work should contribute further to this evidence base.

3

BACKGROUND

It has been known for some time now that children who die or deteriorate unexpectedly in the hospital setting will often have observable features in the period before the seriousness of their condition is recognised. A seminal study of paediatric mortality in the United Kingdom estimated that approximately 1 in 5 children who die in hospital have avoidable factors leading to death and up to half of children have potentially avoidable factors.[1] The report concluded that *"there should be ways of telling if something is wrong with a child as early as possible, for example, an early warning scoring system".*[1] Other studies have examined the signs (physiological and behavioural) of deterioration that may be present in the period preceding a cardiopulmonary arrest,[2, 3] and the fact that these features are often not recognised or acted upon in a timely fashion by hospital staff.[4, 5] Recent years have also witnessed an increased risk of paediatric cardiopulmonary arrest, and its associated mortality, in acute healthcare settings largely as a consequence of increased acuity of care and higher dependency on technology.[2] Although the percentage of paediatric cardiopulmonary arrests for inpatient admissions has been reported as low (e.g. 0.7-3%),[6, 7] survival to discharge for children that experience in-hospital cardiopulmonary arrest is poor (11-37%).[3, 6]

Paediatric Early Warning Systems (PEWS) are bedside tools to help alert staff to clinically deteriorating children by periodic observation of physiological parameters, generation of a numeric score and predetermined criteria for escalating urgent assistance with a clear framework for communication. In using these physiological track and trigger systems the goal is to ensure timely recognition of patients with potential or established critical illness and to ensure timely attendance from appropriately skilled staff. Critical to early warning systems are four integrated components which work together to provide a comprehensive safety net for clinically deteriorating patients and that are most likely to identify and manage patients at highest risk for cardiac or respiratory arrest; (i) the afferent component which detects clinical deterioration and triggers an appropriate response; (ii) the efferent component which consists of the personnel and resources providing the response (e.g. medical emergency team); (iii) the process improvement component containing elements such as auditing/monitoring/evaluation to enhance patient care and safety and (iv) the governance/administrative component focusing on the organisational safety culture, education and processes to implement and sustain the system.[8]

4

In Ireland, a 2013 patient safety review by the Health Information and Quality Authority (HIQA) into the unexpected death of a young woman in a maternity setting identified several care failures.[9] These included a lack of provision of basic fundamental care, failure to recognise risk of clinical deterioration, failure to act or escalate concerns about deterioration to appropriately qualified clinicians and lack of detail in medical record documentation of clinical status and potential risk of clinical deterioration. This led to a request from the Minister for Health that the Department of Health's National Clinical Effectiveness Committee commission quality assure a number of National Clinical Guidelines; including early warning scoress for adult, maternity and paediatric healthcare settings.

This request presented several design challenges including the need for an observation tool that would work in all paediatric care settings (secondary and specialist care) and a requirement to align with the Adult and Maternity scores. Additionally the application of early warning scores to paediatric patients is more compex than in adults. There are several reasons for this: variation in age-specific thresholds for normal and abnormal physiology; children's inability or difficulty in articulating how or what they feel; children's physiological compensatory mechanisms; staff training issues and the need for more focused attention on respiratory deterioration.[10] Finally, although many PEWS have been developed and tested, uncertainty remains as to which system, or system feature, is most useful for paediatric patients. Even the concept of PEWS as a system (i.e. the application all four components in parallel as considered above) is poorly developed.

The aim of this review was to systematically identify and synthesise available evidence on PEWS for use in acute paediatric healthcare settings for the detection of, and timely response to, clinical deterioration in children.

Our review questions were:
1. What is the available evidence on the use, composition and clinical validity of PEW detection systems?
2. What evidence exists on the availability, composition, activation and effectiveness of PEW response mechanims?
3. What evidence exists on the process of implementing PEWS including education, governance, monitoring effectiveness, additional safety nets and cost-effectiveness?

METHODS

Design

This review was conducted and reported in accordance with the Centre for Reviews and Dissemination guidance for undertaking systematic reviews in healthcare,[11] the National Clinical Effectiveness Committee Guideline Development Manual [12] and the Preferred Reporting in Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) criteria.[13]

Data sources and search strategy

We systematically searched the following electronic databases PubMed, MEDLINE, CINAHL, EMBASE, and Cochrane (inclusive of Cochrane Database of Systematic Review; Database of Abstracts of Review Effects, and CENTRAL - Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials) through to August 2016 using various combinations of controlled vocabulary (e.g. MeSH) and free text words guided by our PICOS parameters (see online supplementary Appendix 1). We limited the search by language (English). For unpublished research reports, we searched grey literature databases, trial registers and national/international professional organisations and association websites. To retrieve evidence based clinical guidelines we searched electronic guideline clearinghouses, performed scoping searches of Google and Bing and conducted a consultation process with key paediatric experts and paediatric hospitals internationally. We also scanned bibliographies of all included papers.

Screening and selection process

Eligible papers had to refer to paediatric early warning systems, inclusive of rapid reponse systems and teams. Outcomes had to be specific to the identification of and/or response to clinical deterioration in child patients (including neonates) in paediatric hospital settings (including emergency departments). No study design restrictions were applied. We excluded papers that focused on paediatric community health settings; PEWS specific to intra and/or inter-hospital transfer and/or transportation of critically ill children; trigger tools for identification of adverse events and/or harm caused by medical interventions; severity of illness scales and patient classification systems specifically for identifying illness acuity and mortality (except in cases where such studies included PEWS as comparative interventions) and studies which included both child and adult populations where child specific data could not be exclusively extracted.

6

For stage 1 screening, two reviewers independently assessed each title and abstract retrieved from the electronic searches for relevance. Any discrepancies were resolved by discussion and consensus with a third reviewer. If no abstract was available, the full-text paper was sourced and assessed. For studies deemed to meet the inclusion criteria, full texts of the studies were obtained. Full text papers were independently assessed by two reviewers against the inclusion criteria before a final decision regarding inclusion/exclusion was confirmed. Any discrepancies were resolved by discussion and consensus with a third reviewer. Reasons for excluding studies from the review were noted (see Figure 1).

Appraisal of the level of evidence

In an attempt to conduct a comprehensive review all studies which met the inclusion criteria were included regardless of quality. Two reviewers appraised and classified the level of evidence of the included studies in accordance with the Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelines Network (SIGN) criteria for assessment of studies based on type of study design. Assessing comparative quality across eligible studies proved difficult due to the heterogeneous nature of the research methodologies employed; including disparate research designs, different ranges for collecting data over time periods (from months to years), localised small case and comparative group selections, and diverse clinical contexts ranging from general medical and surgical units to specialised settings such as oncology, cardiac, endocrine, and rehabilitation units.

Data extraction and synthesis

Two reviewers independently extracted and managed data from the included studies. Any discrepancies were resolved through consultation with other reviewers. A data extraction table was developed to retrieve information pertaining to each study setting, aim, design, sample, intervention and main outcomes/findings. In line with the review research questions the studies were segregrated by PEW detection systems, response mechanisms and implementation processes. All data were narratively synthesised as it was not possible to conduct a meta-analysis and/or a meta-synthesis because of the heterogeneity of evidence retrieved including non-comparative research designs and diversity of systems, approaches and methods adopted in developing and implementing PEWS in paediatric contexts.

Figure 1: Flowchart of search strategy outputs and screening process

RESULTS

Overall search and selection results

A total of 2,742 papers were identified as potentially eligible for inclusion in the review. Following first screening of titles and abstracts we excluded 2,616 papers because they were adult focused, discussion papers, commentaries, conference abstracts and/or duplicate papers.

8

We obtained full texts of the remaining 126 papers. On second screening of these 126 full text papers we excluded a further 56 papers because they were adult focused, both child and adult focused in which it was not possible to segregate child and adult data, not specifically focused on the outcome of clinical deterioration, concentrated on clinical deterioration at point of transportation, examined illness severity or acuity or were discussion papers, commentaries or conference abstracts. We were left with 70 papers that met the inclusion criteria. We sourced an additional 19 papers through secondary citations, personal communications and web-resources. Subsequently, 89 papers fulfilled the eligibility criteria. Figure 1, an adapted PRISMA flow chart, visually displays the search and selection process.

Characteristics of included studies

The studies emanated from the USA (n=47), the UK (n=17), Canada (n=10), Canada & the UK (n=1), Australia (n=5), the Netherlands (n=2), Ireland (n=2), Norway (n=1), Pakistan (n=1), Sweden (n=1), Thailand (n=1) and South America (n=1). The majority of the studies were observational in design of which 13 were cohort studies, 11 were case control, 8 were before and after and 6 were cross-sectional surveys. There were 7 review papers and 3 interruprted time series quasi-experimental studies. The remainder were chart/database reviews (n=22), quality improvement initiatives (n=9), qualitative studies (n=4) or case reports (n=2). There was 1 feasibility and reliability testing stud, 1 cost-analysis exercise, 1 protocol and 1 course evaluation survey. Of the 89 included papers, 43 studies focused on PEW detection systems [2-3, 6-7, 10, 14-51] (Table 1); 30 studies examined PEW response mechanisms [8, 52-80] (Table 2) and 16 studies reported on PEW implementation processes [81-96] (Table 3). The level of evidence of included studies, including rationale for judgement, is also summarised in Tables 1, 2, and 3 respectively.

9

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

Table 1: Characteristics of included studies: PEW detection systems (n=43)

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes/findings	Level of evidence & rationale for judgement
Agulnik et al. (2016) [14]	Boston Children's Hospital, Boston (USA)	Evaluate correlation of a PEW Score with unplanned PICU transfer in hospitalized oncology & hematopoietic stem cell transplant (HSCT) patients	Case–control Retrospective	All unplanned PICU transfers among hospitalized oncology & HSCT patients 110 paediatric oncology patients (42 oncology, 68 HSCT) 220 matched controls (not require PICU transfer)	Children's Hospital Early Warning Score, Boston Children's Hospital (adapted a modified PEWS-Brighton PEWS)	PEW Score highly correlated with need for PICU transfer overall (AUROC = 0.96) & in oncology & hematopoietic stem cell transplant groups (AUROC = 0.95 & 0.96 respectively) Among cases, average max PEWS 24-hour pre transfer 4.6 for oncology & 5.7 for HSCT patients ($p = 0.002$) Patients with higher PEW scores pre transfer had increased PICU mortality ($p = 0.028$) & length of stay ($p = 0.004$)	2+ Well-conducted case control study Retrospective, controls matched to cases 2:1 using 4 developmental ages (<1yr, 1-6yr, 7-11yr, ≥12yr), 2 hospital services (oncology & HSCT) and length of stay (i.e. time from admission to PICU transfer)
Akre et al. (2010) [15]	Children's Hospitals & Clinics of Minnesota (USA)	Evaluate sensitivity of PEWS	Chart review Retrospective	170 RRT calls & 16 code blue events for 186 patients on medical surgical units	Adapted the Brighton PEWS	Sensitivity of PEWS 85.5% Median time from first critical PEWS to RRT or code event 11h 36min & latest critical score 30min For 97.3% of patients earliest median time to consult was 80min Oximetry monitoring added at median time of 6.9h for 43.5% of patients 7% of patients had increased nursing assessment. Sub-group of patients had critical PEWS, consult & addition of monitor. Median time for earliest critical PEWS for these patients was significant ($p <0.001$)	3 Non-analytic, case reviews Retrospective, descriptive
Bell et al. (2013) [16]	Texas Children's Hospital Houston (USA)	Examine psychometric properties of PAWS	Chart review Retrospective	150 infant & child charts randomly selected from 3 units; included if length of stay > 48 hours (general medicine, transplant; pulmonary, adolescent, endocrine; & cardiology units)	Texas Children's Hospital Paediatric Advanced Warning Score (PAWS) (adapted a modified PEWS-Tucker at al. who had adapted the Brighton PEWS)	Cronbach's alpha reliability co-efficient for PAWS score at final measurement was 0.75 (adequate instrument reliability)	3 Non-analytic, case reviews Retrospective, descriptive, 6 month period, 150 charts (reflected 0.7% of population)
Bolger et al. (2015) [17]	National Children's Hospital, Tallaght (Republic of Ireland)	Determine if time taken to maximise clinical input into deteriorating children would reduce following	Before & after Retrospective	All charts of patients whose clinical condition resulted in a CRA, PEWT call or a critical illness transfer to another	Paediatric Early Warning Trigger (PEWT) (based on modified Bristol PEWS)	9/89 PEWTs resulted in patients remaining on ward; 48/89 patients had care escalated to HDU; 9 patients required transfer to PICU; 1 patient died Time from deterioration to senior clinician involvement reduced from 312min to 166min Rate of transfers to PICU (among triage category	2- High risk of confounding or bias Retrospective, no control, audits of patient charts, 12mths pre & 3yrs post PEWT

10

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes/findings	Level of evidence & rationale for judgement
		introduction of PEWT		centre (included paediatric wards and emergency department)		1&2 patients – i.e. all patients who require assessment by a doctor within 10min of arrival to ED) reduced from 1:50 pre the study to 1:29, 1:118, 1:131 during the 3 years of the study Rate of CA reduced from 1:100 pre the study to 1:129, 1:216, 1:542 during the 3 years of the study	
Bradman & Maconochie (2008) [18]	St Marys Hospital London (UK)	Determine if PEWS can detect patients who need hospital admission or discharge home	Chart review Retrospective	424 patients who visited paediatric A&E	Brighton PEWS	PEWS ≥4; sensitivity 24%, specificity 96% PEWS ≥2; sensitivity 37%, specificity 88% Score had low sensitivity therefore limited value in predicting need for admission	3 Non-analytic, case reviews Retrospective audit of patients who attended ED over 2 week period
Bradman et al. (2014) [19]	Princess Margaret Hospital, Perth (Australia)	Compare published prediction tools (PRISA, PRISA II, PEWS, triage category) with triage nurse (TN) predictions	Chart review Prospective	All patients who presented to emergency department over 1 week study period (except patients presenting with psychiatric, dental, child protection concerns or non-medical presentations)	Comparing TN predictions for admission to PRISA (paediatric risk of admission score) ≥9 PRISA II (refined score) ≥2 Brighton PEWS ≥4 Triage category 1,2, 3	Of 1223 patients, 946 (83.6%) included (as had TN predictions) TNs had highest prediction accuracy (87.7%), followed by elevated PEWS (82.9%), triage category 1, 2, or 3 (82.9%) PRISA & PRISA II score had accuracy of 80.1% & 79.7% respectively	3 Non-analytic, case reviews Prospective, patients who attended ED over 1 week period, potential selection bias as not all patients had TN predictions performed
Breslin et al. (2014) [20]	Emergency department of urban tertiary care children's hospital (USA)	Determine association between PEWS at time of emergency department disposition & level of care	Chart review Prospective	383 patients; 239 discharged (62%); 126 admitted to acute care (33%); 18 admitted to ICU (5%)	Brighton PEWS	PEWS ≥ 1 = maximum discriminant ability for admission (sensitivity 63%; specificity 68%) PEWS ≥3 = maximum discriminant ability for ICU admission (sensitivity 56%; specificity 72%) Respiratory patients (n=97): PEWS >=3 had maximum discriminant ability to distinguish admission from discharge with sensitivity 60% specificity 83%	3 Non-analytic, case reviews Prospective data, 10 month period, convenient sample (based on availability of study team member)
Chaiyakulsil & Pandee (2015) [21]	Ramathibodi Hospital, Mahidol University, Bangkok (Thailand)	Validate PEWS in predicting hospitalisation in children <15 years presenting in emergency department (ED)	Chart review Prospective	All consecutive children aged > 15 years who presented to ED at time of study (except patients presenting with trauma, psychiatric, dental and surgical concerns)	PAWS (Egdell)	Of 1136 patients,168 (14.8%) were admitted (162 to general ward & 6 to ICU) For overall admission, PEWS ≥1 sensitivity 78%, specificity 59.6%, PPV 27.7%, NPV 94.8%, AUC 0.71 For ICU admission, PEWS ≥3 sensitivity 100%, specificity 90.5%, PPV 4.8%, NPV 100%, AUC 0.98 For general ward admission, PEWS ≥1, sensitivity 77.2%, specificity 59.1%, PPV 23.5%, NPV 93.8%, AUC 0.71	3 Non-analytic, case reviews Prospective, descriptive, patients who attended ED over 3 month period
Chapman et al. (2010) [7]	Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children	Identify number and nature of PAC & evaluate their	Review	Included 11 publications describing 10 PAC	Paediatric alert criteria (PAC)	Number of PAC small & diverse in purpose, content & thresholds for activation	2++ High quality systematic review of observational/quasi-experimental studies

11

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes/findings	Level of evidence & rationale for judgement
	NHS Trust, London (UK)	validity, reliability, clinical effectiveness and clinical utility				Potential of PACs to improve care of hospitalised children (i.e. early identification of those at risk of clinical deterioration) has not yet been demonstrated Evidence lacking in support of PACs validity, reliability & utility	Detailed description of search strategy/evidence reviewed; quality assessment in line with research design criteria; results summarised narratively
Duncan et al. (2006) [22]	Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto, Ontario (Canada)	Develop bedside score to identify children requiring resuscitation to treat actual or impending CPA	Case control Retrospective	Case patients: (n=87) had code blue calls made as part of care Control patients: (n=128) had no code blue event	Paediatric Early Warning System (PEWS) score	PEWS sensitivity 78%, specificity 95% @ threshold score of 5 Score greater in case than control patients (mean max score 7.9 vs 3.2; P < 0.0001) & within each age category Score could discriminate between cases & controls & within each age category (AUROC 0.83-1.0) PEWS score identifies patients with at least 1-hour warning before code blue event	2+ Well-conducted case control study Frequency matched case control design, retrospective, 87 cases/128 controls
Ennis (2014) [23]	University Hospital Waterford (Republic of Ireland)	Support staff to recognise physiological changes & make appropriate decisions for early proactive intervention; & evaluate clinical utility & effectiveness (PEWS)	Quality Improvement Initiative Prospective	30 bed acute children's ward All children triggering PEWS of ≥3 during inpatient stay	PEWS track & trigger system; & ISBAR (Identify, Situation, Background, Assessment & Recommendation) (NHS Institute's PEWS Charts)	72 instances of PEWS ≥3 (35 children) 97% (34/35) with PEWS ≥3 had additional medical intervention following first PEWS alert review 82% (59/72) resulted in specific intervention or change to treatment plan Medical responses to 18% of all PEWS alerts (n=13) was 'continue to monitor'; 12/13 were for children with an earlier PEWS review/intervention 85% (n=30) with PEWS ≥3 improved within 24h following initial rapid medical review/interventions Low (0.3%) incidence of ICU level care (n=5); emergency resuscitations or unpredicted ICU referrals 3 children electively transferred to ICU for a higher level of care & 2 children received ICU-level monitoring and non-invasive respiratory support on the children's ward Presence of experienced senior clinicians (registrars/consultants) at PEWS-triggered review was 82% of all PEWS reviews	3 Non-analytic, case review Prospective, descriptive, cohort, chart review/audit 18 month period
Edwards et al. (2009) [24]	Paediatric wards at University Hospital of Wales (UK)	Develop & evaluate predictability of PEWS (C&VPEWS)	Cohort Prospective	n=1000 patients 9075 observation sets	Cardiff &Vale PEWS (C&VPEWS)	As a single parameter: for threshold score of 1: 89.0% sensitivity, 63.9% specificity, 2.2% PPV, 99.8% NPV, AUROC 0.86 As a multiple parameter: 69.5% sensitivity, 89.9% specificity, 5.9% PPV, 99.7% NPV Tool is sensitive but not specific with low PPV (positive predictive value) - high number of false positives	2+ Well-conducted cohort study Prospective, to test predictability of PEW system, all children admitted in a time period were eligible to participate, data collected on 1,000 children; follow-up across admission

12

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes/findings	Level of evidence & rationale for judgement
Edwards et al. (2011) [25]	Paediatric wards at University Hospital of Wales (UK)	Test predictability of MAC of medical emergency team (MET)	Cohort Prospective	n=1000 patients 9075 observation sets Data set from Edwards et al. (2009)	Melbourne criteria for activation (MAC) of MET (as described by Tibballs & Kinney)	MAC as single parameter: 68.3% sensitivity, 83.2% specificity, 3.6% PPV, 99.7% NPV, AUROC 0.79 Criteria had reasonable sensitivity but at cost of low specificity and low PPV which could result in high number of false positive triggers	2+ Well-conducted cohort study Prospective, to test predictability of activation system, all admissions to paediatric wards over 12 month period
Egdell et al. (2008) [26]	James Cook University Hospital, Middlesbrough (UK)	Design & validate physiology-based scoring system for assessment of children attending emergency department (ED)	Case control Retrospective	Case: (n=46) children admitted directly from ED to PICU Control: (n=49) children admitted from ED to paediatric ward	Paediatric Advanced Warning Score (PAWS) Chart	PAWS score could discriminate between cases and controls, with AUROC curve of 0.86 (p<0.0001) At threshold trigger score of 3, PAWS able to identify children requiring admission to PICU with sensitivity 70% & specificity 90%	2- High risk of confounding or bias Retrospective, pilot, 50 consecutive control patients
Fenix et al. (2015) [27]	Large tertiary children's hospital, Washington (USA)	Compare a prospectively validated PEWS to physician opinion in identifying patients at risk of deterioration	Chart Review Retrospective	All patient non-electively transferred to PICU	PEWS (modified Brighton)	97 patients non-elective transfer to ICU (also eligible for placement on SSO (assignment to institutional senior sign-out) lists before PICU transfer) – 51 experienced deteriorating events Patients experiencing a deterioration event in 12h after ICU transfer had max mean PEWS of 3.9 before PICU transfer compared with max mean PEWS of 2.9 in patients not experiencing a deterioration event (p = .01) Patients experiencing deterioration within 12 hours of PICU transfer were assigned to SSO lists 43% of the time, whereas patients without a deterioration event were assigned to SSO lists 30% of the time; this difference not statistically significant (p = .2) PEWS was significantly associated with ICU deterioration whereas physician opinion was not	3 Non-analytic, case review Retrospective, descriptive, chart review, single center, limited sample size, limited time period (9months)
Fuijkschot et al. (2015) [28]	Radboudumc Amalia Children's Hospital (Netherlands)	Design & implementation of a PEWS system	Cohort 1: Retrospective case review Cohort 2: Retrospective case review Cohort 3: Prospective cohort study	Case cohort 1: All patients admitted to 20 bed oncology ward over 3 month period Focus was clinical condition of patients with high scores (>8) Case cohort 2: Patients whose clinical course during admission	Modified Bedside PEWS	Case cohort 1: PEWS≥8 scored 56 times in 15/118 admissions (13%); specificity 88% (taking unplanned PICU admission as end point); sensitivity calculated as 100% (however this parameter is not reliable as only one unplanned PICU admission); n=15 (27%) false-positive scores; PPV 0.73. Case cohort 2: Of 24 patients, 16 scored PEWS of ≥8 at 2–6h pre PICU admission. Sensitivity 0.67 (threshold score ≥8 endpoint 2-6h pre unplanned PICU admission) Case cohort 3: 17 cases received emergency	2+ Well-conducted case/cohort study Three case/cohort studies, appropriate sample and follow-up duration – two described as retrospective, one prospective

13

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes/findings	Level of evidence & rationale for judgement
				(general ward) had deteriorated (i.e. cardiopulmonary arrest & unplanned PICU admission) Case cohort 3: All patients receiving emergency medical interventions		medical interventions); median PEWS 10 (range 8–15) at time of intervention; threshold score 8, no falsely negative scores detected (high sensitivity)	
Gold et al. (2014) [29]	Nationwide Children's Hospital, Ohio (USA)	Explore if PEWS assigned in ED predicts need for ICU admission or clinical deterioration in admitted patients	Chart Review Prospective	Patients presenting to ED at time of study 2 outcome groups Patients admitted to ICU (initially from the ED or subsequently from the floor) Patients admitted to the floor (with no ICU transfer)	Monaghan PEWS *P0* PEWS at initial assessment *P1* PEWS at time of admission	12,306 consecutively admitted patients, with 98.9% having a PEWS documented PEWS scores higher for patients in ICU group (P02.8& P13.2, p < 0.0001) vs floor (P00.7& P10.5, p < 0.0001) To predict need for ICU admission, optimal cut-off points on ROC are P0 =1 & P1 =2, with AUROC 0.79 & 0.86 respectively For every unit increase in P0 & P1, the odds of admission to ICU were 1.9 times greater (p < 0.0001) & 2.9 times greater (p < 0.0001) than to the floor	3 Non-analytic, case review Prospective, 12-month study period
Haines et al. (2006) [10]	Bristol Royal Hospital for Children (UK)	Develop & evaluate clinical & physiological tool for identifying acutely ill children in hospital ward areas	Cohort Prospective	Case: Children (*n* = 360) who triggered tool over a 6-month period Control: (*n* = 180) 5 random bed space numbers generated on each day of data collection	Bristol PEWS	Of case (n=360) patients 73 (20%) required paediatric intensive or high dependency care. All fulfilled trigger criteria thus tool 100% sensitive for identification of patients requiring HDU/PICU; 63% specificity Modified tool (post research): 99% sensitivity & 66% specificity	2- High risk of confounding or bias Prospective, with a random control sample on day of data collection. Sample generated by nurse identification of previous high-dependency nursing needs
Holme et al. (2013) [30]	Neonatal Unit Whittington Health (UK)	Design & validation of objective clinical scoring system to identify unwell neonates	Case cohort Retrospective	Group 1: n=193 (classed as 'unwell') All neonates born in study period admitted to NICU from labour or postnatal wards Group 2: n= 292 (classed as 'well') Neonates born	Neonatal Trigger Score (NTS)	AUROC 0.924 threshold score ≥2 predicting need for admission to NICU 79.3% sensitivity & 93.5% specificity; mean NTS significantly higher for neonates in group 1 (2.8 vs 0.35, p<.001) NTS out-performed PEWS, with significantly better sensitivity, particularly in neonates who deteriorated within the first 12 hours after birth (P <.001) or in neonates with sepsis or respiratory symptoms (P <.001).	2+ Well-conducted case cohort study Retrospective, 2 groups - 1 classed as 'unwell' and 1 class as 'well'

14

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes/findings	Level of evidence & rationale for judgement
				during same study period not admitted to NICU			
Kaul et al. (2014) [31]	Children's Hospital of Wisconsin (USA)	Determine if Bedside PEWS impacts on nurses ability to identify patients' at risk of CPA & enables nurses to share assessments & effectively manage deteriorating patients'	Cross-sectional survey	2 acute care medical units (1 with, & 1 without, Bedside PEWS) n=35 nurses (RR 46%) n=17 physicians (RR 81%)	Bedside PEWS	Nurses using Bedside PEWS significantly more likely to recognize risk for deterioration ($p < .04$) & significantly greater ability to initiate escalation of care when a patient was at risk for deterioration ($p < .01$) Physicians on the Bedside PEWS unit significantly more likely to indicate nurses able to effectively communicate concerns about deterioration in patient status ($p < .05$)	4 Expert opinion Electronic descriptive cross-section survey; small sample; one centre; self-report data
Mandell et al. (2015) [32]	Children's Hospital Los Angeles, CA (USA)	Evaluate association between PEWS at PICU discharge & 1st PEWS on paediatric ward with risk of early unplanned PICU readmission	Case-control Retrospective	Cases: 38 children readmitted to PICU within 48 hours after transfer to paediatric ward Control: 151 age-matched controls (not readmitted to PICU within 48 hours after transfer to paediatric ward)	PEWS (modified version of Brighton tool)	PEWS score pre PICU discharge higher for readmitted vs non-readmitted children p = .0003 First PEWS score on paediatric ward higher for readmitted vs non-readmitted children p<.0001 Higher PEWS scores pre PICU discharge & on paediatric ward associated with increased risk of PICU readmission p=.001 & p<.001 respectively No threshold score had adequate sensitivity and specificity to definitively identify children requiring PICU readmission within 48 hours of discharge	2+ Well-conducted case control study Age matched controls, retrospective, 38 cases/151 controls, controls randomly chosen by computer 1 case/3 control
McLellan et al. (2013) [3]	Boston Children's Hospital (USA)	Validation of Cardiac Children's Hospital Early Warning Score (C-CHEWS) tool and its related three-tiered algorithm	Cohort Retrospective	*Case:* All patients on inpatient cardiac unit experiencing a CPA or unplanned ICU transfer (n = 64 with 10 arrests, 54 transfers) *Comparison:* 248 patients admitted to inpatient cardiac unit that did not experience CPA or unplanned ICU transfer	C-CHEWS tool Comparison: Paediatric Early Warning Score (Monaghan 2005; Tucker et al 2008)	For threshold score ≥3, PEWS sensitivity 54.7% vs 95.3% C-CHEWS; PEWS specificity 86.3% vs 76.2% C-CHEWS; PPV for PEWS 50.7% vs C-CHEWS 50.8%; NPV for PEWS 88.1% vs C-CHEWS 98.4% For threshold score ≥ 5, PEWS sensitivity 23.4% vs 67.2% C-CHEWS; PEWS specificity 97.6% vs 93.6% C-CHEWS; PPV for PEWS 71.4% vs C-CHEWS 72.9%; NPV or PEWS 83.2% vs C-CHEWS 91.7% C-CHEWS higher AUROC (0.917) compared with PEWS (0.785) (p < .001) Lead-time: for cut point ≥ 3, median for C-CHEWS 9.25h vs 2.25h for PEWS & for cut point ≥ 5, C-CHEWS median approx. 2h vs PEWS of 0h	2+ Well-conducted cohort study Retrospective, a specific high risk population, convenient comparison group

15

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes/findings	Level of evidence & rationale for judgement
						C-CHEWS achieved statistically significant higher discrimination than PEWS in identifying cardiovascular patients who may experience an arrest or ICU transfer	
Miranda et al. (2016) [33]	Federal University of Bahia, Salvador, Brazil (South America)	Review literature on use of Brighton PEWS as an instrument to identify signs of clinical deterioration in hospitalised children & possibilities of its application in a Brazilian context	Review	Included 11 research papers (using the Brighton PEWS)	Brighton PEWS	The Brighton PEWS was used, in most studies, as a tool to measure warning signs of clinical deterioration in hospitalized children

Although some studies show limitations, the Brighton PEWS proved to be easy to apply & user-friendly & was regarded as low complexity, short time & wider feasibility of application, since its use is quick & monitoring equipment is not required;

The Brighton PEWS may be regarded as a scoring option to be used in Brazil | 2+ Integrative review of 11 studies specifically focused on the validity & reliability of 1 PEWS; 2 databases searched with limited search terms; quality assessment not reported; results reported narratively/descriptively on non-controlled non-randomised studies; included English, Portuguese & Spanish language |
| **Monaghan (2005) [34]** | Royal Alexandra Children's Hospital Brighton (UK) | Development of a PEWS to detect children at risk of deterioration | Chart review

Retrospective | n=30 patients scored 4 on PEWS | Brighton PEWS | 96% of patients seen within 15min of applying the Brighton PEWS
83% of patients improved following intervention
17% of patients deteriorated requiring PICU admission | 3 Non-analytic, case review Descriptive pilot (of PEWS for 3 month period), followed by patient audit – retrospective |
| **Murray et al. (2015) [35]** | Boston Children's Hospital (USA) | Explore literature about the use of early warning system scores with paediatric patients | Review | Included 28 publications; 13 data/research based, 10 clinical practice articles & 5 conference abstracts | PEWS | Greater psychometric testing of tools is needed before any recommendations can be made regarding extensive implementation with paediatric population | 2+ Integrative review of 28 publications of which 13 were research based and the remainder grey literature; search terms and databases outlined and acknowledged that due to limited search terms publications may have been missed; quality appraisal included ranking level of evidence; narrative/descriptive presentation of findings |
| **Nielsen et al. (2015) [36]** | Seattle Children's Hospital (USA) | Determine association between MPEWS in the emergency department (ED) and inpatient ward-to-PICU transfer within 24 hours of admission | Case-control

Retrospective | Cases: 50 children transferred to PICU within 24 hours

Controls: 575 children remaining hospitalised on inpatient ward | Modified paediatric EWS (MPEWS) (modified from Duncan) | Children with MPEWS > 7 in ED more likely to experience ward-to-PICU transfer; sensitivity 18%, specificity 97.4%, AUROC 0.691 (using this threshold would have led to 167 unnecessary PICU admissions & identified only 9/50 patients requiring PICU care) | 2+ Well-conducted case control study Retrospective, control-case ratio 5:1, 18-month study period |
| **Niu et al. (2016) [37]** | Children's Hospital of Michigan, Detroit (USA) | Assess feasibility & reliability of PEW scores in paediatric | Feasibility & reliability testing study | Emergency department patients aged 18 years or younger | Modified PEWS (from Skaletzky et al. who modified Brighton PEWS) | PEW scores demonstrated high inter-rater reliability (intra-class correlation coefficient = 0.91) and intra-rater reliability (intra-class correlation coefficient = 0.90) | 3 Non-analytic, case review Descriptive prospective reporting of feasibility and reliability testing in a small sample in one |

16

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes/findings	Level of evidence & rationale for judgement
		emergency department setting	Prospective	n=56 ED nurses			emergency department
Parshuram at al. (2009) [38]	Hospital for Sick Children Toronto (Canada)	Develop & validate a simple bedside score to quantify severity of illness in hospitalized children	Case control Prospective	Case: (n=60) patients admitted urgently to PICU from inpatient ward (not following a 'code-blue' call) Control: (n=120) patients admitted to inpatient ward (not PICU, NICU, OPD, ED) (no 'code-blue' call & not admitted to PICU)	Bedside PEWS score	AUROC 0.91; sensitivity 82%; specificity 93% at threshold score 8 Score increased over 24h pre-urgent PICU admission ($P < 0.0001$) & score higher in patients admitted to ICU ($P < 0.0001$) Bedside PEWS Score can differentiate sick patients & identify >80% of patients with at least 1h notice before urgent ICU admission	2+ Well-conducted case control study Prospective, frequency matched case control design (+ retrospective survey interview), risk recall bias, data abstraction not verified
Parshuram et al. (2011a) [39]	4 participating hospitals - Montreal, Edmonton, Toronto & Birmingham (Canada & UK)	Evaluate performance of Bedside PEWS score in large population at multiple hospitals	Case control Prospective Multicentre	4 hospitals Case: (n= 686) patients experiencing a clinical deterioration event resulting in immediate resuscitation team call or urgent ICU admission Control: (n=1388) patients cared for in an inpatient unit without resuscitation team call or urgent ICU admission	Bedside PEWS scoring system	Threshold 7, sensitivity 64% & specificity 91% Threshold 8, sensitivity 57% & specificity 94% AUROC 0.87 with scores maintained across age groups, diagnoses and hospitals After inclusion of data from the hour immediately before near or actual CPA, AUROC increased from 0.87 to 0.88	2++ High quality case control study. Large multi-centre international, prospective, 1:2 frequency matched case control design (acc. to clusters of similar inpatient units and stratified patient age categorises), clinical data abstraction + nurse interview/recall of observations (+ retrospective survey global rating); missing data was a limiting factor
Parshuram et al. (2011b) [40]	Community hospital (Canada)	Evaluate effect of implementation of Bedside PEWS in 22-bed community paediatric hospital	Before-and-after Prospective	1274 patient admissions Care provided for 842 patient-days before & 2350 patient-days after implementation	Bedside PEWS	Reduction from 2.4 to 0.43 significant clinical deterioration events per 1000 patient-days (P=0.013) Fewer stat calls to respiratory therapists per 1000 patient-days (9.5 vs 3.4; P<0.0001) & to paediatricians per 1000 patient-days (22.6 vs 5.1; P<0.0001) Increase in overall number of transfers per 1000 patient-days (5.9 vs 8.1; P=0.041)	2- High risk of confounding or bias No control group, prospective, 9-month period, small number of events, self-report subjective responses
Parashuram et al. (2015) [41]	Hospital for Sick Children Toronto (Canada)	Evaluate impact of Bedside PEWS on early identification of	Protocol (for 22 hospital cluster randomised	Randomization unit is participating hospitals with a PICU	Bedside PEWS vs standard care (no severity of illness score)	Primary outcome: all-cause hospital mortality Secondary outcomes: (i) clinical outcomes: clinical deterioration, severity of illness at and during ICU	NA

17

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes/findings	Level of evidence & rationale for judgement
		children at risk for near and actual CPA, hospital mortality, processes of care & ICU resource utilization	trial) EPOCH (evaluating processes & outcomes of children in hospital)	Eligible inpatient wards providing care to children other than NICU, PICU, operating rooms & other areas where anaesthetist-supervised procedures are performed Eligible patients >37 weeks gestational age & <18 years	Bedside PEWS 4 elements: Bedside PEW score, Bedside PEW documentation record, score-matched care recommendations & education program	admission & potentially preventable cardiac arrest; (ii) processes of care outcomes: immediate calls for assistance, hospital and ICU readmission & perceptions of healthcare professionals; (iii) resource utilization: ICU days and use of ICU therapies	
Rahman et al. (2016) [42]	New York-Presbyterian/Weill Cornell Medical Center (USA)	Investigation of the external validity of Burn PEWS	Chart review Retrospective	All patients aged 0-15.9 years admitted to the burn center for ≥3 days for treatment of a burn injury, inhalation injury, or toxic epidermal necrolysis syndrome n=50 charts	NewYork-Presbyterian/Weill Cornell Medical Center burn center pediatric early warning score (PEWS) - modified a general PEWS system to a burn specific PEWS	1612 PEWS from 1745 opportunities documented (92.4%); mean overall PEWS 0.9 ± 1.2 (0–10) From 1612 scores, PEWS were elevated greater than 0 for a total of 912 events (56.6%); mean elevated PEWS value greater than 0 was 1.61 ± 1.23 (1–10); parameters most frequently elevated were intake (95.6%) and output (7.9%) 129 PEWS increases (79.6%) were followed by an intervention that most commonly included text notation of score increase (93.7%), physician/physician assistant notification (70.5%), and feeding-tube insertion (25.6%)	3 Non-analytic, case review Retrospective, cohort small sample, single site, 12 month period
Robson et al. (2013) [2]	Children's Hospital in California (USA)	Validate & compare sensitivity & specificity of 3 previously validated PEW scoring systems in predicting acute care patients at risk for impending or actual CPA	Case control Retrospective	Cases: n=96 triggered EMRT call due to critical illness with impending or actual CPA Controls: n=96 selected from internal database; matched to cases	Comparison of 3 PEWS PEW Tool (Haines); Bedside PEW System Score (Parshuram); PEW System Score (Duncan)	PEW Tool: PEWS ≥1sensitivity 76.3%, specificity 61.5%, AUROC 0.75 Bedside PEW System Score: PEWS ≥7 sensitivity 56.3%, specificity 78.1%, AUROC 0.73 PEW System Score: PEWS ≥5 sensitivity 86.6%, specificity 72.2%; demonstrated significantly greater accuracy (p<0.05) with AUROC of 0.85	2+ Well-conducted case control Matched case control, on age, diagnosis and gender; retrospective
Roland et al. (2010) [43]	Neonatal Unit, Derriford hospital, Plymouth (UK)	Describes development, and assessment of effectiveness, of a Newborn Early Warning (NEW) system	Chart reviews x 2 Retrospective x 1 Prospective x 1	Retrospective Term infants > 2.5kg presenting to neonatal unit from either postnatal wards or transition care ward	Newborn Early Warning (NEW) System	Retrospective 122 term infants, 51% fulfilled ARNI criteria (84% were correctly identified as such) Only 48% (25/52) of infants recognised as ARNI had observations recorded, but half would have been reviewed earlier (13/25) by a neonatal doctor or nurse practitioner if their observations had been charted on the NEW chart	3 Non-analytic, case reviews 2 chart review audits, 1 retrospective and 1 prospective (+ qualitative survey)

18

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes/findings	Level of evidence & rationale for judgement
				Prospective 117 at risk newborn infants (ARNI) - 84 charts available for review (71.2%).		Prospective Increase in retrievable observations to 72% NEW chart threshold criteria prompted management decisions in 9 (47.3%) of 19 infants who required intervention	
Roland et al. (2014) [44]	Paediatric Emergency Medicine Leicester Academic (PEMLA) Group, University of Leicester (UK)	Determine use of PEWS & RRT in paediatric units in Great Britain	Cross sectional survey	All hospitals with inpatient paediatric services in GB (n=157) 126 hospitals classified as district general hospital (DGH) & 31 tertiary children's hospitals		85% of units using PEWS & 18% had RRT (in 2005 <25% of UK hospitals used PEWS) Tertiary units more likely than district to have PEWS 90% vs 83%, & RRT 52% vs 10%. Large no. of PEWS in use, majority unpublished & invalidated systems; respiratory and heart rates most common criterion used in PEWS with > 50% of respondents using these and oxygen saturations, abnormal consciousness and effort of breathing Implementation of PEWS inconsistent with large variation in the PEWS used, activation criteria used, availability of RRT & membership of RRT	4 Expert opinion Electronic survey based on 2005 PEWS survey (+ follow up telephone survey for non-responders) of identified hospitals providing inpatient paediatric services in Great Britain, self-report data
Sefton et al. (2015) [45]	Alder Hey Children's NHS Foundation Trust (UK)	Explore how introducing PEWS at a tertiary children's hospital affects emergency admissions to PICU	Before and after Prospective	In-house cohort of emergency admissions to PICU External cohort of emergency admissions transferred to PICU from wards at District General Hospitals (without PEWs in place) 958 unplanned PICU admissions over 2 years reviewed (1 year before and 1 year after PEWS)	Modified Bristol PEW	In-house cohort Median Paediatric Index of Mortality (PIM2) reduced from 0.60 to 0.44 ($p < 0.001$) Fewer admissions required invasive ventilation 62% vs75% ($p = 0.015$) for a shorter median duration, dropping from 4 to 2 days Median length of PICU stay reduced from 5 to 3 days ($p = 0.002$) Non-significant reduction in mortality ($p = 0.47$) External cohort No comparable improvements in outcomes Impact on service delivery 39% overall reduction in total number of bed days used for emergency PICU admissions which resulted in reduced cancellation of major elective surgical cases by 90% & 79% reduction in number of refused regional PICU referrals	2- High risk of confounding or bias Cohort, prospective, before 12 month period and after 12 month period, 'in-house' cohort emergency admissions to PICU, comparative group 'external' admissions transferred from DGH (without PEWS)

19

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes/findings	Level of evidence & rationale for judgement
Seiger et al. (2013) [46]	Erasmus MC - Sophia Children's Hospital, Rotterdam, (Netherlands)	Compare validity of 10 different PEWS to predict ICU admission or hospitalization in large population of children visiting a paediatric emergency department (ED)	Cohort Prospective	n= 17,943 ED patients; 16% (n=2828) admitted to hospital and 2% (n=373) admitted to ICU or died in ED	10 different PEWS (Monaghan; Akre; Skaletzky; Duncan; Parshuram; Egdell; Tibballs; Edwards; Haines; Brilli)	For ICU admission range for the 10 PEWS: sensitivity 61.3-94.4% & specificity 25.2-86.7% For hospitalization range for the 10 PEWS: sensitivity 36.4-85.7% & specificity 27.1-90.5% Discriminative ability of PEWS (AUROC) moderate-to-good for ICU admission (range: 0.60-0.82); poor-to-moderate for admission to the hospital (range: 0.56-0.68). None of PEWS showed both high sensitivity & specificity	2+ Well-conducted cohort study Prospective collected data during triage assessments, all admissions to ED, 10 different PEWS evaluated
Sinitsky & Reece (2016) [47]	Royal Free London NHS Foundation Trust & West Hertfordshire Hospitals NHS Trust (UK)	In paediatric patients can a PEW trigger or scoring system predict serious clinical deterioration?	Review	Included one systematic review & 12 research papers validating PEWS in paediatric inpatient settings	PEWS	No evidence to recommend the use of any one specific PEWS in paediatric inpatient settings No PEWS yet validated in large multi-centre RCT; although results are awaited from 1st international cluster RCT for Bedside PEWS (EPOCH study)	2- Commentary review of validation of PEWS; unsure risk of bias Search terms delineated, search restricted to specific databases & limited reporting of methodology (i.e. selection & screening process, quality assessment, data synthesis etc.) underpinning the review
Skaletzky et al. (2012) [48]	Miami Children's Hospital (USA)	Validate modified version of Brighton PEWS tool for assessment of at-risk children in less acute care hospital areas	Case control Retrospective	Case: (n=100) all patients admitted to medical–surgical wards & transferred to PICU Controls: (n=250) patients admitted to medical–surgical wards but not transferred to the PICU	Modified Brighton PEWS score	Max PEWS score significantly higher p < .0001 for cases; AUROC 0.81; sensitivity & specificity of PEWS score 2.5 for transfer to higher level of care was 62% & 89%, respectively	2+ Well-conducted case control study Retrospective, 1:3 matching controls for each case, matched for age, ward of admission, month of admission, admitting diagnosis
Solevag et al. (2013) [49]	Akershus University Hospital (Norway)	Assess correlation of modified version of Brighton PEWS with other indictors of severe illness/patient characteristics	Chart review Retrospective	n=761 patients (PEWS forms collected)	Modified and translated version of Brighton PEWS	16.2% patients PEWS ≥ 3 & 83.8% PEWS ≤ 2 Transfer to higher level of care was significantly (p = 0.04) more frequent among patients with PEWS ≥3 (4.9%) as compared to PEWS 0-2 (1.4%) Patients with PEWS ≥3 had a higher proportion of admissions compared to patients with PEWS 0-2 Children with PEWS ≥3 received fluid resuscitation, oxygen supplementation & IV antibiotics significantly more often than those with PEWS 0-2	3 Non-analytic, case review Quality improvement project, retrospective data (3 month period – 761 PEWS forms)
Tucker et al.	Cincinnati	Evaluate use of	Chart review	n=2979; all patients	Adapted Brighton	n=51 transferred to PICU (1.8%); PEWS	3 Non-analytic, case review

20

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes/findings	Level of evidence & rationale for judgement
(2009) [6]	Children's Hospital (USA)	PEWS for detecting clinical deterioration among hospitalised children	Prospective	admitted to a medical unit	PEWS tool	discriminated between children who required transfer to PICU (AUCROC = 0.89, p< .001) For PEWS of 3 (lowest score requiring additional intervention) sensitivity 90.2%, specificity 74.4%, PPV 5.8%, NPV 99.8%. For PEWS of 9, sensitivity 7.8%, specificity 99.9%, PPV 80%, NPV 98.4% Inter-rater reliability high (intra-class correlation coefficient = 0.92, p<.001)	Prospective, descriptive, all patients admitted to one unit over 12 month period, data recorded by charge nurse using localised tool
Tume (2007) [50]	Large specialist children's hospital based in North West of England (UK)	Examine extent of inpatient deterioration & critical care unit admission	Chart review Prospective	n=341 children admitted to PICU (65 children (19%) were unplanned admissions from wards); 346 children admitted to HDU, 16% (n = 52) unplanned admissions from wards	Bristol Children's PEWS Melbourne Activation Criteria (MAC)	121 children required unplanned HDU or ICU admission; mostly (55%) for respiratory distress (predominantly (59%) occurred out of office hours) When matched, 88% (n = 29) of ICU-admitted children would have triggered the Bristol PEW tool & 88% (n = 29) would have also triggered MAC 83% (n =27) of HDU admitted patients would have triggered the Bristol Children's tool & 89% (n = 28) would have also triggered MAC	3 Non-analytic, case review Prospective audit, 4 month period, descriptive analysis, child physiological data retrospectively matched against two PEW tools
Zhai et al. (2014) [51]	Cincinnati Children's Hospital (USA)	Develop & evaluate performance of an EHR-based automated algorithm to predict need for PICU transfer & compare effectiveness of this new algorithm with 2 published PEWS	Case control Retrospective	Cases: n=526 patients admitted to PICU within 24 hours of admission Control: n=6772 patients never transferred to PICU	EHR-based automated prediction algorithm for PICU transfer Comparison: Monaghan PEWS tool & Bedside PEWS	Algorithm achieved 0.849 sensitivity, 0.859 specificity & 0.912 AUC; the algorithm's AUC was significantly higher by 11.8 and 22.6%, than two published PEWS Bedside PEWS (sensitivity 0.736, specificity 0.717, AUC 0.816) & Monaghan's PEWS (sensitivity 0.684, specificity 0.816, AUC 0.744)	2- High risk of confounding or bias Retrospective, to test algorithm

21

Table 2: Characteristics of included studies: PEWS response mechanisms (n=30)

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes	Level of evidence and rationale for judgement
Avent et al. (2010) [52]	St Jude's Children's Research Hospital, Memphis Tennessee (USA)	Describe successful use of RRT in management of a severely septic patient	Case report	Outpatient clinic 1 patient	Paediatric Rapid Response Team	When used in OPD RRT facilitated efficient faster patient transfer to higher level of care - case patient transferred to ICU within 40 minutes of RRT activation. RRT managed 16 patients in outpatient clinics; 10 resulted in patient transfers to ICU; cardiovascular instability accounted for 63% of RRT calls; average length of stay for 10 patients transferred to ICU was 1.5 days; none of patient required mechanical ventilation	3 Non-analytic, case report. Case report on one patient case presenting to outpatient department
Bonafide et al. (2014a) [53]	Children's Hospital of Philadelphia (USA)	Evaluate impact of paediatric RRS implementation on critical deterioration	Interrupted time series. Retrospective	1810 unplanned transfers from medical/surgical wards to PICU/NICU	Hospital-wide RRS inclusive of MET and an early warning score	Absolute reductions in ward cardiac arrests (from 0.03 to 0.01 per 1000 non–intensive care patient-days) and deaths during ward emergencies (from 0.01 to 0.00 per 1000 non–intensive care patient-days), but these were not statistically significant (p =0.21 and p =0.99, respectively). Among all unplanned transfers, critical deterioration was associated with a 4.97-fold increased risk of death (p < .001)	2- High risk of non-causal relationships. Retrospective, historical records, potential exposure to unmeasured confounding
Bonafide et al. (2012) [54]	Children's Hospital of Philadelphia (USA)	Develop a valid pragmatic measure for evaluating & optimizing RRSs over shorter periods of time	Cohort. Retrospective.	724 medical emergency team (MET) & 56 code-blue team (CBT) activations	Rapid Response System including an early warning score & a MET	Critical deterioration (1.52 per 1000 non-ICU patient-days) >8 times more frequent than CHCA (Child Health Corporation of America) metric & associated with >13-fold increased risk of death among patients who received treatment from MET & CBT. Critical deterioration metric sensitivity 76.0%; specificity 83.1%; PPV 16.7%; NPV 98.7%; relative risk of death 13.1 (95% CI:5.4–32.1) vs CHCA metric sensitivity 20.0%; specificity 98.8% ; PPV 41.7%; NPV 96.5%; relative risk of death 12.0 (95% CI:5.4–26.6)	2- High risk of confounding or bias. Retrospective, review of MET activations, chart and unit review
Brilli et al. (2007) [55]	Free standing children's hospital (USA)	Implement & evaluate effectiveness of MET & develop a 'trigger tool' (like PEWS)	Chart review. Retrospective	Hospital medical records 44 patients who had CRA (cardiac respiratory arrest)	Medical Emergency Team (MET)	Code rate (respiratory + cardiopulmonary arrests) post-MET 0.11 per 1,000 patient days compared with baseline 0.27 (p=.03). For codes outside ICU, pre-MET mortality rate 0.12 per 1,000 days compared with 0.06 post-MET (p =.13); overall mortality rate for outside ICU codes 42%	3 Non-analytic, case reviews. Described as a performance improvement project, pre-post chart review + a staff performance assessment survey

22

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes	Level of evidence and rationale for judgement
Chan et al. (2010) [56]	Dept. of Internal Medicine, Mid America Heart Institute at St Luke's Hospital, University of Missouri–Kansas City (USA)	Assess effect of RRT implementation in reducing rates of CPA & hospital mortality; examine cumulative temporal trend on outcomes of RRTs & evaluate degree to which mortality reductions are explained by lower rates of CPA	Review	17 articles identified\n\n5 child specific studies	Rapid Response Team (RRT)	37.7% reduction in rates of CPA outside ICU & 21.4% reduction in hospital mortality rates (pooled analysis); however this pooled mortality estimate in children was not robust to sensitivity analyses\n\nAlthough RRTs have broad appeal, robust evidence to support their effectiveness in reducing hospital mortality is lacking	2++ High quality systematic review of observational/quasi-experimental studies Search strategy detailed, 5 child specific studies of varying quality; all before/after studies with one time series study; results analysed at study not patient-level data; meta-analysis limited by extensive heterogeneity in reported outcomes and variation in research designs
Chen et al. (2014) [57]	Adult and children's hospitals with PICUs (USA)	Determine prevalence, characteristics & opinions of RRTs in hospitals with PICUs	Cross sectional survey	Survey sent to 210 US hospitals, 130 included - 103 completed by PICU medical directors Response rate 64%	Rapid Response Teams	103 (79%) had an RRT (most implemented in last 5 years); all available 7 days a week, 24 hours a day.\n80% of institutions had RRT separate from cardiopulmonary resuscitation team\nFamily activations present in 69% of hospitals\nComposition: median of 3 members composed of physicians in 77%; nurses in 100% and respiratory therapists in 89% of institutions\nRespondents with RRTs more likely to agree RRTs improve patient safety than respondents from institutions without RRTS (76% vs 52%) & more likely to disagree that RRTs are not worth the money invested (82% vs 63%)	4 Expert opinion Surveys (designed by investigators & piloted) distributed online and via mail, targeted selected US hospitals with PICU only, surveyed PICU physicians – data self-reported practices and beliefs, potential for non-response bias
Dean et al. (2008) [58]	Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh of the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center (USA)	Develop paediatric patient safety program to give families a voice in their child's medical care	Quality Improvement Initiative	42 calls from patients/parents to Condition HELP team over 24 month study period	Condition Help Call	Main reason for each call - communication breakdown between patient/parents & clinical staff (physician/nurse)	4 Expert opinion Descriptive account of 2 year analysis of Condition Help
Hanson et al. (2010) [59]	North Carolina (USA)	Determine effects of multifaceted paediatric RRS on duration of predefined clinical instability &	Interrupted time series\n\nRetrospective	All patients in the hospital during the study period	Paediatric Rapid Response Team (PRRT)	Increase in mean time interval between cardiac arrests from 2512 to 9418 patient days\nMedian duration of clinical instability decreased from 9h 55min to 4h 15min in unplanned PICU admissions (p=0.028)	2- High risk of non-causal relationships Retrospective (+ chart review); potential exposure to

23

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes	Level of evidence and rationale for judgement
		subsequent rate of cardiac arrests				Ward cardiac arrest rate/1000 ward admissions 1.27 before & 0.45 after PRRS (p=0.126) Ward death rate/1000 ward admissions 1.5 before & 0.45 after PRRS (p=0.070)	unmeasured confounding
Haque et al. (2010) [60]	Aga Khan tertiary care University Hospital (Pakistan)	Report before & after implementation of a PRRT in paediatric wards to determine effect & outcome of the intervention	Chart review Retrospective	All paediatric admissions pre & post intervention	Paediatric rapid response team (RRT)	Code rate per 1000 admissions outside the PICU decreased from 5.2 to 2.7 (p=0.004) Mortality rate of patients admitted in PICU from wards decreased from 50% to 15% (p=0.001)	3 Non-analytic case review Audit, retrospective data, before and after, 9 month post-implementation period, all children admitted, data form completed by RRT and later collected by one investigator for review
Heath et al. (2016) [61]	Birmingham Children's Hospital (UK)	Development, and pilot of, a tool to support parents in communicating & escalating concerns about their child's clinical condition when in hospital	Quality improvement initiative	51 parents & 49 staff completed evaluation questionnaire	'Listening to You' communication bundle (poster, booklets, planning care together sheet) for parents and staff	Implementation 24/51 parents reported seeing the poster & 20/51 the booklet; only 3 parents reported using these resources; reasons for non-usage were-lack of awareness or lack of need 38/49 staff reported being aware of the project & 4 reported been involved in parent-initiated discussions using the resources User feedback Of the 3 parents who used the 'Listening to You' resources, 2 felt the materials led to increased confidence in raising concerns & having them listened to Of the staff who had seen or used the staff resources, approximately half reported they were easy to use, gave them confidence to elicit & discuss parental concerns & helped with parent-professional communication Incidents and complaints Prior to implementation of 'Listening to You', two SIRIs relating to staff not listening to parent concerns were recorded. No incidents or complaints had been reported at the end of the pilot.	4 Expert opinion Outlines local quality improvement initiative including a purposive national survey of current practice (31 wards 14 hospitals contacted over 1 month period via telephone/email), a literature review (30 papers mainly adult focused), semi-structured interviews (10 parents, 14 health professionals); describes intervention development & local user feedback

24

1
2
3
4

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes	Level of evidence and rationale for judgement
						PEW Scores (parental concerns box) On two cardiac wards reviewed, 81% of parental/nurse concern boxes were completed & of the completed boxes, 4% had documented a parental concern	
Hueckel et al. (2012) [62]	Duke University Hospital - Children's Health Center (USA)	Increase nursing & family awareness about Condition H	Quality improvement initiative	PBMTU n=38 families eligible for teaching Those who received teaching ranged from 64-90% monthly with mean of 80% n=32 eligible to complete survey on family understanding Intermediate ward n=159 patients admitted during study period; n=107 families received Condition H teaching – weekly range 53% - 85% (mean 68%)	Condition Help .	PBMTU 88% completed survey – all indicated they had heard about Condition H and could provide reason for calling Condition H; only 1 family needed additional instruction on how to call Condition H Intermediate ward n=81 (81%) participated - all but 2 families (98%) heard about Condition H; 64 (74%) could describe reason for calling Condition H and 66 (76%) answered correctly when asked how to call a Condition help. Rapid response and Condition H Activations 2 family initiated calls - in both cases parents were following up on signs & symptoms they had been told by medical staff to watch for; both appropriate & did not need higher level of care	4 Expert opinion Describes education process for teaching families about Condition Help & follow up survey to evaluate family understanding
Humphreys & Totapally (2016) [63]	Miami Children's Hospital, Florida (USA)	Evaluate times & disposition of rapid response alerts & outcomes for children transferred from acute care to intensive care	Cohort Retrospective	542 rapid response calls	Rapid response (RR) calls	321/542 (59.2%) RR calls were during daytime 323 children (59.6%) transferred to PICU 164 (30.3%) remained on acute care unit 19 (3.5%) required resuscitation (and were eventually transferred to PICU) More children transferred to PICU after rapid response alerts (p = .048) during day (66%) than night (59%) time Mortality rate among children transferred from acute care units (3.8%) to PICU significantly higher (p < .001) than other PICU admissions (1.4%)	2- High risk of confounding or bias Retrospective, RR calls reviewed
Hunt et al. (2008) [64]	Johns Hopkins Children's	Effect of a PMET intervention on prevention of	Before-and-after	Admitted patients who had either code team or	Paediatric medical emergency team (PMET)	No change in the rate of CPAs Respiratory arrests decreased by 73% (0.23 to	2- High risk of confounding or bias No control group,

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes	Level of evidence and rationale for judgement
	Medical and Surgical Center (USA)	respiratory arrest & cardiopulmonary arrest	Retrospective & Prospective	PMET called or who had a CRA		0.06 per 1000 patient-days p=.03) Combined rate of respiratory and CPAs on the wards decreased 51% after transition to the PMET, but not significantly Consistent decrease (not statistically significant) in survival of patients who had a respiratory or CPA after the intervention	retrospective & prospective
Kotsakis et al. (2011) [65]	4 academic paediatric hospitals in Ontario (Canada)	Examine effectiveness of a paediatric rapid response system (PRRS)	Before-and-after Retrospective & Prospective	Data extracted from hospital administrative databases for 2 years before & after PRRS implementation	Rapid Response System using a physician led MET	No difference in rate of actual CPA 1.9 vs 1.8 per 1000 hospital admissions (p =.68) No change in rate of PICU mortality after urgent PICU admission 1.3 vs 1.1 per 1000 hospital admissions (p =.25) There was reduction in PICU mortality rate after PICU readmission 0.3 vs 0.1 death per 1000 hospital admissions (p <.05)	2- High risk of confounding or bias Interdisciplinary multi-centre study, no control group; retrospective & prospective
Lobos et al. (2014) [66]	Children's Hospital, of Eastern Ontario, Ottawa (Canada)	Explore whether health care staff activate MET differently and if so whether the difference was associated with patient disposition	Cohort Retrospective	Patients < 18 years who received MET activation during hospitalisation	Rapid Response System using a physician led MET	Physicians were most common MET activators 53.3% vs 47.7% generated by nurses Physicians had statistically significant higher PICU admission rates when compared with nurses (25.2% vs 15.0%, p =.001).	2- High risk of confounding or bias Retrospective, MET activations reviewed
Lobos et al. (2015) [67]	Children's Hospital, of Eastern Ontario, Ottawa (Canada)	Describe MET activity in follow-up program of all patients discharged from PICU	Cohort Retrospective	Discharged paediatric patients from PICU	Rapid Response System using a physician led MET – follow-up program of 2 planned MET visits within 48 hours post PICU discharge	1,805 patients followed after PICU discharge 36 patients (2%) readmitted at some point during follow-up period of which 11 (30%) occurred at time of 1st planned MET visit As comparison to 2 years preceding RRS the PICU readmission rate was significantly higher 6.8 vs 2% p=0.0001) Interrupted time-series analysis demonstrated a statistically significant immediate change in PICU readmission rate (−5.5%, p = 0.0001) During the 48-hour planned follow-up period, 4% (64) of patients received an unplanned MET visit & 13% received an active intervention Multiple diseased organs were associated with major MET support after initial visit for recent surgical patients (p = 0.03)	2- High risk of confounding or bias Data from prospectively maintained rapid-response system database over 41-month period
Paciotti et al.	Children's	Explore physician	Qualitative -	30 physicians (21	FAMET (family	Physicians depend on families to explain	4 Expert opinion

26

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes	Level of evidence and rationale for judgement
(2014) [68]	Hospital of Philadelphia (USA)	views on families facilitating identifying deteriorating children & possible options of enabling families to independently activate MET	interviews	medical & 9 surgical)	activated medical emergency team).	child's baseline condition & identify changes; 63% (n=19) Families should not be able to directly activate an MET; 93% (n=28) Reasons why not; Family activation would lead to misuse of resources (64%, n=18) Families lack training & clinical knowledge to determine when MET call is indicated (43%, n=12) Family activation would undermine therapeutic relationship between clinicians & families (25%, n=7) Availability of Family Activation burdens families/increases anxiety (18%, n=5) Evidence demonstrating a relationship between FAMET implementation & improved patient outcome is needed (18% n=5) One FAMET call activated by family member - primary reason for call = communication breakdown between family & staff	Semi-structured interviews based on expert opinions of 30 physicians selected purposively, single site, constant comparative analysis
Panesar et al. (2014) [69]	Stony Brook Long Island Children's Hospital (USA)	Examine changes in characteristics of RRT calls before & after implementation of mandatory hospital policy	Database review Retrospective	Before mandatory triggering: 44 RRT calls (40 patients) After mandatory triggering: 69 RRT calls (63 patients)	Paediatric RRT	Number of night time events increased by 17.5% (p =.07) Main trigger for activations was tachycardia - an increase of 26.1% (p =.004). Reduction of 22.9% (p =.009) in RRTs called due to acute change in mental status/agitation Increase of 15.1% of RRTs required no intervention with mandatory triggering Trend toward decreased frequency of PICU transfers in post group by 17.5% (p = .06) with no change in number of code blue calls or mortality	3 Non-analytic, case review Quality assessment project, retrospective RRT database review, > 2 year period, before and after implementation
Ray et al. (2009) [70]	North Carolina Children's Hospital (USA)	Implementation of family-activated paediatric RRS; issues that arise during process and strategies for overcoming challenges	Quality improvement initiative	140 bed hospital	Family activation RRT	Random in-person surveys of 276 families show on average only 27% of families understand when and how to activate RRT. Family awareness has been as high as 58% and as low as 6% Family concern was noted as a reason for activation in 5% of calls; 2 calls directly	4 Expert opinion Descriptive localised account of implementing a family activated Paediatric RRS, random in-person surveys with

27

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes	Level of evidence and rationale for judgement
						activated by families Insufficient data to evaluate impact of family activation on cardiac arrests	families
Sen et al. (2013) [71]	30 academic US paediatric hospitals (USA)	Examination of standard paediatric RRT practice, focusing on large US academic institutions	Cross-sectional survey	34 hospitals (identified using top US News & World Report rankings) Response rate 88% (n=30) Respondents were arrest committee chairpersons or PICU medical directors		All responding hospitals maintained 24 hour/day-7 day/week arrest teams and RRTs RRTs vary in terms of triggers, composition, response time and follow-up 33% of hospitals had a dedicated emergency team nurse; none had a dedicated physician Only 73% RRT had physician member 23% provide additional support (e.g. salary) 60% received family-activated calls 52% of RRT calls led to PICU transfer 73% of hospitals track RRT call times with 82% reporting majority of calls occur in daytime Limited standardisation (incl. definition) of outcome measures Best outcome measure for determining effectiveness of paediatric RRTs is unclear	4 Expert opinion Telephone survey, focused on prominent academic paediatric hospitals in US, self-report data
Sharek et al. (2007) [72]	Lucile Packard Children's Hospital (LPCH) (USA)	Evaluate effect of RRT implementation on hospital-wide mortality rates and code (respiratory & cardiopulmonary arrests) rates outside ICU in paediatric inpatients	Cohort Retrospective & Prospective	Patients admitted to LPCH during the study period; spent at least 1 day on the non-obstetric, non-nursery-based, non-ICU medical or surgical wards	Paediatric RRT	After RRT implementation, mean monthly mortality rate decreased by 18% (1.01 to 0.83 deaths per 100 discharges; p=.007) Mean monthly code rate per 1000 admissions decreased by 71.7% (2.45 to 0.69) & mean monthly code rate per 1000 patient-days decreased by 71.2% (0.52 to 0.15) Estimated code rate per 1000 admissions for post-intervention group 0.29 times that for pre-intervention group (p=.008) Estimated code rate per 1000 patient-days for post-intervention group 0.28 times that for pre-intervention group (p=.007)	2+ Well-conducted cohort study Described as before and after, uses historic data as 'control', cannot definitively say clinical outcome changes result of RRT intervention potential variance between pre and post intervention populations
Theilen et al. (2013) [73]	Royal Hospital for Sick Children, Edinburgh (UK)	Evaluate impact of regular team training on hospital response to deteriorating in-patients with evolving critical illness and subsequent patient outcome	Cohort Prospective	All deteriorating in-patients requiring admission to PICU the year before & after introduction of pMET & concurrent team training	Paediatric Medical Emergency Team (pMET) Concurrent with weekly in situ simulation team training	Deteriorating patients recognised more promptly (before/after pMET: median time 4/1.5h, p < 0.001); more often reviewed by consultants (45%/76%, p = 0.004); more often transferred to high dependency care (18%/37%, p = 0.021) & more rapidly escalated to intensive care (median time 10.5/5h, p = 0.024) (improvements most marked in out-of-hours)	2+ Well-conducted cohort study Prospective, audit, all admissions to ICU, 1 year period, before & after MET & concurrent team training, uncontrolled, Hawthorne effect bias

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes	Level of evidence and rationale for judgement
						Trend towards fewer PICU admissions, reduced level of sickness at time of PICU admission, reduced length of PICU stay & reduced PICU mortality Introduction of pMET coincided with significantly reduced hospital mortality ($p < 0.001$)	
Tibballs et al. (2005) [74]	Royal Children's Hospital, Melbourne (Australia)	Determine impact of MET on cardiac arrest, mortality, and unplanned admission to intensive care in a paediatric tertiary care hospital.	Chart review Comparison of retrospective & prospective data	Cardiac arrest & death incidences pre & post intervention (excluded non-inpatients, infants in N/PICU, patients with DNR decisions or receiving palliative care & arrests under anaesthesia)	MET .	Risk of cardiac arrest 0.19/1000 admissions before MET; reduced to 0.11/1000 admissions with MET (p=0.32) Risk of death 0.12/1000 admissions before MET; reduced to 0.06/1000 admissions with MET (p=0.28) Incidence of transgression of MET call criteria in patients who arrested decreased from 17 to 0 (risk difference 0.16/1000, p=0.0158) & in those who died, decreased from 12 to 0 (risk difference 0.11/1000, p=0.0426) after introduction of MET Unplanned admissions to ICU from wards increased from mean of 20 to 24 per month (p=0.074), representing increase from 17.3% to 21.3% of total ICU admissions	3 Non-analytic, case review Quality assurance exercise, preliminary results, before & after, compared retrospective data pre-MET (41 month period) with prospective data post-MET (12 month period)
Tibballs & Kinney (2009) [75]	Royal Children's Hospital Melbourne (Australia)	Determine effect of MET service on incidence of unexpected cardiac arrest and death in a paediatric hospital	Chart review Comparison of retrospective & prospective data	104780 admissions during a 41 month period pre-MET 138424 admissions during a 48 month period post-MET	Paediatric MET	Incidence of hospital deaths decreased from 4.38 to 2.87/1000 admissions ($p < 0.0001$) Incidence of unexpected in-hospital ward deaths decreased from 0.12 to 0.04/1000 (p=0.03) Incidence of total unexpected ward cardiac arrest did not change from 0.19 to 0.17/1000 (p=0.75) Among patients whose condition fulfilled MET calling criteria (preventable cardiac arrest), incidence of arrest decreased from 0.16 to 0.07 (p=0.04) & incidence of subsequent death decreased from 0.11 to 0.01/1000 admissions (p=0.001)	3 Non-analytic, case review Before & after, compared retrospective data pre-MET (41 month period) with prospective data post-MET (48 month period)

29

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes	Level of evidence and rationale for judgement
						Among patients whose condition did not fulfil MET calling criteria (non-preventable cardiac arrest), incidence of arrest increased from 0.03 to 0.10/1000 (p=0.03) but incidence of subsequent death did not increase. Survival from cardiac arrest increased from 7 of 20 patients to 17 of 23 (p=0.01)	
VandenBerg et al. (2007) [76]	Canadian and American hospitals with >=50 paediatric acute care beds or >=2 paediatric wards (Canada)	Describe levels of care, frequency of near or actual cardiopulmonary arrest (code-blue events), identification mechanisms & responses to evolving critical illness in hospitalized children	Cross-sectional survey	964 health care professionals from 388 hospitals (response rate 84%); of responding hospitals 181 (47%) met inclusion criteria; 16 (8%) were Canadian hospitals; 165 (92%) were American; 85 (47%) were freestanding paediatric acute care hospital		All responding hospitals had immediate-response teams; they were activated 4676 times in previous 12 months. 24% of hospitals had activation criteria for immediate-response teams. Urgent-response teams to treat clinically deteriorating children (not at immediate risk of cardiopulmonary arrest) were available in 75% hospitals; 17% had formal METs and 51% consulted PICU. Code-blue events were more common in hospitals with extracorporeal membrane oxygenation therapy, cardiopulmonary bypass, and larger PICU size.	4 Expert opinion. Telephone survey (designed by investigators), of selected Canadian/American hospitals ≥50 paediatric acute care beds or ≥2 paediatric wards, self-report data – accuracy not verified
Jagt (2013) [8]	Dept. of Paediatrics, University of Rochester (USA)	Identify what is known about use & organization of paediatric resuscitation teams (code teams) & PRRS	Review	Search strategy, screening process and number of eligible papers included in the review not specified	Paediatric rapid response team (PRRT)	Exact details of RRT implementation varies among paediatric institutions. Critical that data is collected in a standardised fashion across institutions so that best possible RRS can be designed	2- Narrative review of components of RRS; unsure risk of bias Methodology (i.e. search strategy, screening process, quality assessment, data synthesis) underpinning the review not reported
VanVoorhis & Willis (2009) [77]	North Carolina Children's Hospital & Levine Children's Hospital (LCH), North Carolina	Highlight process of developing a paediatric rapid response system (PRRS) & measuring its effects on patient safety	Case examples x 2	*Case example 1* North Carolina Children's Hospital *Case example 2* Levine Children's Hospital	Paediatric rapid response system (PRRS) Institution-wide/Paediatric Early Response Team (PERT)	Case example 1: Mean time interval between cardiac arrests increased from 2512 to 9418 days, indicating a decrease in non-ICU cardiac arrests. Median duration of predefined clinical instability before assessment by ICU personnel decreased from 9h 55min to 4h 15min post intervention (p = .028) Case example 2: Mean rate of non-ICU codes	3 Non-analytic, case review Descriptive presentation of case examples from 2 US hospitals

30

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes	Level of evidence and rationale for judgement
	(USA)					decreased from 4 to 1.5/1000 discharges	
Wang et al. (2011) [78]	Children's hospital Denvor (USA)	Describe demographic & clinical variables including outcomes of emergency response team (ERT) activations	Database review Retrospective	n=1334 ERT activations analysed	Emergency Response Team (ERT)	A total of 39% (511) of all ERT activations occurred in patients under the age of 1 year Statistically, there were significantly more ERT activations during day as compared to night shifts (P < 0.001); no statistical significance between summer and winter months Most common admission diagnosis category was cardiac disease Survival rate after an ERT itself was 90%, with an overall survival rate to discharge of 78%	3 Non-analytic, case review Descriptive retrospective, database of ERT activations, 13 year period
Winberg et al. (2008) [79]	Queen Silvia Children's Hospital, Gothenburg (Sweden)	Evaluate & summarise current knowledge about paediatric RRSs	Review	Included 8 articles published in peer-reviewed journals	Paediatric Rapid Response System (PRRS)	PRRSs are used extensively internationally 1 study reported a statistically significant decrease in mortality rate after implementation; 2 studies showed a non-significant association with decreased mortality rate Cardiac and/or respiratory arrest rates decreased in 4 before-after studies with statistical significance in 2 studies Concluded that existing data supports effectiveness of paediatric RRS; however limited guidance on most optimal system	2+ Review reporting on observational / quasi-experimental studies Outline of search strategy provided; quality assessment not reported; results reported narratively on non-controlled non-randomised studies
Zenker et al. (2007) [80]	Children's Hospitals and Clinics of Minnesota (USA)	Evaluate effectiveness & impact of implementing RRT	Pre-post design Retrospective & Prospective	Post-RRT implementation 150 activations (2 requested by parents) Rates of 12.84 RRT activations per 1000 discharges & 3.06 per 1000 patient-days	Paediatric Rapid Response Team	Mortality rate unchanged from 22561 discharges pre-implementation to 11682 discharges during implementation phase (4.3 vs 4.5 per 1000 discharges p=.57) Incidence of arrests both cardiac and respiratory decreased from 8 to 5.1 per 1000 discharges a decrease of 36% (p=.19)	2- High risk of confounding or bias No control group, retrospective & prospective

31

Table 3: Characteristics of included studies: PEWS implementation processes (n=16)

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main Outcomes	Level of evidence and rationale for judgement
Azzopardi et al. (2011) [81]	Royal Children's Hospital Melbourne (Australia)	Assess value/attitudes placed on MET by clinical staff & identify barriers to activation of MET	Cross-sectional survey	n=407 (280 nurses & 127 doctors) Of the 407 participants, 305 were MET callers & 102 were MET responders	MET	MET highly valued for obtaining urgent assistance for seriously ill patients by 85% nurses & 83% doctors Amongst MET callers more nurses than doctors (p = 0.01) disagreed that MET reduces their skills in managing sick patients and agreed that MET teaches them how to better manage severely ill patients (p = 0.09) Doctors who were MET responders agreed that MET increases their workload when caring for sick patients compared to MET callers (p < 0.01) Amongst nurses, MET responders were more likely to agree that MET was overused compared to MET callers (p < 0.01) Amongst MET callers, medical staff were more likely to agree that MET was overused compared to nurses (p < 0.01)	4 Expert opinion Electronic survey, modified version of a previously developed & validated questionnaire, all clinical staff (medical and nursing) invited to complete; 1 month time-period; self-report expert opinion, potential for non-response bias
Bonafide et al. (2013a) [82]	Children's Hospital of Philadelphia (USA)	Identify mechanisms beyond statistics to predict clinical deterioration by which physicians and nurses use EWS to support their decision making	Qualitative - interviews	n=57 (27 nurses & 30 physicians) General medical & surgical wards	Rapid Response System (EWS based on Bedside Paediatric Early Warning System + MET)	EWS facilitates safety by alerting physicians & nurses to concerning vital sign changes & prompting critical thinking about possible deterioration EWS provides less-experienced nurses with age-based vital sign reference ranges Having concrete evidence of clinical changes in form of an EWS empowers nurses to escalate care & communicate their concerns For patients who are stable; patients with abnormal physiology baselines who consistently have high EWSs & patients experiencing neurologic deterioration EWS may not help with decision-making	4 Expert opinion Semi-structured interviews, expert opinion of nurses and physicians in one context, potential social desirability response bias
Bonafide et al (2014b) [83]	Children's Hospital of Philadelphia (USA)	Model the financial costs & benefits of operating a MET & determine annual reduction in critical deterioration (CD) events required to off-set MET costs	Cohort Retrospective	Unplanned transfer of child classified as CD if any life-sustaining interventions (ventilation or vasopressor infusion) were required within 12 hours of ICU	MET team	Patients who had CD cost $99,773 (p < .001) more during their post-event hospital stay than transfers to ICU that did not meet CD criteria Annual MET operating costs ranged from $287,145 for a nurse & respiratory therapist team with concurrent responsibilities to $2,358,112 for a nurse, respiratory therapist, & ICU attending physician freestanding team	2- High risk of confounding or bias Retrospective review

32

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main Outcomes	Level of evidence and rationale for judgement
				transfer. 1,759 unplanned transfers occurred during study period; 1,396 patients met inclusion criteria; 378 (27.1%) met CD criteria		In base-case analysis, a nurse, respiratory therapist, & ICU fellow team with concurrent responsibilities cost $350,698 per year, equivalent to a reduction of 3.5 CD events	
Brady & Goldenhar (2013) [84]	Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center (USA)	Learn about factors that influence front-line healthcare providers' ability to achieve and maintain SA	Qualitative – focus group interviews	n=3 focus groups with charge nurses (n=3,3,4) n=3 focus groups bedside nurse/RT groups (n=3,3,5) n=1 resident focus group (n=10)	NA	**Team based care (social system input)** *Family empowerment* – listening to, engaging & giving families power to escalate their concerns *Nurse empowerment* - having a powerful, equal and welcomed voice in huddles and within patient care team *Unit culture that supports teamwork, accountability & safety* - support trusting relationships, encourage communication & willingness to ask for second opinions **Availability of standardised data (technological system input)** *Standardised data elements/score*s e.g. objective algorithms (e.g. PEWS) + gut feeling *Tools for entering, displaying and monitoring data and data trends* e.g. electronic health record & its ability to display data over time **Standardised processes and procedures (organisational system input)** *Shared training and language regarding patient risk* - e.g. watcher - having a gut feeling about a patient that is at risk for deterioration or close to the edge; having experienced providers; peer coaching & debriefing *Structure to proactively identify and plan for risk* e.g. huddles, frequent scheduled assessments, check-ins by charge nurses & physicians, MRT calling criteria, planning tools and explicit contingency planning *Structure to support handoffs and continuity of care* e.g. clear and standardised handoff practices and knowledge of the patient's initial and current status and the patient's family *Structure that supports adequate workload/staffing* e.g. improved staff-to-patient ratio; experienced &	4 Expert opinion Localised focus group interviews with nurses, respiratory therapists and physician, potential for group think bias & presentation of beliefs and opinions rather than actual behaviours/actions

33

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main Outcomes	Level of evidence and rationale for judgement
						diverse team of providers available on all shifts; extra resources available	
Brady et al. (2013) [85]	Cincinnati Children's Hospital Centre (USA)	Design a system to identify, mitigate, & escalate patient risk by using principles of high-reliability organizations	Time series	Checklist-based form followed flow of situation awareness algorithm; completed by charge nurse (collected from each unit on each nursing shift)	Situation Awareness intervention	Rate of UNSAFE (unrecognized situation awareness failures events) transfers/10000 non-ICU inpatient days were significantly reduced from 4.4 to 2.4; days between inpatient SSEs (serious safety events) also increased significantly	2- High risk of non-causal relationships Retrospective, potential exposure to unmeasured confounding, no measure for situation awareness
Demmel et al. (2010) [86]	Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center (USA)	Implement PEW Scoring System on a Paediatric Haematology/Oncology	Chart review Quality improvement initiative (PDSA cycles)	Haematology/oncology/bone marrow transplant unit PEWS team & historical data (unplanned ICU transfers from oncology unit)	PEWS scoring process & 'watchful eye' action algorithm	Immediately prior to implementation of PEWS, no. of days between CPA on unit = 299; Post-implementation, days between CPA on unit increased to 1053; sustained at that level for nearly 2 years Staff evaluation: PEWS scoring process improved multidisciplinary team communication & defined clear actions for new, less experienced staff High level of charge nurse involvement helped keep the initiative going	3 Non-analytic, case reviews Describes implementation of PEWS tool & action algorithm, prospective and retrospective data, ongoing cycles using plan-do-study-act
Duncan & Frew (2009) [87]	Teaching specialist children's hospital (UK)	Determine additional short-term health service costs of in-hospital acute life threatening events in children to inform a cost-effectiveness analysis of prevention strategies	Cost-analysis exercise	All life-threatening event calls over a 27 month period Control group of age and specialty matched patients	Cardio-pulmonary resuscitation attempts	120 acute life-threatening event calls (36 cardiac & 80 respiratory arrest; 4 for another event); average 12.8 staff members attended each call Total cost of a CPR attempt (actual attempt & preparedness) £3,663/attempt Mean cost of post-event length of stay in hospital was £22,562 for cardiac arrest, £26,335 for other acute life-threatening events, and £26,138 for urgent PIC admissions. Cost per survivor to hospital discharge £53,289	3 Non-analytic, case reviews Prospective
Hayes et al. (2012) [88]	20 Child Health Corporation of America (CHCA) hospitals (USA)	Implement suite of prevention, detection & correction strategies to reduce number of inpatient paediatric cardiopulmonary arrests and improve patient safety culture	Quality improvement initiative	Ward areas: each team identified target units from noncritical care inpatient units, ED, operating rooms, and ICUs.	Foundational changes e.g. SBAR Midlevel changes e.g. RRT Advanced changes e.g. FARRT	PEWS implemented in 92% of hospitals within 12months of end of collaborative period Code rate for collaborative did not decrease significantly (3% decrease) 12 hospitals reported additional data after collaborative & saw significant improvement in code rates (24% decrease) Patient safety culture scores improved by 4.5% to 8.5%.; the only statistically significant improvement was seen in "non-punitive response to error" (P = .02)	4 Expert opinion Multi-centre multi-disciplinary collaborative based on Model for Improvement (plan-do-study-act); monthly data submissions over 12 month study period and preceding 12 month period as baseline data, + safety culture survey at 3 time points
Kukreti et	Hospital for	Implementation &	Quality	4 Paediatric	Paediatric MET	>95% satisfied with quality & timeliness of MET	4 Expert opinion

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main Outcomes	Level of evidence and rationale for judgement
al. (2014) [89]	Sick Children in Toronto (Canada)	evolution of a paediatric rapid response team; process, barriers, and ongoing challenges	improvement initiative	Academic Health Science Centres, Ontario granted funding to initiate paediatric Program introduced in 3 phases at Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto	program	>90% MET had positive impact on patient care 3 perceived benefits of MET were: Education provided on hospital floors/clinics Satisfaction of service users (patients, nurses & physicians) Empowerment of bedside staff No significant reduction in code blue rate or readmission rate to CCU	Describes local experience of implementing RRT, presented some data on pre-post implementation survey and MET activity
Lobos et al (2010) [90]	Toronto & Children's Hospital of Eastern Ontario; McMaster Children's Hospital, Hamilton; Children's Hospital London (Canada)	Describe standardised implementation of RRS using a MET across 4 paediatric hospitals .	Quality improvement initiative	2 free-standing paediatric hospitals & 2 paediatric units in adult hospitals	Paediatric RRS using physician-led MET	44 activations/1000 admissions during 1st 2 years with respiratory concerns most common activation reason (46%) Resulted in significant reductions in total code blue events & PICU mortality following unplanned PICU admissions and PICU readmissions from the ward	4 Expert opinion Multi-centre study on standardised implementation of RRS, based on Social Marketing principles, phases of implementation described
McCrory et al. (2012) [91]	John Hopkins University Hospital Simulation Center (USA)	Evaluate education intervention of teaching ABC-SBAR to paediatric interns	Pre-post design	n=27 paediatric interns 26 (96%) of 27 interns agreed to have their pre-and post-intervention video-recorded hand-off data included 52 total hand-offs included for analysis	Education session: Rapid Response: why, when and how (incl. ABC-SBAR training) Video-recorded mock patient hand-off (before & after education session)	After training: Mean score of hand-offs improved significantly (3.1/10 pre- vs 7.8/10, P<0.001) Hand-offs including airway or breathing assessment improved (9/26 [35%] to 22/26 [85%], p = 0.001) & this information was stated earlier (25 vs 5 seconds, p<0.001) Hand-offs including an assessment or recommendation by interns significantly increased (1/26 [4%] vs 22/26 [85%], p<0.001). Hand-offs with ABCs or situation prioritized before background increased ($\leq$5% vs $\geq$77%) Elapsed time to stated essential content items significantly decreased (19 vs 7 seconds, p<0.001) Total hand-off duration increased (29 vs 36 seconds, P = 0.004)	2- High risk of confounding or bias No control group, simulated environment not patient care environment
McKay et al. (2013) [92]	Tertiary hospital providing regional paediatric care (Australia)	Evaluate impact of newly designed PEWS & accompanying education package COMPASS	Before & after study	2 inpatient paediatric wards Pre-intervention n=1059 Post-intervention	Education package: COMPASS (e-learning package and a 3-hour face-to-face low-	Patient outcomes Reduction in the number of patients requiring unplanned admission to paediatric HDU (3.8% vs. 2.7%, *P* = 0.22) Vital sign documentation Significant improvement in daily documentation of vital signs including: level of consciousness (0 vs.	2- High risk of confounding or bias Prospective, controlled, potential selection bias at one site and potential for Hawthorne effect (sustainability unknown)

35

BMJ Open

Page 36 of 62

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main Outcomes	Level of evidence and rationale for judgement
				n=899 Random subgroup Pre-intervention n=262 Post-intervention n=221	fidelity simulation)	7.8, p < 0.001), respiratory effort (0.0 vs. 7.8 p < 0.001), capillary refill (0 to 1.1 p < 0.001) and blood pressure (0.0 vs. 0.0), p = 0.007) Fewer children breached MET criteria (38.9% (*n* =102) vs. 20.4% (*n* = 45)) <u>Communication and medical review</u> Significant improvement in number of documented communication episodes (8.5% vs. 40.9%, *P* < 0.001)	
McLellan & Connors (2013) [93]	Children's Hospital Boston (USA)	Implementation & modifications of CHEWS & its companion Escalation of Care Algorithm for paediatric cardiovascular patients	Chart reviews 3 pilot studies	Inpatient paediatric cardiovascular unit Pilot 1: 27 patients & 157 observations Pilot 2: 33 patients & 312 observations Pilot 3: 20 patients & 119 observations	Children's Hospital Early Warning Score (CHEWS) & Escalation of Care Algorithm	Pilot 1: 29.6% of patients had lower CHEWS scores than the acuity severity of their clinical presentation Pilot 2: 7.5% of patients' C-CHEWS scores did not correlate with acuity of their clinical picture Pilot 3: 100% of C-CHEWS scores matched the acuity of patients' clinical presentations <u>Unplanned CICU transfers after C-CHEWS implementation</u> Chart review of patients who had an unplanned transfer to the CICU or experienced an arrest on the cardiac unit typically had elevated C-CHEWS scores with exception to sudden onset of compromising arrhythmia; in comparing rate (transfers per 1000 patient days) of these events 1 year pre- and 1 year post- C-CHEWS implementation, there was a reduction in unplanned transfers	3 Non-analytic, case reviews Describes modification and implementation of a PEWS tools and escalation of care algorithm for cardiac patients, processes implemented over course of 3 pilot studies which incorporated retrospective chart reviews/audits + clinician interviews
Randhawa et al. (2011) [94]	Children's National Medical Center, Division of Nursing, Washington (USA)	Describe process & outcomes of implementing & sustaining use of PEWS at unit & organizational level to reduce paediatric cardiopulmonary arrest	Quality improvement initiative - cycles of change	First cycle: 15-bed cardiology & nephrology unit Second cycle: 39-bed general medical unit Third cycle: All acute care areas (additional 136 beds, including haematology/oncology, surgical, respiratory, short stay &	PEWS & escalation algorithm	First cycle: Frequency of codes of CPA's reduced from 0.98/1000 to 0.62/1000 patient-days Second cycle: Frequency of codes/1,000 patient-days reduced from 0.65/1000 to 0.49/1000 patient-days Third cycle: CPA reduced from 0.15/1000 patient-days to 0.12/1000 patient-days 23.4% reduction in CPA organizationally (0.21 codes/1000 patient days) 19.4% reduction in CAT Team activations across all acute units	4 Expert opinion Single site, description of 3 cycles of change related to the process and outcome implementation of PEWS, underpinned by plan-do-check-act methodology

36

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-014497 on 13 March 2017. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on April 10, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main Outcomes	Level of evidence and rationale for judgement
				neurosciences units)			
Roberts et al. (2014) [95]	Children's Hospital of Philadelphia (USA)	Identify & understand barriers to calling for urgent assistance in a children's hospital where an rapid response system (RRS) was implemented	Qualitative - interviews	n=57 (27 nurses & 30 physicians) General medical/surgical wards	RRS consisting of calling criteria, EWS & MET	Nurses & physicians valued RRS; believed it enhanced patient safety & improved relationships between clinicians in general care and ICU areas Reported on barriers that shaped decision to activate MET see Table 4	4 Expert opinion Semi-structured interviews, based on expert opinion of select nurse (n=27) and physician (n=30) participants in single setting, modified grounded theory approach used to analyse data
Tume et al. (2013) [96]	Large children's hospital in the North West of England (UK)	Describe development of the RESPOND course, including preliminary evaluation of 1st 4 courses	Course evaluation survey	Course participants over 4 separate days n=65 (multi-professional) 63 of 65 (97% response rate) paper evaluations of 4 RESPOND courses completed	RESPOND (Recognising Signs of Paediatric hOspital iNpatients Deterioration) (1-day course)	Most useful aspects of RESPOND: Discussion/review of real life cases Learning to use SBAR - improved communication between doctors & nurses & working more as a team Multi-professional approach improved understanding among each professional group when dealing with deterioration cases Stated that in-hospital cardiac arrests had reduced from mean of 21.3 to 13 post introduction of RESPOND course	4 Expert opinion Small preliminary evaluation of a training course, post-course paper evaluation form and 3-month post-course electronic survey (low response rate – non-response bias); descriptive

37

Review question 1: What is the available evidence on the use, composition and clinical validity of PEW detection systems?

Throughout the 43 papers focusing on PEW detection systems, we identified a number of original [3, 10, 22, 24, 26, 30, 34, 38, 43] (see online supplementary Appendix 2) and/or adopted/modified [2, 6, 14-21, 23, 25, 27-29, 31-33, 36-37, 39-42, 45-46, 48-51] PEW detection systems for use in general paediatric in-patient settings, paediatric emergency departments and for specific specialities and/or populations including cardiac, oncology, burns and neonates. Original PEW detection systems were developed in various local settings by expert groups incorporating multidisciplinary clinical team members with differing standards and cut-off threshold points. There was, some, but, limited consistency on the number, type, and classification of the scoring, calling criteria and measurement parameters across the identified PEW detection systems. For example, while the majority of PEW detection systems measured neurological, cardiovascular and respiratory status there was considerable diversity in the specific physiological variables measured within these categories, and the age-specific reference range values or thresholds used. Not only were the reference range values, where cited, diverse across studies, the source of evidence underpinning the specifically selected optimal physiological measurement thresholds was often unclear, lacking and/or based on clinical consensus. Twenty-three of 43 studies, reported on the diagnostic predictive accuracy of PEW detection systems using the performance criteria of sensitivity, specificity, receiver operating characteristic curve, positive predictive value and negative predictive value.[2-3, 6, 10, 14-15, 18, 20-22, 24-26, 28-30, 32, 36, 38-39, 46, 48, 51] The validity of the evaluated PEW detection systems demonstrated wide ranging sensitivity and specificity largely as a consequence of different settings adopting and self-regulating varying markers for clinical deterioration (i.e. code blue call, PICU admission, death, and interventions) and multiple threshold scores (see online supplementary Appendix 3).

Review question 2: What evidence exists on the availability, composition, activation and effectiveness of PEW response mechanims?

A number of PEW response mechanisms were in use internationally, most notably in the USA and in tertiary care children's hospitals. Throughout the studies examining 30 PEW response systems, there was no standardisation of terms used (i.e. paediatric/rapid response systems/teams (P/RRS/T),[52, 59-60, 65, 69, 72, 77, 80] emergency response team (ERT),[78] paediatric early response teams (PERT),[77] paediatric/medical emergency teams

(p/MET)[53-55, 64, 66-67, 73-75] and family activated response systems (e.g. Condition Help, Listening to you, FAMET/FARRT)[58, 61-62, 68, 70] and response team composition varied hugely in terms of membership. The most common response team members were a PICU respiratory therapist,[52-53, 55, 59, 64-66, 69, 72, 75, 77-78, 80] a PICU/critical care nurse[52-53, 55, 59, 64-66, 69, 72, 74, 80] and a PICU fellow/attending physician.[53, 55, 59-60, 64-65, 72, 74-75] Calling criteria and their thresholds varied considerably with changes in haemodynamic, cardiovascular, respiratory and neurological status;[52, 55, 59-60, 64-65, 69, 72, 73-74, 77, 80] and staff and family concern,[55, 59-60, 64, 69, 72, 74-75, 77] the most common trigger criteria for RRS. Generally the response team could be activiated by any concerned staff member. Where PRRS were reported to be in place they were available 24 hours/day, 7-days a week.[52-54, 60, 64-66, 69, 72-73, 75, 80] In terms of determining effectivessness of response mechanisms, outcomes measured across studies varied substantially. The most common clinical and process outcomes reported were rates of cardio/respiratory arrest,[53, 55, 59, 64-65, 69, 72-75, 77, 80] mortality rates,[53-55, 59-60, 63, 65, 72] unplanned PICU transfers/admissions[52-53, 55, 59, 65-66, 69, 73-75, 77, 80] interventions required (i.e. intubation, mechanical ventilation, vasopressors),[52-53, 55, 59, 75, 80] and rates of MET utilisation/calls and/or code blue activations.[53, 55, 59-60, 63-66, 69, 72, 74-75, 77, 80]. Collectively, there was mixed evidence of the impact of PEW response mechanisms on clinical and process outcomes. While many studies reported notable reductions in cardio-pulmonary arrests rates, mortality rates, transfer time to PICU and time to interventions these are often not statistically significant. For any study that reported some statistically significant finding, there was an equal counterbalance study with a non-significant finding. Five papers reported on quality improvement initiatives for families to activate the RRT.[58, 61-62, 68, 70] Findings revealed that families infrequently activate the response system and when they do the reason is largely as a consequence of communication failures rather than critical care deterioration. While physicians value family input and depend on families to explain their child's baseline condition and identify subtle changes in their child, physicians are apprehensive towards family activated RRT because of potential misuse of resources, undermining of the clinician-family therapeutic relationship, increased family anxiety/burden and a need to provide knowledge/training to families. Further evidence on family activated response mechanisms is needed to demonstrate improved patient outcomes.

Review question 3: What evidence exists on the process of implementing PEWS including, education, governance, monitoring, effectiveness, additional safety nets, and cost-effectiveness?

Of the 16 studies that reported on implementation processes; 6 studies focused specifically on the process of implementing PEWS/RRS;[86, 88-90, 93-94] 3 studies described educational interventions (see online supplementary Appendix);[91-92, 96] 5 studies addressed cultural, socio-technical and organisational issues (including situation awareness)[81-82, 84-85, 95] and 2 studies reported on economic evaluations.[83, 87]

Despite the fact that many anecdotal accounts emphasise the important of the implementation process when introducing PEWS, a dearth of published literature was sourced in this area. The evidence was diverse in approach, ranging from adopting social marketing principles to quality/performance improvement initiatives to chart reviews and pre-post implementation surveys. Comparative evaluations were therefore difficult, with no conclusions drawn on an optimal implementation strategy to influence change in clinical/process outcomes (or indeed what the best clinical/process outcomes are to measure). Notwithstanding, this lack of evidence, valuable insights were gleaned into the potential challenges of translating PEWS into clinical practice. For instance, one key aspect of PEWS/RRS is early intervention with no delay in response; however a number of barriers and facilitators to MET activation, and advantages and disadvantages of MET, were identified (see Table 4).[81, 95] Additionally, the integration of situation awareness interventions into healthcare 'patient safety/risk' fora to supplement early warning scores was highlighted as important for acknowledging the tacit knowledge of experienced clinicians (e.g. 'watcher' defined as gut feeling about a patient that is at risk of deterioration; briefings and huddles).[84-85] However, Brady and Goldenhar[84] categorised three emergent themes and nine sub-themes as social, technological and organisational system inputs that influenced, either positively and/or negatively, the achieving of situation awareness (i.e. knowing what is going on – perception, comprehension, prediction) and identifying, mitigating and escalating the recognition of patient risk (see Table 5).

For the three reported educational interventions (see online supplementary Appendix 4), positive evaluations on course delivery related to working through real-life cases and using a multi-professional approach.[96] The most useful thing clinician participants felt they had learned were improved doctor-nurse communication, enhanced team-work and using the

SBAR communication technique.[96] Significant improvements were found in documented vital signs (i.e. level of consciousness, respiratory effort, capillary refill and blood pressure), documented communication episodes from nursing staff to the patient's medical team following clinical instability and time to medical review.[92] One study also demonstrated significant improvement in the mean total score of intern hand-offs after ABC-SBAR (communication technique) training.[91]

Finally, while no economic evaluation covering the resource implications of a complete PEW system (detection, response and implementation) was found, a cost-benefit analysis of a MET in a children's hospital in the US found that children who had experienced 'critical deterioration' (CD) (arrest, ventilation or vasopressor infusion), preventable by MET intervention, cost more than those admissions to PICU who did not; and that savings from even a modest reduction in CD events would offset MET costs.[83]

Table 4: Medical Emergency Teams – barriers, facilitators, advantages and disadvantages

Barriers to MET activation	Facilitators to MET activation
- Fear of criticism - Negative attitudes from MET staff - Concerned clinical decision making would be evaluated - Active discouragement to activate MET - Poor staff self-efficacy - Lack of appreciation for severity of patient's condition - Preference for calling attending team/PICU before MET - Preserving relationships within own team - Hierarchical barriers - Previous negative experiences - Reluctant to transfer patients to ICU	- Presence of self-efficacy to overcome hierarchical norms and resistance - Use of mechanisms to overcome such barriers e.g. teaming up with charge nurse - Previous positive experiences more likely to activate MET quickly
Disadvantages of MET	Advantages of MET
- Inadequate training of medical MET responders - MET de-skills staff in managing unwell patients - Overuse of MET - Calling MET even if vital signs normal - Not activating MET if vitals abnormal as patient looked well - Increase in workload for MET responders - Too many people attending MET - Lack of clear leadership and defined roles	- Teaches staff better management of severely ill patients - Immediate support from experienced staff - Early intervention - MET initiated by anyone at any time

Table 5: Factors influencing the achievement of situational awareness

Influencing factors	Social	Technological	Organisational
Negative influences to achieving situation awareness	Fear of speaking up and/or being wrong in front of peers Disagreements about plans among team members & lack of collegiality/teamwork Lack of familiarity with and trust of team members on MET	Objective algorithms not used in standardised manner across units or providers Algorithms not applicable for use with certain patients (e.g. high PEWS score could be baseline for certain patients) Clinical staff all chart	Inexperienced providers unfamiliar with standardised processes; reluctant to ask for a second opinion; asked to care for complex patients with unfamiliar diseases Variation in understanding and application of standardised terms/language Lack of standardised practices and procedures for identifying and planning

41

		information differently and in different places	for risk
			Caring for very sick patients or those with whom providers have less personal and clinical familiarity
			Fewer resources available and competing demands due to heavy workloads
Positive influences to achieving situation awareness	Family empowerment Nurse empowerment Culture that facilitates and builds trusting relationships Willingness to ask for second opinions Being accountable for carrying out mitigation plans and escalating patient care Open team communication and supportive teamwork	In addition to 'gut feeling', having objective standardised algorithms/PEWS for conducting patient assessment Electronic health care record; ability to display data trends over time	Training providers in common language & terminology Experienced providers in critical care Experienced providers ability to train others (i.e. peer coaching, mentoring & debriefs) Structures to proactively identify and plan risk e.g. huddles Standardised 'hand-off' practices Knowledge of patient history & baseline & patient's family Documented 'follow-up' plan Adequate staffing (staff-to-patient ratio) Experienced and diverse team of providers available on all shifts with staff knowledge of disease/patient population Extra resources available if needed

DISCUSSION

This review is the first to systematically examine and synthesise evidence on PEWS as a comprehensive system comprised of detection, response and implementation components. Notwithstanding this, despite many authors reporting on the complexity and multi-faceted nature of PEW systems, no evidence was sourced which collectively examined the multiple components of PEWS as a complex health-care intervention in one study. Rather, the various bodies of evidence reviewed examined PEWS in a piece-meal manner by focusing on one particular aspect of PEWS such as PEW detection systems, response mechanisms or implementation processes. In relation to PEW detection systems, we identified a number of original and modified tools that were in use internationally. Empirical evidence on which system was most effective was limited due to the heterogeneity in how the detection tools were developed, modified and investigated across the included studies. Furthermore, the majority of PEW detection systems were evaluated at one point in time in single site paediatric hospital settings. One multi-centre case-control study [39] was identified which

42

validated the Bedside PEWS across inpatient units in four children's hospitals. Results are eagerly awaited from the first multi-centre cluster randomised controlled trial evaluating the impact of Bedside PEWS across 22 hopsitals internationally.[41]

Perhaps as a consequence of the fact that the majority of PEW detection systems have been developed by diverse expert opinion/multi-disciplinary working groups in varied contexts, there was limited consensus across the PEW detection systems on the number, type, classification of, scoring and calling criteria of the detection measurement parameters. This was also illustrated by the various modifications made to PEW detection system parameters to meet local need. As contended by Roland et al.[44] the variety of PEW parameters used by local units is perhaps reflective of the desire for units to have locally derived systems; however this creates challenges in standardising not only a common scoring tool but also establishing a common language among health care professionals in recognising clinically deteriorating children. Our review also found limited uniformity on reference range values used for physiological measurements for different aged children. The sources of evidence underpinning the selected 'optimal' reference range value cut-offs were unclear, lacking or based on expert clinical consensus. Recent publications recommending updating reference ranges for vital signs with new thresholds could serve as useful references for clinicians to inform the development of evidence-based vital sign parameters for physiological monitor alarms, inpatient electronic health record vital sign alerts, medical emergency team calling criteria and early warning scoring systems.[97-98] These factors, diversity in PEW detection system score physiological (and other) parameters and differences in age dependent vital sign reference ranges makes it difficult to compare and contrast the performance criteria of PEW detection systems. There were also different standards for cut-off/threshold points and for what was taken to be the endpoint or surrogate marker for clinical deterioration in terms of measuring clinical outcomes (e.g. cardio-pulmonary arrest, PICU admission, mortality, escalation to higher level of care) for PEW detection systems. It was rare for any PEW detection system to have both a high specificity and sensitivity and although some systems did show some promising performance criteria many were unable to be fully validated due to low sensitivity. Alongside considering validity of the PEW detection system, many contexts chose simplicity and clinical utility as a priority in electing which PEW detection system to implement. The diversities in PEW detection systems hinders the ability to make any definitive comparisons between bodies of evidence, not only on what might be an optimal

43

system to use but also what the optimal combination of physiological parameters might be for the timely detection of clinical deterioration in children.

Evidence to support the use of PEW detection systems in contexts such as paediatric emergency departments and paediatric units in district general hospitals was limited. The small number of studies that did examine the use of PEW scoring systems in paediatric emergency departments urged caution in recommending the use of early warning scoring systems as triage tools to prioritise patients, based on the lack of evidence of impact on patient outcomes and cost analysis comparing PEWS to conventional triage tool systems.[18-21, 26, 29, 36-37, 46] As the majority of studies were conducted in freestanding tertiary children's hospitals, we do not know how well PEW scoring systems would perform in paediatric units within district general hospitals where different cohorts of child patients may present. Additionally, evidence on the use of early warning scoring systems in neonatal populations was limited. Only two studies were identified that focused on the design, use and evaluation of neonatal early warning scoring systems.[30, 43] There is the need for PEW detection systems to be validated for different patient cohorts and different paediatric inpatient contexts/settings. Furthermore, consensus on the most appropriate outcomes to measure and report on require standardisation to enable comparisons to be made and thereby strengthen the body of evidence on the performance of PEW detection systems.

Considering PEW response mechanisms, findings revealed diversity in how institutions operationalised and evaluated the performance of RRS. There was limited standardisation in the adoption of a one or two tiered response system; team composition/membership; calling/trigger criteria, and activation processes/escalation protocols. There was often limited detail describing the specific 'response' intervention. No evidence was sourced on the validation of activation/calling criteria for RRS; rather these were determined locally through expert clinical consensus opinion based on local need/situational context. This review also found limited uniformity on how clinical and process outcomes were defined and measured across studies; perhaps somewhat explaining the mixed evidence on the impact of RRS. For instance, while many studies reported trending reductions in cardio-pulmonary arrests rates, mortality rates, transfer time to PICU, time to interventions, these were often not statistically significant. With limited consensual evidence, uncertainly remains on the impact of RRS for the timely intervention to child clinical deterioration. Finally, while family activated response

systems were generally promoted, given the limited volumne of evidence, the effectiveness of such initiatives in preventing child critical deterioration has yet to be established.

In relation to PEW implementation processes, we identified three education packages (i.e COMPASS, RESPOND and intern hand-offs using SBAR) which largely favoured self-directed e-learning mechanisms and peer training models such as train the trainer, alongside short real-life problem-solving scenario based face-to-face sessions.[91-92, 96] While these packages reported favourable results such as improved teamwork, communication and improved documentation of vital signs, these results were largely based on self-completed evaluation surveys post participation in the training programmes. Of the studies that did examine clinical data, no significant differences in hospital mortality or unplanned admissions to critical care areas were identified. Although we found limited empirical evidence related to PEW implementation processes, we did identify the need for cognisance to be given to the multi-faceted nature of PEWS (i.e. communication, escalation, parent involvement), including the health care cultural context in which PEW systems would be implemented. Indeed, there is the need to move responsibilities beyond reactive responses to include proactive assessment of patients at risk of clinical deterioration (e.g. concepts such as the watcher, huddles, roving teams).[84-85, 99]

Strengths and limitations

This manuscript is the first to systematically collate and synthesise evidence on the multiple components of PEWS (i.e. detection, response and implementation/governance components) collectively in one review. While a comprehensive search strategy was employed, and the recommended practices for the conduct and reporting of systematic reviews were adhered to, it is possible that some relevant papers might have been missed. Additionally, with the exclusion of non-English papers there is the potential risk of publication bias.

Recommendations for clinical practice

Clinicians working in inpatient paediatric units, and management at both unit and organisational levels, need to recognise that the early detection of a deteriorating child is much more than identifying and responding to a score. Instead through creation of a common language PEWS should stimulate a heightened sense of situation awareness and open communication among clinicians about children at risk of clinical deterioration; thereby supporting, not replacing, clinical judgement. PEWS should be embraced as one piece of a

45

larger multi-faceted safety framework that will develop and grow over time with strong governance and leadership, targeted training, on-going support and continuous improvement.

Directions for future research

Despite many studies reporting on the complexity and multi-faceted nature of PEWS, no evidence was sourced which examined PEWS as a complex health-care intervention. Future research needs to investigate PEWS as a complex multi-faceted socio-technical system that is embedded in a wider safety culture influenced by many organisational and human factors such as, but not limited to, clinician knowledge, experience and confidence; effective multi-disciplinary communication and team-work; family engagement; situation awareness; decision making; unit and hospital management and leadership; working conditions and the environment; and stress and fatigue. There is evidence of some potential emerging work in this area in the UK.[100]

CONCLUSION

This review identified that PEW systems are widely used internationally. However, empirical evidence revealed a lack of consensus on which PEW system is most effective or useful. Notwithstanding the limited consensual evidence, positive trends in improved clinical outcomes, such as reduced cardiopulmonary arrest or earlier intervention and transfer to paediatric intensive care unit, were reported. Additionally, PEWS have been shown to enhance multidisciplinary team working, communication and confidence in recognising and making clinical decisions about clinically deteriorating children. Notwithstanding this, there was a lack of multi-centre studies, no national guidelines, no research evaluating PEWS as a complex health-care intervention and limited development of any underlying theory; all of which impact on the consistency with which PEWS are defined, implemented and measured for effectiveness.

Contributors

VL was the lead investigator for the original and revised review. VL and AM designed the review protocol, developed and ran the updated search searches, selected and appraised the papers, extracted data and drafted the initial manuscript. RM and JF commented on the protocol, searches, evidence appraisal and revised the manuscript for important intellectual content. All authors approved the final manuscript.

Competing interests

None declared.

47

REFERENCES

1 Confidential Enquiry into Maternal and Child Health (CEMACH). Why children die – a pilot study 2006. London: CEMACH 2008.

2 Robson MJ, Cooper CL, Medicus LA, et al. Comparison of three acute care pediatric early warning scoring tools. *J Pediatr Nurs* 2013;28:e33-e41.

3 McLellan MC, Gauvreau K, Connor JA. Validation of the Cardiac Children's Hospital Early Warning Score: An Early Warning Scoring Tool to Prevent Cardiopulmonary Arrests in Children with Heart Disease. *Congenital Heart Dis* 2013;9:194-202.

4 Endacott R, Kidd T, Chaboyer W, Edington J. Recognition and communication of patient deterioration in a regional hospital: A multi-methods study. *Aust Crit Care* 2007;20:100-105.

5 Van Leuvan C, Mitchell I. Missed opportunities? An observational study of vital sign measurements. *Crit Care Resusc* 2008;10(2):111-115.

6 Tucker K, Brewer TL, Baker RB, et al. Prospective evaluation of a pediatric inpatient early warning scoring system. *J Spec Pediatr Nurs* 2009;14(2):79-85.

7 Chapman S.M, Grocott M.P.W, Franck L.S. Systematic review of paediatric alert criteria for identifying hospitalised children at risk of clinical deterioration. *Intensive Care Med* 2010;36:600-611.

8 Jagt EW. Improving pediatric survival from resuscitation events: the role and organization of hospital-based rapid response systems and code teams. *Cur Pediatr Rev* 2013;9:158-174.

9 Health Information and Quality Authority (HIQA). Investigation into the safety, quality and standards of services provided by the Health Service Executive to patients, including pregnant women, at risk of clinical deterioration, including those provided in University Hospital Galway, and as reflected in the care and treatment provided to Savita Halappanavar. Dublin: Health Information and Quality Authority 2013.

10 Haines C, Perrott M, Weir P. Promoting care for acutely ill children – development and evaluation of a paediatric early warning tool. *Intensive Crit Care Nurs* 2006;22: 73-81.

11 Centre for Reviews and Dissemination. Systematic Reviews: CRD's guidance for undertaking reviews in health care. University of York: Centre for Reviews and Dissemination 2008.

12 National Clinical Effectiveness Committee. *Guideline Developers Manual*. 2013 http://health.gov.ie/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/ncec_guideline_development_manual_january13.pdf (accessed 20 Sept 2016)

13 Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *Ann Intern Med.* 2009;151:264–9.

48

14 Agulnik A, Forbes PW, Stenquist N, et al. Validation of a Pediatric Early Warning Score in hospitalised pediatric oncology and hematopoietic stem cell transplant patients. *Pediatr Crit Care Med* 2016;17 (4):e146-e153.

15 Akre M, Finkelstein M, Erickson M, et al. Sensitivity of the Pediatric Early Warning Score to Identify Patient Deterioration. *Pediatrics* 2010;215:2763-e769.

16 Bell D, Mac A, Ochoa Y, et al. The Texas Children's Hospital Pediatric Advanced Warning Score as a Predictor of Clinical Deterioration in Hospitalized Infants and Children: A Modification of the PEWS Tool. *J Pediatr Nurs* 2013;28:e2-e9.

17 Bolger T, Clarke N, Crowe S, et al. Paediatric Early Warning Trigger: A Cry for Help. *Ir Med J* 2015;108(10):294-6.

18 Bradman K, Maconochie I, Can paediatric early warning score be used as a triage tool in paediatric accident and emergency? *Eur J Emerg Med* 2008;15:359-360.

19 Bradman K, Borland M, Pascoe E, Predicting patient disposition in a paediatric emergency department. *J Paediatr Child Health*. 2014;50(10):39-44.

20 Breslin K, Marx J, Hoffman H, et al. Pediatric Early Warning Score at Time if Emergency Department Disposition is Associated with Level of Care. *Pediatr Emerg Care* 2014;30(2):97-103.

21 Chaiyakulsil C, Pandee U, Validation of Pediatric Early Warning Score in pediatric emergency departments. *Pediatr Int* 2015;57 (4): 694-698.

22 Duncan H, Hutchison J, Parshuram CS, The pediatric early warning system score: A severity of illness score to predict urgent medical need in hospitalized children. *J Crit Care* 2006;21:271-279.

23 Ennis L, Paediatric early warning scores on a children's ward: a quality improvement initiative. *Nurs Child Young People* 2014;26 (7): 25-31.

24 Edwards ED, Powell CVE, Mason BW, et al. Prospective cohort study to test the predictability of the Cardiff and Vale paediatric early warning system. *Arch Dis Child* 2009;94:602-606.

25 Edwards ED, Mason BW, Oliver A, et al. Cohort study to test the predictability of the Melbourne criteria for activation of the medical emergency team. *Arch Dis Child* 2011;96:174-179.

26 Egdell P, Finlay L, Pedley DK, The PAWS score: validation of an early warning scoring system for the initial assessment of children in the emergency department. *Emerg Med J* 2008;25:745-749.

27 Fenix JB, Gillespie CW, Levin A, et al. Comparison of Pediatric Early Warning Score to Physician opinion for deteriorating patients. *Hosp Pediatr* 2015;5(9):474-479.

49

28 Fuijkschot J, Vernhout B, Lemson J, et al. Validation of a paediatric early warning score: first results and implications for usage. *Eur J Pediatr* 2015;174(1):15-21.

29 Gold DL, Mihalov LK, Cohen DM, Evaluating the Pediatric Early Warning Score (PEWS) System for admitted patients in the pediatric emergency department. *Acad Emerg Med* 2014;21:1249-1256.

30 Holmes H, Bhatt R, Koumettou M, et al. Retrospective evaluation of a new neonatal trigger score. *Pediatrics* 2013;131:e837-e842.

31 Kaul M, Snethen J, Kelber ST, et al. Implementation of the Bedside Paediatric Early Warning System (Bedside PEWS) for nurse identification of deteriorating patients. *J Spec Pediatr Nurs* 2014;19:339-349.

32 Mandell IM, Bynum F, Marshall L, et al. Pediatric Early Warning Score and unplanned readmission to the pediatric intensive care unit. *J Crit Care* 2015;30:1090-1095.

33 Miranda JOF, Camargo CL de, Sobrinho CLN, et al. Clinical deterioration in hospitalised children: integrative review of a Paediatric Early Warning Score. *Journal of Nursing UFPE online* 2016;10(3):1128-36.

34 Monaghan A, Detecting and managing deterioration in children. *Paediatr Nurs* 2005;17(1):32-35.

35 Murray JS, Williams LA, Pignataros S, et al. An integrative review of Paediatric Early Warning System Scores. *Pediatr Nurs* 2015;41(4):165-174.

36 Nielsen KR, Migita R, Batra M, et al. Identifying high risk children in the emergency department. *J Intensive Care Med* Published Online First: 10 February 2015. doi: 10.1177/0885066615571893

37 Niu X, Tilford B, Duffy E, et al. Feasibility and reliability of Pediatric Early Warning Score in the Emergency Department. *J Nurs Care Qual* 2016;31(2):161-166.

38 Parshuram CS, Hutchinson J, Middaugh K, Development and initial validation of the Bedside Paediatric Early Warning System score. *Crit Care* 2009;13:R135.

39 Parshuram CS, Duncan HP, Joffe AR, et al. Multicentre validation of the bedside paediatric early warning system score: a severity of illness score to detect evolving critical illness in hospitalised children. *Crit Care* 2011a;15:R184.

40 Parshuram CS, Bayliss A, Reiner J, et al. Implementing the Bedside Paediatric Early Warning System in a community hospital: a prospective observational study. *Paediatr Child Health* 2011b;16(3):e18-e22.

41 Parshuram CS, Dryden-Palmer K, Farrell C, et al. Evaluating processes of care and outcomes of children in hospital (EPOCH): study of protocol for a randomised controlled trial. *Trials* 2015;16:245. Doi:10.1186/s13063-015-0712-3

50

42 Rahman ZH, Leahy NE, Sessler K, et al. A pilot study to validate the Burn Centre Pediatric Early Warning Score tool in clinical practice. *J Burn Care Res* 2016;37(3):160-165.

43 Roland D, Madar J, Connolly G, The Newborn Early Warning (NEW) system: development of an at-risk infant intervention system. *Infant* 2010;6(4):116-120.

44 Roland D, Oliver A, Edwards ED, et al. Use of paediatric early warning systems in Great Britain: has there been a change of practice in the last 7 years? *Arch Dis Child* 2014;99:26–29.

45 Sefton G, McGrath C, Tume L, et al. What impact did a Paediatric Early Warning system have on emergency admissions to the paediatric intensive care unit? An observational cohort study. *Intensive Crit Care Nurs* 2015;31(2):91-9.

46 Seiger N, Maconochie I, Oostenbrink R, et al. Validity of different pediatric early warning scores in the emergency department. *Pediatrics* 2013;132(4):e841-e849.

47 Sinitsky L, Reece A, Question 2: Can PEWS predict serious clinical deterioration in paediatric inpatients? *Arch Dis Child* 2016;101(1):109-113.

48 Skaletzky SM, Raszynski A, Totapally BR, Validation of a Modified Pediatric Early Warning System Score: A Retrospective Case-Control Study. *Clin Pediatr* 2012;51(5):431-435.

49 Solevag AL, Eggen EH, Schroder J, et al. Use of a Modified Pediatric Early Warning Score in a Department of Pediatric and Adolescent Medicine. *PLoS ONE* 2013;8(8): e72534.

50 Tume L, The deterioration of children in ward areas in a specialist children's hospital. *Nurs Crit Care* 2007;12(1):12-19.

51 Zhai H, Brady P, Li Q, et al. Developing and evaluating a machine learning based algorithm to predict the need of pediatric intensive care unit transfer for newly hospitalized children. *Resuscitation* 2014;85:1965-1071.

52 Avent Y, Johnson S, Henderson N, et al. Successful use of a rapid response team in the pediatric oncology outpatient setting. *Jt Comm J Qual Patient Saf* 2010;36(1):43-45.

53 Bonafide CP, Localio R, Roberts KE, et al. Impact of Rapid Response System Implementation on Critical Deterioration Events in Children. *JAMA Pediatr* 2014a;168(1):25-33.

54 Bonafide CP, Roberts KE, Priestley MA, et al. Development of a Pragmatic Measure for Evaluating and Optimizing Rapid Response Systems. *Pediatrics* 2012;129:e874-e881.

55 Brilli RJ, Gibson R, Luria JW, et al. Implementation of a medical emergency team in a large pediatric teaching hospital prevents respiratory and cardiopulmonary arrests outside the intensive care unit. *Pediatr Crit Care Med* 2007;8(3):236-246.

56 Chan PS, Jain R, Nallmothu BK, et al. Rapid response teams: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Arch Intern Med* 2010;170(1):18-26.

57 Chen JG, Kemper, A. R., Odetola, F, et al. Prevalence, characteristics, and opinions of pediatric rapid response teams in the United States. *Hosp Pediatr* 2012;2(3):133-140.

58 Dean B.S, Decker MJ, Hupp D, et al. Condition HELP: A Pediatric Rapid Response Team Triggered by Patients and Parents. *J Healthc Qual* 2008;30(3):28-31.

59 Hanson CC, Randolph GD, Erickson JA, et al. A reduction in cardiac arrests and duration of clinical instability after implementation of a paediatric rapid response system. *Postgrad Med J* 2010;86:314-318.

60 Haque A, Saleem AF, Zaidi S, et al. Experience of Pediatric Rapid Response Team in a Tertiary Care Hospital in Pakistan. *Indian J Pediatr* 2010;77(3): 273-276.

61 Heath G, Montgomery H, Eyre C, et al. Developing a tool to support communication of parental concerns when a child is in hospital. *Healthcare.* Published Online First: 13 January 2016.doi:10.3390/healthcare4010009

62 Hueckel RM, Mericle JM, Martin PL, et al. Implementation of Condition Help Family Teaching and Evaluation of Family Understanding. *J Nurs Care Qual* 2012;27(2):176–181.

63 Humphreys S, Totapally BR, Rapid Response Team calls and unplanned transfers to the pediatric intensive care unit in a pediatric hospital. *Am J Crit Care* 2016;25(1):e9-e13.

64 Hunt EA, Zimmer KP, Rinke ML, et al. Transition from a Traditional Code Team to a Medical Emergency Team and Categorization of Cardiopulmonary Arrests in a Children's Center. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med* 2008;162(2):117-122

65 Kotsakis A, Lobos AT, Parshuram C, et al. Implementation of a Multicenter Rapid Response System in Pediatric Academic Hospitals is Effective. *Pediatrics* 2011;128: 72-78.

66 Lobos AT, Fernandes R, Ramsay T, et al. Team (MET) Activation: Disposition Depends on Who Activates the Team Patient Characteristics and Disposition After Pediatric Medical Emergency. *Hosp Pediatr* 2014;4(2):99-105.

67 Lobos AT, Fernandes R, Williams K, et al. Routine Medical Emergency Team assessments of patients discharged from PICU: description of a Medical Emergency Team follow up program. *Pediatr Crit Care Med* 2015;16(4):359-365.

68 Paciotti B, Roberts KE, Tibbetts KM, et al. Physician Attitudes toward Family-Activated Medical Emergency Teams for Hospitalised Children. *Jt Comm J Qual Patient Saf* 2014;40(4):187-192.

69 Panesar R, Polikoff LA, Harris D, et al. Characteristics and outcomes of pediatric rapid response teams before and after mandatory triggering by an elevated pediatric early warning system (PEWS) score. *Hosp Pediatr* 2014;4(3):135-140.

70 Ray EM, Smith R, Massie S, et al. Family Alert: implementing direct family activation of a pediatric rapid response team. *Jt Comm J Qual Patient Saf* 2009;35(11)575-580.

71 Sen AI, Morgan RW, Morris MC, Variability in the Implementation of Rapid Response Teams at Academic American Pediatric Hospitals. *J Pediatr* 2013;163:1772-1774.

72 Sharek PJ, Parast LM, Leong K, et al. Effect of a Rapid Response Team on Hospital-wide Mortality and Code Rates Outside the ICU in a Children's Hospital. *JAMA* 2007;298(19):2267-2274.

73 Theilen U, Leonard P, Jones P, et al. Regular in situ simulation training of paediatric Medical Emergency Team improves hospital response to deteriorating patients. *Resuscitation* 2013;84:218-222.

74 Tibballs J, Kinney S, Duke T, et al. Reduction of paediatric in-patient cardiac arrest and death with a medical emergency team: preliminary results. *Arch Dis Child* 2005;90(11): 1148-1152.

75 Tibballs J, Kinney S. Reduction of hospital mortality and of preventable cardiac arrest and death on introduction of a pediatric medical emergency team. *Pediatr Crit Care Med* 2009;10(3): 306-312.

76 VandenBerg SD, Hutchison JS, Parshuram CS. A cross-sectional survey of levels of care and response mechanisms for evolving critical illness in hospitalized children. *Pediatrics* 2007;119(4): 940-946.

77 Van Voorhis KT, Willis TS. Implementing a pediatric rapid response system to improve quality and patient safety. *Pediatric Clin North Am* 2009;56(4): 919-933.

78 Wang GS, Erwin N, Zuk J, et al. Retrospective review of emergency response activations during a 13-year period at a tertiary care children's hospital. *J Hosp Med* 2011;6(3):131-135.

79 Winberg H, Nilsson K, Aneman A, Paediatric Rapid Response Systems: A literature review. *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand* 2008;52:890-896.

80 Zenker P, Schlesinger A, Hauck M, et al. Implementation and Impact of a Rapid Response Team in a Children's Hospital. *Jt Comm J Qual Patient Saf* 2007;33(7):418-425.

81 Azzopardi P, Kinney S, Moulden A, et al. Attitudes and barriers to a Medical Emergency Team system at a tertiary paediatric hospital. *Resuscitation* 2011;82:167-174.

82 Bonafide PC, Roberts KE, Weirich CM, et al. Beyond Statistical Prediction: Qualitative Evaluation of the Mechanisms by which Pediatric Early Warning Scores Impact Patient Safety. *J HospMed* 2013a;8(5):248-253.

83 Bonafide CP, Localio AR, Song L, et al. Cost-benefit analysis of a medical emergency team in a children's hospital. *Pediatrics* 2014b;134(2):235-241.

53

84 Brady PW, Goldenhar LM, A qualitative study examining the influences on situation awareness and the identification, mitigation and escalation of recognised patient risk. *BMJ Qual Saf* 2013;0:1-9.

85 Brady PW, Muething S, Kotagal U, et al. Improving situation awareness to reduce unrecognised clinical deterioration and serious safety events. *Pediatrics* 2013;131(1):e298-e308.

86 Demmel KM, Williams L, Flesch L, Implementation of the Pediatric Early Warning Scoring System on a Pediatric Hematology/Oncology Unit. *J Pediatr Oncol Nurs* 2010;27(4):229-240.

87 Duncan HP, Frew E, Short-term health system costs of paediatric in-hospital acute life-threatening events including cardiac arrest. *Resuscitation* 2009;80(5): 529-534.

88 Hayes LW, Dobyns EL, DiGiovine B, et al. A Multicenter Collaborative Approach to Reducing Pediatric Codes Outside the ICU. *Pediatrics* 2012;129(3):785-e791.

89 Kukreti V, Gaiteiro R, Mohseni-Bod H, Implementation of a Pediatric Rapid Response Team: Experience of the Hospital for Sick Children in Toronto. *Indian Pediatr* 2014;51:11-15.

90 Lobos AT, Costello J, Gilleland J, et al. An implementation strategy for a multicentre pediatric rapid response system in Ontario. *Jt Comm J Qual Patient Saf* 2010;36(6):271-280.

91 McCrory MC, Aboumatar H, Custer JW, et al. "ABC-SBAR" Training improves simulated critical patient hand-off by pediatric interns. *Pediatr Emerg Care* 2012;28(6):538-543.

92 McKay H, Mitchell I, Sinn K, et al. Effect of a multifaceted intervention on documentation of vital signs and staff communication regarding deteriorating paediatric patients. *J Paediatr Child Health* 2013;49;48–56

93 McLellan M, Connors JA, The cardiac children's hospital early warning score (C-CHEWS). *J Pediatr Nurs* 2013;28:171-178.

94 Randhawa S, Roberts-Turner R, Woronick K, et al. Implementing and Sustaining Evidence-Based Nursing Practice to Reduce Pediatric Cardiopulmonary Arrest. *West J Nurs Res* 2011;33(3):443-456.

95 Roberts KE, Bonafide CP, Paine CW, et al. Barriers to calling for urgent assistance despite a comprehensive pediatric rapid response system. *Am J Crit Care* 2014;23(3):223-229.

96 Tume LN, Sefton G, Arrowsmith P. Teaching paediatric ward teams to recognise and manage the deteriorating child. *Nurs Crit Care* 2013;19(4):196-203.

97 Fleming S, Thompson M, Stevens R, et al. Normal ranges of heart rate and respiratory rate in children from birth to 18 years of age: a systematic review of observational studies. *Lancet* 2011;377:1011-1018.

98 Bonafide CP, Brady PW, Keren R, et al. Development of Heart and Respiratory Rate Percentile Curves for Hospitalized Children. *Pediatrics* 2013b;131;e1150.

99 Hueckel RM, Turi JL, Cheoifetz IM, et al. *Beyond Rapid Response Teams: Instituting a "Rover Team" Improves the Management of At-Risk Patients, Facilitates Proactive Interventions, and Improves Outcomes.* http://www.ahrq.gov/professionals/quality-patient-safety/patient-safety-resources/resources/advances-in-patient-safety-2/vol3/advances-hueckel_27.pdf (Accessed 20 Sept 2016)

100 PUMA HS&DR - 12/178/17: *PUMA - Paediatric early warning system (PEWS): Utilisation and Mortality Avoidance. A prospective, mixed methods, before and after study identifying the evidence base for the core components of an effective PEWS and the development of an implementation package for implementation and use in the UK* http://www.nets.nihr.ac.uk/projects/hsdr/1217817 (Accessed 10 Sept 2016)

Online Supplementary Appendix 1: Population, Intervention, Comparison, Outcomes, Study Design

PICO	Indicative Terms
Population	- Newborn/neonate/infant/child/adolescent/young person patient - Newborn/neonate/child/adolescent/young person acute patient - Critically ill/deteriorating paediatric/pediatric patient - Sepsis/septic infection/shock in newborn/neonate/infant/child/adolescent/young person patient
Intervention	- Neonatal/Paediatric/Pediatric Early Warning Score/System/Tool/Chart - Neonatal/Paediatric/Pediatric Modified Early Warning Score/System/Tool/Chart - Bedside PEWS/BPEWS - Parent Activated Early Warning Systems - Sepsis Six - Track and Trigger Systems/Tools - Instrument Validity/Reliability/Evaluation - Calling Criteria/Rapid Response/Escalation Protocols/ Communication Tools/Situation Awareness - Education/Training/ALERT™/COMPASS©
Comparison#	- Neonatal/Paediatric/Pediatric Early Warning Score/System/Tool/Chart - Neonatal/Paediatric/Pediatric Modified Early Warning Score/System/Tool/Chart - Bedside PEWS/BPEWS - Parent Activated Early Warning Systems - Sepsis Six - Track and Trigger Systems/Tools - Validity/Reliability/Evaluation - Calling Criteria/Rapid Response/Escalation Protocols/ Communication Tools/Situation Awareness - Education/Training/ALERT™/COMPASS© (comparison against each other or with no intervention)
Outcome	***Clinical outcomes*** Detection, and/or timely identification, of clinical deterioration of the newborn/neonate/child/adolescent/young person patient and all relevant *sequalae*; and diagnostic accuracy Instrument sensitivity/specificity ***Economic outcomes*** Costs and results - Healthcare resource use - Training/Education costs - Staff time costs - ICU outreach costs/additional referrals - Results e.g. number of unplanned ICU admissions; number of cardio-pulmonary arrests; ongoing care costs, hospital mortality - Immediate call to resuscitation team/MET (medical emergency team) team/CCRT (Critical Care Response Team) - Cost savings - Cost-effectiveness measures (e.g. ICER)
Study Design	Not specified as no limits were applied to study type/designs

Online Supplementary Appendix 2: Original PEWS Tools

PEWS Tool	Origin	Development
Brighton-Paediatric Early Warning Score (Monaghan 2005) [33]	Royal Alexandra Hospital for Sick Children (UK)	Multidisciplinary working group; developed on available adult systems (not specified)
Pediatric Early Warning System score (Duncan et al. 2006) [21]	Hospital for Sick Children Toronto (Canada)	Expert group of nurses utilised a modified Delphi approach to achieve consensus on parameters and ranges
Paediatric Early Warning (PEW) Tool (Haines et al. 2006) [8]	Bristol Royal Hospital for Children (UK)	Expert group; pilot tool based on un-validated tool developed at Derriford Hospital Plymouth with modifications from criteria developed at Melbourne Children's Hospital Australia & similar adult systems. Modifications made by expert opinion of investigating team including study research nurse, two supervisors, a PICU intensivist & PICU consultant nurse
Paediatric Advanced Warning Score (Edgell et al 2008) [25]	James Cook University Hospital (UK)	Not reported
Bedside Paediatric Early Warning System Score (Parshuram et al. 2009) [37]	Hospital for Sick Children Toronto (Canada)	Expert group & statistical methods (evaluated alongside score comparison & score progression)
Cardiff & Vale Paediatric Early Warning System (Edwards et al. 2009) [23]	University Hospital of Wales (UK)	Developed using physiological parameters based on 2005 advanced paediatric life support guidelines for recognition of sick child Expert group - general paediatricians, regional nurse educator & paediatric intensivist –reviewed other EWS to modify age-related normal ranges & identify other parameters for inclusion; the group reached a consensus opinion to agree 8 parameters & trigger criteria
Newborn Early Warning System (Roland et al 2010) [42]	Neonatal Unit, Derriford Hospital, Plymouth (UK)	Not reported
Cardiac Children's Hospital Early Warning Score (McLellan et al. 2013) [4]	Boston Children's Hospital (USA)	Expert group; developed from CHEWS - a multidisciplinary panel assessed which risk factors were unique to cardiovascular patients & incorporated these risks into new tool
Neonatal Trigger Score (Holme et al 2013) [29]	Neonatal Unit London (UK)	Developed by expert group (5 consultant neonatologists, NICU nurses & midwives) consensus & guidance from Neonatal Life Support, National Institute for Clinical Excellence Postnatal Care & a neonatal scoring chart

Online Supplementary Appendix 3: Performance criteria of PEW detection systems

Citation	PEWS	Marker of clinical deterioration /endpoint	Threshold /score cut-point	AUROC	Sensitivity	Specificity	Positive predictive value (PPV)	Negative predictive value (NPV)
Agulnik et al. 2016 [13]	Children's Hospital EWS Boston Children's Hospital	Unplanned PICU transfer	5	0.96	66%	98%	NR*	NR
Akre et al. 2010 [14]	Modified Brighton PEWS	RRT call Code blue call	≥4 or domain score of 3	NR	85%	NR	NR	NR
Bradman & Maconochie 2008 [17]	Brighton PEWS	Need for hospital admission	≥4 ≥2	NR	24% 37%	96% 88%	NR	NR
Breslin et al. 2014 [19]	Brighton PEWS	Need for hospital admission	≥1 ≥3	NR	63% 56%	68% 72%	NR	NR
Chaiyakulsil & Pandee 2015 [20]	PAWS	Need for hospital admission	≥1	0.71	78%	60%	28%	95%
Duncan et al. 2006 [21]	PEW system score (Birmingham/ Toronto)	Code blue call - require resuscitation to treat actual or impending CPA	5	0.90	78%	95%	4.2%	NR
Edwards et al. 2009 [23]	Cardiff and Vale PEWS	Respiratory or cardiac arrest PHDU/PICU admission Death	≥1 (single parameter) ≥2 (multiple parameter)	0.86	89% 70%	64% 90%	2.2% 5.9%	99.8% 99.7%
Edwards et al. 2011 [24]	Melbourne criteria for activation (MAC) (Adopted from Tibballs)	PHDU/PICU admission; death	≥1	0.79	68%	83%	3.6%	99.7%
Edgell et al. 2008 [25]	PAWS	Need for hospital admission	3	0.86	70%	90%	NR	NR
Fuijkschot et al. 2014 [27]	Modified Bedside PEWS from Parshurum	Unplanned ICU admission Need for emergency medical interventions	≥8	NR	67%	88%	NR	NR
Gold et al. 2014 [28]	Monaghan PEWS	Need for hospital admission	1	0.79	78%	68%	0.21	0.97
Haines et al. 2006 [8]	Bristol PEWS	Escalation to higher level of care	≥1	NR	99%	66%	NR	NR
Holme et al. 2013 [29]	Neonatal Trigger Score (NTS)	Admission to NICU	≥2	0.92	79.3%	93.5%	NR	NR
Mandell et al. 2015 [31]	Modified Brighton PEWS	Unplanned PICU readmission	≥2 (@PICU discharge) ≥2 (1st PEWS on ward)	0.77	71% 76%	58% 56%	NR	NR
McLellan et al. 2013 [4]	C-CHEWS	CPA Unplanned ICU transfer	≥3 ≥5	0.92	95% 67%	76% 94%	50.8% 72.9%	98.4% 91.7%
Nielsen et al. 2015 [35]	MPEWS (modified from Duncan)	Ward-to-PICU transfer (post ED admission)	>7	0.69	18%	97%	NR	NR
Parshuram et al. 2009 [37]	Bedside PEWS	Urgent ICU admission without a code blue call	≥8	0.91	82%	93%	NR	NR

Parshuram et al. 2011a [38]	Bedside PEWS	Urgent ICU admission without code blue Code blue calls	≥7 8	0.87	64% 57%	91% 94%	9%	NR
Robson et al. 2013 [1]	PEW System Score (by Duncan)	EMRT call for impending or actual CPA	5	0.85	86.6%	72.2%	NR	NR
Seiger et al. 2013[45]	10 different PEWS	ICU admission Hospital admission	1-3	0.60-0.82 0.56-0.68	61-94% 36-86%	25%-87% 27%-90%	NR	NR
Skaletzky et al. 2012 [47]	Modified Brighton PEWS	Transfer to PICU	2.5	81%	62%	89%	NR	NR
Tucker et al. 2009 [2]	Modified Brighton PEWS	Unplanned transfer to PICU	≥3 ≥4	89%	90.2% ≥78%	74.4% ≥82%	5.8% 7.2%	99.8% 99.5%
Zhai et al. 2014 [50]	Bedside PEWS Monaghan PEWS	Need for PICU transfer	7 2	0.82 0.74	74% 68%	72% 82%	0.021 0.023	NR
Performance criteria		**Explanation**						
Sensitivity		Ability of a PEWS tool to correctly identify children who are clinical deteriorating (however this clinical deterioration is defined such as cardio-pulmonary arrest, unplanned ICU transfer/admission etc.). It is the probability of testing positive (scoring high) on the PEWS screening tool when the outcome measure is truly present.						
Specificity		Ability of a PEWS tool to demonstrate a low score in children who are not clinical deteriorating. It is the probability of testing negative (scoring low) when the outcome measure is truly absent. Low specificity indicates high rate of false positives.						
AUROC (area under receiver operating characteristic curve)		The *receiver operating characteristic curve (ROC)* demonstrates the balance between sensitivity and specificity. As sensitivity increases specificity will decrease and vice versa. A tool that correctly identifies children who are clinical deteriorating and those who are not with 100% accuracy would give an area under the ROC (AUROC) of one. The closer AUROC is to one, the better the tool will perform in correctly identifying child clinical deterioration.						
Positive predictive value (PPV)		Probability that a child is truly clinically deteriorating given that they scored a high PEWS.						
Negative predictive value (PPV)		Probability that a child is not clinically deteriorating given that they scored low on the PEWS.						

*NR=not reported

Online Supplementary Appendix 4: Overview of PEW education interventions

Title of intervention	RESPOND	COMPASS	Rapid Response: why, when and how
Content	Multi-professional 1-day Background evidence of paediatric deterioration on wards & use of EWT Brief key note lecture on assessing deteriorating child on the ward Group work to examine real (anonymized) patient case scenarios (critical analysis of case & practice escalation of concern using SBAR) Short interactive 'management of condition' lectures Clips from in-house DVD produced to improve knowledge & skill of junior staff in undertaking clinical observations	Multifaceted e-learning package 3 hour face-to-face low fidelity simulation package	Participation in video-recorded mock patient hand-off (simulated) Attendance at 45-minute didactic session discussing the rapid response team at the institution as well as learning the mnemonic: ABC-SBAR Participation in 2nd video-recorded simulated patient handoff (approx. 1 hour after 1st simulated hand-off)
Target audience	Ward nurses & junior doctors (foundation years 1 & 2)		Paediatric interns
Aim	Improve children's ward based teams' ability to recognize & act on patient deterioration earlier	Assist health professionals detect changes in vital signs & recognise child clinical deterioration	
Primary Outcome/s	Preventing of cardiopulmonary arrest & intensive care unit admissions	Daily frequency of vital signs measured Documented incidences of health professional communication Documented incidences of medical reviews	Total score on intern's SBAR evaluation tool

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

PRISMA 2009 Checklist

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Reported on page #
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.	√ 1
ABSTRACT			
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary including, as applicable: background; objectives; data sources; study eligibility criteria, participants, and interventions; study appraisal and synthesis methods; results; limitations; conclusions and implications of key findings; systematic review registration number.	√ 2
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.	√ 4,5
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).	√ 5
METHODS			
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate if a review protocol exists, if and where it can be accessed (e.g., Web address), and, if available, provide registration information including registration number.	√ 6
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify study characteristics (e.g., PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale.	√ 6
Information sources	7	Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and date last searched.	√ 6
Search	8	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	√ 6
Study selection	9	State the process for selecting studies (i.e., screening, eligibility, included in systematic review, and, if applicable, included in the meta-analysis).	√ 6,7
Data collection process	10	Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	√ 7
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made.	√ 6
Risk of bias in individual studies	12	Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies (including specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), and how this information is to be used in any data synthesis.	√ 7
Summary measures	13	State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means).	na
Synthesis of results	14	Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, if done, including measures of consistency (e.g., I^2) for each meta-analysis.	√ 7

PRISMA 2009 Checklist

Page 1 of 2

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Reported on page #
Risk of bias across studies	15	Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies).	√ 7
Additional analyses	16	Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified.	na
RESULTS			
Study selection	17	Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram.	√ 8,9
Study characteristics	18	For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations.	√ 9
Risk of bias within studies	19	Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12).	√ 9
Results of individual studies	20	For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot.	√ 10-37
Synthesis of results	21	Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency.	√ 38-41
Risk of bias across studies	22	Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15).	na
Additional analysis	23	Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]).	na
DISCUSSION			
Summary of evidence	24	Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers).	√ 42-45
Limitations	25	Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias).	√ 45
Conclusions	26	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research.	√ 45-46
FUNDING			
Funding	27	Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review.	√ 47

From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(6): e1000097. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed1000097

For more information, visit: **www.prisma-statement.org**.

BMJ Open

Paediatric Early Warning Systems for detecting and responding to clinical deterioration in children: a systematic review

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Paediatric Early Warning Systems for detecting and responding to clinical deterioration in children: a systematic review

Authors: Veronica Lambert[1], Anne Matthews[1], Rachel MacDonell[2], John Fitzsimons[2]

[1]School of Nursing and Human Sciences, Dublin City University, Dublin, Ireland
[2]Health Service Executive, Ireland

Corresponding author:
Veronica Lambert
School of Nursing and Human Sciences
Dublin City University
Dublin, Ireland
Tel: +353 1 7007161
Email: veronica.lambert@dcu.ie

Word Count: 3975

Key words: PEWS; paediatric early warning system; clinical deterioration; children; systematic review

Abstract

Objective: To systematically review the available evidence on paediatric early warning systems (PEWS) for use in acute paediatric healthcare settings for the detection of, and timely response to, clinical deterioration in children.

Method: The electronic databases PubMed, MEDLINE, CINAHL, EMBASE and Cochrane were searched systematically from inception up to August 2016. Eligible studies had to refer to PEWS, inclusive of rapid response systems and teams. Outcomes had to be specific to the identification of and/or response to clinical deterioration in children (including neonates) in paediatric hospital settings (including emergency departments). Two review authors independently completed the screening and selection process, the quality appraisal of the retrieved evidence and data extraction; with a third reviewer resolving any discrepancies, as required. Results were narratively synthesised.

Results: From a total screening of 2,742 papers, 90 papers, of varied designs, were identified as eligible for inclusion in the review. Findings revealed that PEWS are extensively used internationally in paediatric inpatient hospital settings. However, robust empirical evidence on which PEWS is most effective was limited. The studies examined did however highlight some evidence of positive directional trends in improving clinical and process based outcomes for clinically deteriorating children. Favourable outcomes were also identified for enhanced multi-disciplinary team work, communication and confidence in recognising, reporting and making decisions about child clinical deterioration.

Conclusion: Despite many studies reporting on the complexity and multi-faceted nature of PEWS, no evidence was sourced which examined PEWS as a complex health-care intervention. Future research needs to investigate PEWS as a complex multi-faceted socio-technical system that is embedded in a wider safety culture influenced by many organisational and human factors. PEWS should be embraced as one piece of a larger multi-faceted safety framework that will develop and grow over time with strong governance and leadership, targeted training, on-going support and continuous improvement.

Strengths and limitations of this study

- This review systematically and collectively synthesises the available evidence on the multiple components of PEWS.

- The review highlights that PEWS should be embraced as one piece of a larger multi-faceted safety framework.

- Future research needs to investigate PEWS as a complex multi-faceted socio-technical system embedded in a wider safety culture.

- Due to heterogeneous research designs assessing quality across eligible studies was limited.

- While no strong evidence underpinning any one PEW system was available emerging work should contribute to this evidence base.

3

BACKGROUND

It is known that children who die or deteriorate unexpectedly in the hospital setting will often have observable features in the period before the seriousness of their condition is recognised. A seminal study of paediatric mortality in the United Kingdom estimated that approximately 1 in 5 children who die in hospital have avoidable factors leading to death and up to half of children have potentially avoidable factors.[1] The report concluded that *"there should be ways of telling if something is wrong with a child as early as possible, for example, an early warning scoring system".*[1] Other studies have examined the signs (physiological and behavioural) of deterioration that may be present in the period preceding a cardiopulmonary arrest,[2, 3] and the fact that these features are often not recognised or acted upon in a timely fashion by hospital staff.[4, 5]   Recent years have also witnessed an increased risk of paediatric cardiopulmonary arrest, and its associated mortality, in acute healthcare settings largely as a consequence of increased acuity of care and higher dependency on technology.[2] Although the percentage of paediatric cardiopulmonary arrests for inpatient admissions has been reported as low (e.g. 0.7-3%),[6, 7] survival to discharge for children that experience in-hospital cardiopulmonary arrest is poor (11-37%).[3, 6]

Early warning scores are generally defined as bedside 'track and trigger' tools to help alert staff to clinically deteriorating children by periodic observation of physiological parameters, generation of a numeric score and predetermined criteria for escalating urgent assistance with a clear framework for communication. In using these physiological track and trigger systems the goal is to ensure timely recognition of patients with potential or established critical illness and to ensure a timely and appropriate response from skilled staff. Critical to early warning scores are four integrated components which work together to provide a comprehensive safety system for clinically deteriorating patients and those that are most likely to identify and manage patients at highest risk for cardiac or respiratory arrest; (i) the afferent component which detects clinical deterioration and triggers an appropriate response; (ii) the efferent component which consists of the personnel and resources providing the response (e.g. medical emergency team); (iii) the process improvement component containing elements such as auditing/monitoring/evaluation to enhance patient care and safety and (iv) the governance/administrative component focusing on the organisational leadership, safety culture, education and processes required to implement and sustain the system.[8] This highlights the need to view early warning tools as more than just a 'score', rather, they are

4

part of a multifaceted 'system' approach based on the implementation of several complementary safety interventions to improve child patient safety and clinical outcomes.

In Ireland, a 2013 patient safety review by the Health Information and Quality Authority (HIQA) into the unexpected death of a young woman in a maternity setting identified several care failures.[9] These included a lack of provision of basic fundamental care, failure to recognise risk of clinical deterioration, failure to act or escalate concerns about deterioration to appropriately qualified clinicians and lack of detail in medical record documentation about clinical status and potential risk of clinical deterioration. This led to a request from the Minister for Health that the Department of Health's National Clinical Effectiveness Committee commission and quality assure a number of National Clinical Guidelines; including early warning scores for adult, maternity and paediatric healthcare settings.

For paediatrics, this request presented several design challenges including the need for an observation tool that would work in all paediatric care settings (secondary and specialist care) and a requirement to align with the Adult and Maternity scores. Additionally the application of early warning scores to paediatric patients is more complex than in adults. There are several reasons for this: variation in age-specific thresholds for normal and abnormal physiology; children's inability or difficulty in articulating how or what they feel; children's physiological compensatory mechanisms; staff training issues and the need for more focused attention on respiratory deterioration.[10] Finally, although many Paediatric Early Warning Systems (PEWS) have been developed and tested, uncertainty remains as to which system, or system feature, is most useful for paediatric patients. Even the concept of PEWS as a system (i.e. the application of all four components in parallel as described above) is poorly developed.

The aim of this review was to systematically identify and synthesise available evidence on PEWS in acute paediatric healthcare settings for the detection of, and timely response to, clinical deterioration in children. The review questions were set by the Irish Department of Health who commissioned this review:

1. What is the available evidence on the effectiveness of different PEW detection systems?
2. What evidence exists on the effectiveness of PEW response mechanisms, and what interventions are used?

5

3. What evidence exists on PEWS implementation strategies/interventions?

METHODS

Design

This review was conducted and reported in accordance with the Centre for Reviews and Dissemination guidance for undertaking systematic reviews in healthcare,[11] the National Clinical Effectiveness Committee Guideline Development Manual [12] and the Preferred Reporting in Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) criteria.[13]

Data sources and search strategy

The following electronic databases PubMed, MEDLINE, CINAHL, EMBASE, and Cochrane (inclusive of Cochrane Database of Systematic Review; Database of Abstracts of Review Effects, and CENTRAL - Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials) were systematically searched from database inception up to August 2016 using various combinations of controlled vocabulary (e.g. MeSH) and free text words guided by our PICOS parameters (see online supplementary Appendix 1). The search was limited by language (English). For unpublished research reports, grey literature databases, trial registers and national/international professional organisations and association websites were searched. To retrieve evidence based clinical guidelines electronic guideline clearinghouses were searched, scoping searches of Google and Bing were performed and a consultation process conducted with key paediatric experts and paediatric hospitals internationally. Additional literature was sourced by contacting reference study authors and experts in the field and scanning bibliographies of all included papers.

Screening and selection process

Eligible papers had to refer to PEWS, inclusive of rapid reponse systems and teams. Outcomes had to be specific to the identification of and/or response to clinical deterioration in child patients (including neonates) in paediatric hospital settings (including emergency departments). No study design restrictions were applied. We excluded papers that focused on paediatric community health settings; PEWS specific to intra and/or inter-hospital transfer and/or transportation of critically ill children; trigger tools for identification of adverse events and/or harm caused by medical interventions; severity of illness scales and patient classification systems specifically for identifying illness acuity and mortality (except in cases

6

where such studies included PEWS as comparative interventions) and studies which included both child and adult populations when child specific data could not be exclusively extracted.

For stage 1 screening, two reviewers independently assessed each title and abstract retrieved from the electronic searches for relevance. Any discrepancies were resolved by discussion and consensus with a third reviewer. If no abstract was available, the full-text paper was sourced and assessed. For studies deemed to meet the inclusion criteria, full texts of the studies were obtained. Full text papers were independently assessed by two reviewers against the inclusion criteria before a final decision regarding inclusion/exclusion was confirmed. Any discrepancies were resolved by discussion and consensus with a third reviewer. Reasons for excluding studies from the review were noted (see Figure 1).

Appraisal of the level of evidence

In an attempt to conduct a comprehensive review all studies which met the inclusion criteria were included regardless of quality. Two reviewers appraised and classified the level of evidence of the included studies in accordance with the Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelines Network (SIGN) criteria for assessment of studies based on type of study design. Assessing comparative quality across eligible studies proved difficult due to the heterogeneous nature of the research methodologies employed; including disparate research designs, different ranges for collecting data over time periods (from months to years), localised small case and comparative group selections, and diverse clinical contexts ranging from general medical and surgical units to specialised settings such as oncology, cardiac, endocrine, and rehabilitation units.

Data extraction and synthesis

Two reviewers independently extracted and managed data from the included studies. Any discrepancies were resolved through consultation with a third reviewer. A data extraction table was developed to retrieve information pertaining to each study setting, aim, design, sample, intervention and main outcomes/findings. In line with the review research questions the studies were segregated by PEW detection systems, response mechanisms and implementation processes. All data were narratively synthesised as it was not possible to conduct a meta-analysis and/or a meta-synthesis because of the heterogeneity of evidence retrieved including non-comparative research designs and diversity of systems, approaches and methods adopted in developing and implementing PEWS in paediatric contexts.

7

RESULTS

Overall search and selection results

A total of 2,742 papers were identified as potentially eligible for inclusion in the review. Following first screening of titles and abstracts 2,616 papers wre excluded because they were adult focused, discussion papers, commentaries, conference abstracts and/or duplicate papers. Full texts of the remaining 126 papers were obtained. On second screening of these 126 full text papers a further 57 papers were excluded because they were adult focused, both child and adult focused in which it was not possible to segregate child and adult data, not specifically focused on the outcome of clinical deterioration, wrong setting (i.e. not inpatient), concentrated on clinical deterioration at point of transportation, examined illness severity or acuity or were discussion papers, commentaries or conference abstracts. This left 69 papers that met the inclusion criteria. An additional 21 papers were sourced through secondary citations, personal communications with reference authors/experts in the field and web-resources. Subsequently, 90 papers fulfilled the eligibility criteria. Figure 1, an adapted PRISMA flow chart, visually displays the search and selection process.

Characteristics of included studies

The studies emanated from the USA (n=46), the UK (n=19), Canada (n=10), Canada & the UK (n=1), Australia (n=5), the Netherlands (n=2), Ireland (n=2), Norway (n=1), Pakistan (n=1), Sweden (n=1), Thailand (n=1) and South America (n=1). The majority of the studies were observational in design, and included 13 cohort studies, 11 case control, 8 before and after and 6 cross-sectional surveys. There were 8 review papers and 3 interruprted time series quasi-experimental studies. The remainder were chart/database reviews (n=23), quality improvement initiatives (n=9), qualitative studies (n=4) or case reports (n=1). There was 1 feasibility and reliability testing study, 1 cost-analysis exercise, 1 protocol and 1 course evaluation survey. Of the 90 included papers, 45 focused on PEW detection systems [2-3, 6-7, 10, 14-53] ; 29 examined PEW response mechanisms [8, 54-81] and 16 reported on PEW implementation strategies [82-97] (see online supplementary Appendix 2 for a summary of these studies including the level of evidence and rationale for judgement).

Review question 1: What is the available evidence on the effectiveness of different PEW detection systems?

Thirty-eight primary studies reported on original [3, 10, 23, 25, 27, 31, 35, 39, 44, 46] (see online supplementary Appendix 3) and/or adopted/modified [2, 6, 14-21, 24, 26, 28-30, 33-, 37-38, 40-43, 47-48, 50-53] PEW detection systems for use in paediatric in-patient settings.Twenty-three of these 38 studies reported on the effectiveness of PEW detection systems using the performance criteria of sensitivity, specificity, receiver operating characteristic curve, positive predictive value and/or negative predictive value.[2-3, 6, 10, 14-15, 18, 20-21, 23, 25-27, 29-31, 33, 37, 39-40, 48, 50, 53] Diversity in PEW physiological (and other) parameters and differences in age dependent vital sign reference ranges made it difficult to compare and contrast performance criteria. To enable some comparisons to be made, further studies were excluded if they; were from specialist units if only one study was published, only reported on inter- and intra- rater agreement, had less than 100 cases and did not report data on both sensitivity and specificity. Figure 2 shows the diagnostic predictive accuracy of PEW detection systems from 11 studies [6, 10, 14, 18, 20-21, 25-26, 30, 40, 50]. This illustrates that the effectiveness of PEW detection systems demonstrated wide ranging sensitivity and specificity largely as a consequence of different settings adopting and self-regulating varying endpoint or surrogate markers for clinical deterioration (i.e. cardio-pulmonary arrest, PICU admission, mortality, and interventions) and different standards for cut-off/threshold scores.

Review question 2: What evidence exists on the effectiveness of PEW response mechanisms, and what interventions are used?

Table 1 provides an overview of the evidence on PEW response interventions. Across 18 primary studies the main PEW response intervention in use was health professional activated rapid response systems (RRS) incorporating paediatric rapid response teams (RRTs) or medical emergency teams (METs) [54-56, 60-61, 64-68, 70, 73-76, 78-79, 81]. Where reported, RRS were available to be activated by any staff member 24 hours/day, 7-days a week. The staffing composition of the majority of RRT/METs included a critical care nurse, physician and respiratory therapist. The most common RRT/MET activation criteria were cardiovascular, respiratory and neurological status, alongside staff and family concern. Studies examining the effectiveness of RRSs reported on a number of clinical and process outcome data e.g. cardio/respiratory arrest (CPA) rates, mortality rates unplanned PICU transfers/admissions interventions required (i.e. intubation, mechanical ventilation,

9

inotropes), and MET/ code blue activations. Collectively, findings revealed mixed evidence on the effectiveness of RRSs. For instance, although four studies reported a significant reduction in CPA rates and five studies found a significant reduction in mortality, there was an equal number of studies reporting non-significant findings.

Five papers reported on quality improvement initiatives for families to activate the RRS.[59, 62-63, 69, 71] Findings revealed that families infrequently activate the RRS but when they do the reason is largely as a consequence of communication failures rather than critical care deterioration. While physicians value family input and depend on families to explain their child's baseline condition and identify subtle changes in their child, physicians are apprehensive towards family activated RRS because of potential misuse of resources, undermining of the clinician-family therapeutic relationship, increased family anxiety/burden and a need to provide knowledge/training to families.

Table 1: Overview of evidence on PEW response mechanisms

Level of evidence	Type of study	Intervention	Availability	Composition	Activation criteria	Outcomes	Effectiveness	References
2+ well conducted cohort study (n=2)	Cohort (n=2)	Paediatric RRT (n=1) Paediatric MET (n=1) Weekly insitu simulation team training (n=1)	24 hours/7 days a week (n=11) *Not reported (n=6)* Activation by any staff member (n=10) *Not reported (n=7)* Activation by parent/family member (n=10)	4 team members incl. PICU respiratory therapist, critical care nurse, PICU physician & hospital manager (n=1) *Not reported (n=1)*	Cardiovascular, respiratory & neurological changes, staff concern/worry (n=1) *Not reported (n=1)*	*Clinical* Cardiopulmonary arrest (n=2) Unplanned transfer to PICU (n=1) Mortality rates (n=1) *Process* MET/code blue activations (n=1)	Significant reduction in hospital mortality rates (n=2) Significant reduction in code rates (n=1)	73-74
2- high risk of non-causal relationships / high risk of confounding or bias (n=9)	Interrupted time series (n=2) Cohort (n=4) Before & after (n=3)	RRS incl. MET & EWS (n=2) Paediatric RRT (n=2) RR calls (n=1) Paediatric MET (n=1) RRS using physician led MET (n=3) Follow up 2 MET visits within 48 hours post PICU discharge (n=1)	*Not reported (n=11)* RSS includes follow-up program for all patients after PICU discharge (n=1)	2 members incl. PICU respiratory therapist & critical care nurse (n=1) 3 team members (+ PICU physician or paediatric resident) (n=5) 4 members (+ paediatric critical care resident) (n=1) 9 members (+ pharmacist, assistant residents, intern, security officer, chaplin) (n=1) *Not reported (n=1)*	Haemodynamic changes (n=1) Cardiovascular, respiratory & neurological changes (n=6), Staff concern/worry (n=5) Parent/family concern (n=4) Other – seizures (n=2), lethargy (n=1) *Not reported (n=2)*	*Clinical* Unplanned transfer to PICU (n=6) Mortality rates (n=5) Cardiac and/or respiratory arrest (CPA) (n=5) Interventions required (n=3) *Process* MET/code blue activations (n=7) Time from ICU transfer to life saving interventions (n=2) Time to transfer to ICU (n=1) Time of RR calls (n=2) Disposition of patient after RR call (n=1) MET assessment (activations	Reduction in cardiac and/or respiratory arrests but not significant (n=4) Reduction in death rates but not significant (n=2) No difference in CPA and/or mortality (n=1) No difference in mortality rates (n=2) Statistically significant more activations during day time (n=1) Mortality rate significantly higher for children transferred to PICU from acute care wards than other PICU admissions (n=1)	54-55, 60, 64-68, 81

11

						& planned and unplanned visits) (n=1)		
3 non-analytic case review (n=7)	Chart review (n=4) Database review (n=2) Case examples (n=1)	Paediatric RRT (n=2) Paediatric MET (n=3) Paediatric RRS (n=1) Paediatric Early Response Team (PERT) (n=1) Emergency Response Team (ERT) (n=1)		1 member – PICU physician (n=1) 3 members incl. PICU respiratory therapist, critical care nurse & senior paediatric resident (n=1) 4-5 members (varied + charge nurse, manager, pharmacist) (n=5)	Cardiovascular changes (n=4) Respiratory & neurological changes (n=6), Staff concern/worry (n=6) Parent/family concern (n=5) Other – pain, agitation, seizures (n=1) *Not reported (n=1)*	*Clinical* Unplanned transfer to PICU (n=5) Cardiac and/or respiratory arrest (n=4) Mortality rates (n=2) Interventions required (n=2) Cardiac arrest (n=1) *Process* MET/code blue activations (n=7) Time from ICU transfer to life saving interventions (n=1) Time of RR calls (n=3)	Significant reduction in CPA (n=3) Significant reduction in mortality rates (n=3) Reduction in mortality rates but not significant (n=1) Risk of cardiac arrest & mortality decreased but not significant (n=1) No change in number of code blue calls (n=1) No change in mortality (n=1) Trend towards decreased frequency of PICU transfers (n=1) Unplanned admissions to PICU increased but not significant (n=1) Statistically significant more activations during day time (n=1)	56, 61, 70, 75-76, 78-79

12

Review question 3: What evidence exists on PEWS implementation strategies/interventions?

Table 2 provides an overview of evidence from 16 studies reporting on PEW implementation strategies/interventions. The evidence was diverse in approach, ranging from the adoption of social marketing principles to quality/performance improvement initiatives to chart reviews, qualitative studies and pre-post implementation surveys. Comparative evaluations were therefore difficult and no conclusions were drawn on an optimal implementation strategy to influence change in clinical/process outcomes (or indeed what the best clinical/process outcomes are to measure). Despite the limited evidence, valuable insights were gleaned into cultural, sociotechnical, education/training and organisational issues impacting, either positively or negatively, on the effective implementation of PEWS. For example, a number of qualitative and quality improvement studies highlighted the importance of creating an empowering culture that fosters trusting relationships, open communication and supportive teamwork. [83, 85, 87, 90, 96] Working through real-life cases and using a multi-professional approach to PEWS education/training were positively evaluated for improving doctor-nurse communication, enhanced team-work and better use of the SBAR (Situation, Background, Assessment, Recommendations) communication technique.[97] Significant improvements were also found in documented vital signs, communication episodes and intern hand-offs after ABC-SBAR (communication technique) training.[92-93] The integration of situation awareness interventions into EWS was also recommended to recognise experienced clinicians tacit knowledge (i.e. watcher/clinician gut feeling) and the incorporation of structures, such as huddles, to proactively identify risk and communicate concerns at bedside, unit and organisational level.[85-86]

No published evidence for the resource implications of a complete PEW system (detection, response and implementation) was found. Bonafide et al. [84] costed a MET component of PEWS and found three clinical deterioration events would offset MET costs (compared to pre-MET). After this, any clinical deterioration events averted (by MET) would represent cost savings. These findings relate to one element of PEWS and may not translate directly to PEW scoring systems or additional safety structures that enhance PEWS implementation.

Table 2: Overview of evidence on PEW implementation strategies/interventions

Level of evidence	Type of study	Intervention	Implementation strategy	Outcomes	Effectiveness	References
2- high risk of confounding ot bias or high risk of non-causal relationships (n=4)	Time series (n=1)\n\nCohort (n=1)\n\nBefore and after (n=2)	MET team (n=1)\n\nSituation awareness intervention (n=1)\n\nEducation programme (n=2)	Checklist-based form followed flow of situation awareness algorithm; completed by charge nurse (n=1)\n\nDidactic education session (45 mins) and participation in 2 video-recorded mock patient hand-off (n=1)\n\nMultifaceted e-learning package & 3 hour face to face low fidelity simulation package (n=1)	Costs & benefits of operating MET (n=1)\n\nRate of UNSAFE (unrecognised situation awareness failure events) (n=1)\n\nPaediatric interns patient hand-offs (n=1)\n\nUnplanned admission to PHDU (n=1)\n\nVital sign documentation (n=1)\n\nCommunication & medical review (n=1)	3 clinical deterioration events would offset costs of MET (n=1)\n\nRate of UNSAFE transfers significantly reduced (n=1)\n\nSignificant improvement in paediatric intern hand-offs (n=1)\n\nReduction in unplanned admission to PHDU (not significant) (n=1)\n\nSignificant improvement in vital sign documentation (n=1)\n\nSignificant improvement in number of documented communication episodes (n=1)	84, 86, 92-93
3 non-analytic case review (n=3)	Chart review (n=2)\n\nCost analysis exercise (n=1)	Cardiopulmonary resuscitation attempts (n=1)\n\nPEWS scoring system & watchful eye action algorithm (n=1)\n\nCHEWS & escalation of care algorithm (n=1)	Piloted intervention through multi-phases (n=2)	Cost of CPR (n=1)\n\nNumber of days between CPA (n=1)\n\nUnplanned CICU transfers (n=1)	Short-term costs of CPR events more expensive than adults; post PICUadmission costs higher than arrest/event cases (n=1)\n\nIncrease in number of days between CPA (n=1)\n\nReduction in unplanned CICU transfers (n=1)	87-88, 94
4 expert opinion (n=9)	Qualitative study (n=3)\n\nQuality improvement initiative (n=4)\n\nCourse evaluation	PEWS & escalation algorithm (n=1)\n\nRRS/MET program (n=4)\n\nRRS incl. calling criteria, EWS & MET (n=1)	Social marketing (n=2)\n\nMulti-site & multidisciplinary improvement collaborative (n=2)\n\nComprehensive paediatric change package (n=1)	How EWS supports clinician decision-making (n=1)\n\nAchievement & maintenance situation awareness (n=1)\n\nCardiopulmonary arrest rates/code blue events	EWS alerts clinicians to concerning vital sign changes; prompts critical thinking about possible deterioration; provides less-experienced nurses with age-based vital sign reference ranges & empowers nurses to escalate care & communicate concerns (n=1)\n\nA number of social, technological & organisational factors were identified as influencing the achievement of situation	83, 85, 89-91, 95-97

14

survey (n=1) Cross-sectional survey (n=1)	Foundation changes e.g. ISBAR, midlevel changes e.g. RRT & advanced changes e.g. FARRT (n=1) Education course (n=1)	Plan-Do-Check-Act (n=1) Multi-phased pilots (n=2) Roll out cycles/phases across different units (n=3) Introduced on limited basis then expanded to full 24/7 service roll out (n=2) Multi-professional 1 day face to face education programme (n=1)	(n=4) PICU mortality (n=1) RRS activations (n=2) Improvement in patient safety culture (n=1) Benefits of MET (n=1) Values/attitudes placed on MET by clinicians (n=1) Barriers to activating MET (n=2) Most useful aspects of education course (n=1)	awareness categorised under the 3 themes of team based care, availability of standardised data, and standardised processes and procedures (n=1) No reduction, or no sifgnificant reduction, in code rates (n=2) Significant reductions in code blue events & PICU mortality (n=1) Reduction in CPA organisationally (n=1) Reduction in RRS activations (n=1) Patient safety culture scores improved (only statistically significant improvement was seen in "non-punitive response to error" (n=1) MET benefits included education provided on hospital floors; satisfaction of service users incl. patients, nurses & physicians; empowerment of bedside staff (n=1) Clinicians valued RRS; enhanced patient safety & improved relationships among clinicians in general care and ICU areas; reported on barriers that shaped decision to activate MET (n=1) Most useful aspects of education course were, discussion/review of real life cases; learning to use SBAR which improved communication between clinicians & team working; multi-professional approach which improved understanding among each professional group when dealing with deterioration cases (n=1)	

15

DISCUSSION

This review systematically examined and synthesised evidence on PEWS as a comprehensive system comprised of detection, response and implementation components. For all three review questions, no conclusive answers on the effectiveness and impact of PEWS on clinical practice were identified. The review revealed the absence of a standard PEW scoring system across paediatric inpatient settings internationally, limited standardisation of outcomes to enable comparison of published PEWS studies and uncertainty regarding PEWS education and implementation processes at different institutions. This highlights the need for more organised multisite coordination and study around PEW scoring, systems usage, implementation and outcome measures. While the review revealed mixed outcomes it is promising to see evidence suggesting positive directional trends in clinical outcomes e.g. reduced cardio-pulmonary arrests, earlier intervention and transition to PICU with accompanying potential improvements in patient safety culture through enhanced multi-disciplinary communication and team-work for example.

The review draws attention to the fact that multiple distinct PEWS scoring systems are in use internationally, yet empirical evidence on which system is most effective was limited. Perhaps this is due to the heterogeneity in how the detection tools were developed, modified, and investigated across included studies. Diversity in the composition of PEW detection systems (i.e. physiological parameters, reference range values, trigger threshold points and clinical deterioration outcome markers) makes it difficult to compare and contrast performance criteria. It was rare, however, for any PEW detection system to have both a high specificity and sensitivity. While some systems showed promising performance criteria, many were unable to be fully validated due to low sensitivity. Many contexts chose simplicity and clinical utility as a priority in deciding which PEW detection system to implement. The variety of PEW parameters used by local units is perhaps reflective of the desire to have locally derived systems.[45] This presents difficulty for development of a national, and/or international, standard to guide clinical practice. Challenges exist in standardising not only a common scoring tool but also in establishing a common language among health care professionals for recognising and responding to clinically deteriorating children. Indeed, the majority of PEW detection systems were evaluated at one point in time, and in single site paediatric hospital settings, limiting the transferability of results. One multi-centre case-control study [40] was identified which validated the Canadian Bedside PEWS across inpatient units in four children's hospitals. Results are eagerly awaited from the first

16

multi-centre cluster randomised controlled trial evaluating the impact of Bedside PEWS across 22 hospitals internationally.[42]

The review identified that the main PEW response intervention in use internationally was health professional activated RRSs, incorporating RRTs and METs. It was difficult to make comparisons, however, because of variations in how RRT/METs were operationalised in terms of team membership, activation criteria and determination of effectiveness. With limited uniformity on how clinical and process outcomes were defined and measured across studies, uncertainty remains around the impact of RRS on the timely intervention for children with clinical deterioration. Further evidence is also needed on family activated response mechanisms to demonstrate improved patient outcomes.

Despite many anecdotal accounts emphasising the importance of the process of PEWS implementation, a dearth of published literature was sourced in this area. The review did identify, however, the need for cognisance to be given to the multi-faceted nature of PEWS (i.e. communication, multi-disciplinary team-work and education, parent involvement), including the health care cultural context in which PEWS would be implemented. There is a need to move beyond reactive responses to include proactive assessment of children at risk of clinical deterioration (e.g. concepts such as the watcher, huddles, roving teams).[85-86, 98] Healthcare professionals can benefit from improved situational awareness to proactively assess all relevant context around the child, family, tasks required, staff/team and environment.[99, 100]

Despite its limitations, this review contributes important learning because no evidence was sourced that collectively examined the multiple components of PEWS as a complex health-care intervention in a single study. Rather, the evidence examined PEWS in a piece-meal manner, focusing on one particular aspect (e.g. detection, response or implementation) each time. The findings support Chapman et al.'s recently updated review [22] which revealed low evidence to support paediatric track and trigger system (PTTS) implementation as a single intervention. There was, however, some moderate evidence to support the delivery of PTTS as part of a package of interventions or 'care bundles'. Chapman et al. [22] contended that this may be reflective of the complexities of healthcare delivery. The multiple challenges inherent in the delivery of effective high quality safe healthcare are increasingly recognised with the call for more proactive defence layers that focus on system, rather than human,

17

resilience.[100] One avenue to potentially assist with addressing the complexity of PEW systems, and advancing this field of knowledge, is the integration of quality improvement science and human factors. This is important because human factors are not independent issues that can be tackled in isolation or on a piece meal basis but need to be integrated into the lifecycle of the systems development.[100] This could potentially lead to improvements not only in better outcomes and experiences for children and their families but better system performance (i.e. care) and professional development (i.e. learning).[101]

Strengths and limitations

This manuscript systematically collated and synthesised evidence on the multiple components (detection, response and implementation) of PEWS collectively in one review. While a comprehensive search strategy was employed, and the recommended practices for the conduct and reporting of systematic reviews were adhered to, it is possible that some relevant papers may have been missed. Additionally, with the exclusion of non-English papers there is the potential risk of publication bias. Although beyond the scope of this review, there is potentially other literature likely to be of relevance to informing the effectiveness of PEWS; most specifically to examine socio-contextual factors (e.g. situation awareness and human factor) that may, or may not, work as active ingredients in the successful implementation of PEWS. There is some work emerging in this area.[102]

Recommendations for clinical practice

Clinicians working in inpatient paediatric units, and management at unit and organisational levels, need to recognise that the early detection of a deteriorating child is much more than identifying and responding to a score. Instead through creation of a common language PEWS should stimulate a heightened sense of situation awareness and open communication among clinicians about children at risk of clinical deterioration; thereby supporting, not replacing, clinical judgement. PEWS should be embraced as one piece of a larger multi-faceted safety framework that will develop and grow over time with strong governance and leadership, targeted training, on-going support and continuous improvement.

Directions for future research

Future research needs to investigate PEWS as a complex multi-faceted socio-technical system that is embedded in a wider safety culture influenced by many organisational and human factors such as, but not limited to, clinician knowledge, experience and confidence;

effective multi-disciplinary communication and team-work; family engagement; situation awareness; decision making; unit and hospital management and leadership; working conditions and the environment; and stress and fatigue. There is evidence of some potential emerging work in this area in the UK.[103]

CONCLUSION

This review identified that PEW systems are widely used internationally. However, empirical evidence revealed a lack of consensus on which PEW system is most effective or useful. Notwithstanding the limited consensual evidence, positive trends in improved clinical outcomes, such as reduced cardiopulmonary arrest or earlier intervention and transfer to PICU, were reported. Additionally, the implementation of PEWS as one part of a wider safety culture has the potential to enhance multidisciplinary team working, communication and confidence in recognising and making clinical decisions about clinically deteriorating children. The lack of multi-centre studies, no national guidelines, no research evaluating PEWS as a complex health-care intervention and limited development of any underlying theory all impact on the consistency with which PEWS are defined, implemented and measured for effectiveness. Consequently, further research is required to establish what the true "*active ingredients*" of PEW system interventions are in contributing to the detection and/or timely identification of, and response to, deterioration in improving clinical outcomes for children in inpatient hospital settings.

Acknowledgements

This work originated from a Department of Health commissioned review lead by the corresponding author in 2014. In August 2016, the authors revised and updated this review. The authors are grateful to the other project team members (Marie T O'Shea, Catherine Walshe, Melissa Corbally, Donal O'Mathuna, Anthony Staines, Caroline O'Connor) for their help in the original review process. We would also like to acknowledge members of our national paediatric expert advisory group for the original review including Cormac Breatnach, Sharon Condon, Orla Franklin, Amanda Halpin, Una McAree and Ann Moran.

Contributors

VL was the lead investigator for the original and revised review. VL and AM designed the review protocol, developed and ran the updated search searches, selected and appraised the papers, extracted data and drafted the initial manuscript. RM and JF commented on the protocol, searches, evidence appraisal and revised the manuscript for important intellectual content. All authors approved the final manuscript.

Funding

This work was supported by the Irish Department of Health and overseen by the National Clinical Effectiveness Committee and Health Service Executive PEWS Guideline Development Group.

Competing interests

None declared.

Data sharing

No additional data available

REFERENCES

1 Confidential Enquiry into Maternal and Child Health (CEMACH). Why children die – a pilot study 2006. London: CEMACH 2008.

2 Robson MJ, Cooper CL, Medicus LA, et al. Comparison of three acute care pediatric early warning scoring tools. *J Pediatr Nurs* 2013;28:e33-e41.

3 McLellan MC, Gauvreau K, Connor JA. Validation of the Cardiac Children's Hospital Early Warning Score: An Early Warning Scoring Tool to Prevent Cardiopulmonary Arrests in Children with Heart Disease. *Congenital Heart Dis* 2013;9:194-202.

4 Endacott R, Kidd T, Chaboyer W, Edington J. Recognition and communication of patient deterioration in a regional hospital: A multi-methods study. *Aust Crit Care* 2007;20:100-105.

5 Van Leuvan C, Mitchell I. Missed opportunities? An observational study of vital sign measurements. *Crit Care Resusc* 2008;10(2):111-115.

6 Tucker K, Brewer TL, Baker RB, et al. Prospective evaluation of a pediatric inpatient early warning scoring system. *J Spec Pediatr Nurs* 2009;14(2):79-85.

7 Chapman S.M, Grocott M.P.W, Franck L.S. Systematic review of paediatric alert criteria for identifying hospitalised children at risk of clinical deterioration. *Intensive Care Med* 2010;36:600-611.

8 Jagt EW. Improving pediatric survival from resuscitation events: the role and organization of hospital-based rapid response systems and code teams. *Cur Pediatr Rev* 2013;9:158-174.

9 Health Information and Quality Authority (HIQA). Investigation into the safety, quality and standards of services provided by the Health Service Executive to patients, including pregnant women, at risk of clinical deterioration, including those provided in University Hospital Galway, and as reflected in the care and treatment provided to Savita Halappanavar. Dublin: Health Information and Quality Authority 2013.

10 Haines C, Perrott M, Weir P. Promoting care for acutely ill children – development and evaluation of a paediatric early warning tool. *Intensive Crit Care Nurs* 2006;22: 73-81.

11 Centre for Reviews and Dissemination. Systematic Reviews: CRD's guidance for undertaking reviews in health care. University of York: Centre for Reviews and Dissemination 2008.

12 National Clinical Effectiveness Committee. *Guideline Developers Manual.* 2013 http://health.gov.ie/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/ncec_guideline_development_manual_january13.pdf (accessed 20 Sept 2016)

13 Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *Ann Intern Med.* 2009;151:264–9.

14 Agulnik A, Forbes PW, Stenquist N, et al. Validation of a Pediatric Early Warning Score in hospitalised pediatric oncology and hematopoietic stem cell transplant patients. *Pediatr Crit Care Med* 2016;17 (4):e146-e153.

15 Akre M, Finkelstein M, Erickson M, et al. Sensitivity of the Pediatric Early Warning Score to Identify Patient Deterioration. *Pediatrics* 2010;215:2763-e769.

16 Bell D, Mac A, Ochoa Y, et al. The Texas Children's Hospital Pediatric Advanced Warning Score as a Predictor of Clinical Deterioration in Hospitalized Infants and Children: A Modification of the PEWS Tool. *J Pediatr Nurs* 2013;28:e2-e9.

17 Bolger T, Clarke N, Crowe S, et al. Paediatric Early Warning Trigger: A Cry for Help. *Ir Med J* 2015;108(10):294-6.

18 Bradman K, Maconochie I, Can paediatric early warning score be used as a triage tool in paediatric accident and emergency? *Eur J Emerg Med* 2008;15:359-360.

19 Bradman K, Borland M, Pascoe E, Predicting patient disposition in a paediatric emergency department. *J Paediatr Child Health*. 2014;50(10):39-44.

20 Breslin K, Marx J, Hoffman H, et al. Pediatric Early Warning Score at Time if Emergency Department Disposition is Associated with Level of Care. *Pediatr Emerg Care* 2014;30(2):97-103.

21 Chaiyakulsil C, Pandee U, Validation of Pediatric Early Warning Score in pediatric emergency departments. *Pediatr Int* 2015;57 (4): 694-698.

22 Chapman SM, Wray J, Oulton K. et al. Systematic review of paediatric track and trigger systems for hospitalised children. *Resuscitation*. 2016;109:87-109.

23 Duncan H, Hutchison J, Parshuram CS, The pediatric early warning system score: A severity of illness score to predict urgent medical need in hospitalized children. *J Crit Care* 2006;21:271-279.

24 Ennis L, Paediatric early warning scores on a children's ward: a quality improvement initiative. *Nurs Child Young People* 2014;26 (7): 25-31.

25 Edwards ED, Powell CVE, Mason BW, et al. Prospective cohort study to test the predictability of the Cardiff and Vale paediatric early warning system. *Arch Dis Child* 2009;94:602-606.

26 Edwards ED, Mason BW, Oliver A, et al. Cohort study to test the predictability of the Melbourne criteria for activation of the medical emergency team. *Arch Dis Child* 2011;96:174-179.

27 Egdell P, Finlay L, Pedley DK, The PAWS score: validation of an early warning scoring system for the initial assessment of children in the emergency department. *Emerg Med J* 2008;25:745-749.

22

28 Fenix JB, Gillespie CW, Levin A, et al. Comparison of Pediatric Early Warning Score to Physician opinion for deteriorating patients. *Hosp Pediatr* 2015;5(9):474-479.

29 Fuijkschot J, Vernhout B, Lemson J, et al. Validation of a paediatric early warning score: first results and implications for usage. *Eur J Pediatr* 2015;174(1):15-21.

30 Gold DL, Mihalov LK, Cohen DM, Evaluating the Pediatric Early Warning Score (PEWS) System for admitted patients in the pediatric emergency department. *Acad Emerg Med* 2014;21:1249-1256.

31 Holmes H, Bhatt R, Koumettou M, et al. Retrospective evaluation of a new neonatal trigger score. *Pediatrics* 2013;131:e837-e842.

32 Kaul M, Snethen J, Kelber ST, et al. Implementation of the Bedside Paediatric Early Warning System (Bedside PEWS) for nurse identification of deteriorating patients. *J Spec Pediatr Nurs* 2014;19:339-349.

33 Mandell IM, Bynum F, Marshall L, et al. Pediatric Early Warning Score and unplanned readmission to the pediatric intensive care unit. *J Crit Care* 2015;30:1090-1095.

34 Miranda JOF, Camargo CL de, Sobrinho CLN, et al. Clinical deterioration in hospitalised children: integrative review of a Paediatric Early Warning Score. *Journal of Nursing UFPE online* 2016;10(3):1128-36.

35 Monaghan A, Detecting and managing deterioration in children. *Paediatr Nurs* 2005;17(1):32-35.

36 Murray JS, Williams LA, Pignataros S, et al. An integrative review of Paediatric Early Warning System Scores. *Pediatr Nurs* 2015;41(4):165-174.

37 Nielsen KR, Migita R, Batra M, et al. Identifying high risk children in the emergency department. *J Intensive Care Med* Published Online First: 10 February 2015. doi: 10.1177/0885066615571893

38 Niu X, Tilford B, Duffy E, et al. Feasibility and reliability of Pediatric Early Warning Score in the Emergency Department. *J Nurs Care Qual* 2016;31(2):161-166.

39 Parshuram CS, Hutchinson J, Middaugh K, Development and initial validation of the Bedside Paediatric Early Warning System score. *Crit Care* 2009;13:R135.

40 Parshuram CS, Duncan HP, Joffe AR, et al. Multicentre validation of the bedside paediatric early warning system score: a severity of illness score to detect evolving critical illness in hospitalised children. *Crit Care* 2011a;15:R184.

41 Parshuram CS, Bayliss A, Reiner J, et al. Implementing the Bedside Paediatric Early Warning System in a community hospital: a prospective observational study. *Paediatr Child Health* 2011b;16(3):e18-e22.

42 Parshuram CS, Dryden-Palmer K, Farrell C, et al. Evaluating processes of care and outcomes of children in hospital (EPOCH): study of protocol for a randomised controlled trial. *Trials* 2015;16:245. Doi:10.1186/s13063-015-0712-3

43 Rahman ZH, Leahy NE, Sessler K, et al. A pilot study to validate the Burn Centre Pediatric Early Warning Score tool in clinical practice. *J Burn Care Res* 2016;37(3):160-165.

44 Roland D, Madar J, Connolly G, The Newborn Early Warning (NEW) system: development of an at-risk infant intervention system. *Infant* 2010;6(4):116-120.

45 Roland D, Oliver A, Edwards ED, et al. Use of paediatric early warning systems in Great Britain: has there been a change of practice in the last 7 years? *Arch Dis Child* 2014;99:26–29.

46 Roland D, Lewis G, Fielding P, et al. The Paediatric Observation Priority Score: A system to aid detection of serious illness and assist in safe discharge. *Open Journal of Emergency Medicine* 2016;4:38-44.

47 Sefton G, McGrath C, Tume L, et al. What impact did a Paediatric Early Warning system have on emergency admissions to the paediatric intensive care unit? An observational cohort study. *Intensive Crit Care Nurs* 2015;31(2):91-9.

48 Seiger N, Maconochie I, Oostenbrink R, et al. Validity of different pediatric early warning scores in the emergency department. *Pediatrics* 2013;132(4):e841-e849.

49 Sinitsky L, Reece A, Question 2: Can PEWS predict serious clinical deterioration in paediatric inpatients? *Arch Dis Child* 2016;101(1):109-113.

50 Skaletzky SM, Raszynski A, Totapally BR, Validation of a Modified Pediatric Early Warning System Score: A Retrospective Case-Control Study. *Clin Pediatr* 2012;51(5):431-435.

51 Solevag AL, Eggen EH, Schroder J, et al. Use of a Modified Pediatric Early Warning Score in a Department of Pediatric and Adolescent Medicine. *PLoS ONE* 2013;8(8): e72534.

52 Tume L, The deterioration of children in ward areas in a specialist children's hospital. *Nurs Crit Care* 2007;12(1):12-19.

53 Zhai H, Brady P, Li Q, et al. Developing and evaluating a machine learning based algorithm to predict the need of pediatric intensive care unit transfer for newly hospitalized children. *Resuscitation* 2014;85:1965-1071.

54 Bonafide CP, Localio R, Roberts KE, et al. Impact of Rapid Response System Implementation on Critical Deterioration Events in Children. *JAMA Pediatr* 2014a;168(1):25-33.

55 Bonafide CP, Roberts KE, Priestley MA, et al. Development of a Pragmatic Measure for Evaluating and Optimizing Rapid Response Systems. *Pediatrics* 2012;129:e874-e881.

24

56 Brilli RJ, Gibson R, Luria JW, et al. Implementation of a medical emergency team in a large pediatric teaching hospital prevents respiratory and cardiopulmonary arrests outside the intensive care unit. *Pediatr Crit Care Med* 2007;8(3):236-246.

57 Chan PS, Jain R, Nallmothu BK, et al. Rapid response teams: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Arch Intern Med* 2010;170(1):18-26.

58 Chen JG, Kemper, A. R., Odetola, F, et al. Prevalence, characteristics, and opinions of pediatric rapid response teams in the United States. *Hosp Pediatr* 2012;2(3):133-140.

59 Dean B.S, Decker MJ, Hupp D, et al. Condition HELP: A Pediatric Rapid Response Team Triggered by Patients and Parents. *J Healthc Qual* 2008;30(3):28-31.

60 Hanson CC, Randolph GD, Erickson JA, et al. A reduction in cardiac arrests and duration of clinical instability after implementation of a paediatric rapid response system. *Postgrad Med J* 2010;86:314-318.

61 Haque A, Saleem AF, Zaidi S, et al. Experience of Pediatric Rapid Response Team in a Tertiary Care Hospital in Pakistan. *Indian J Pediatr* 2010;77(3): 273-276.

62 Heath G, Montgomery H, Eyre C, et al. Developing a tool to support communication of parental concerns when a child is in hospital. *Healthcare.* Published Online First: 13 January 2016.doi:10.3390/healthcare4010009

63 Hueckel RM, Mericle JM, Martin PL, et al. Implementation of Condition Help Family Teaching and Evaluation of Family Understanding. *J Nurs Care Qual* 2012;27(2):176–181.

64 Humphreys S, Totapally BR, Rapid Response Team calls and unplanned transfers to the pediatric intensive care unit in a pediatric hospital. *Am J Crit Care* 2016;25(1):e9-e13.

65 Hunt EA, Zimmer KP, Rinke ML, et al. Transition from a Traditional Code Team to a Medical Emergency Team and Categorization of Cardiopulmonary Arrests in a Children's Center. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med* 2008;162(2):117-122

66 Kotsakis A, Lobos AT, Parshuram C, et al. Implementation of a Multicenter Rapid Response System in Pediatric Academic Hospitals is Effective. *Pediatrics* 2011;128: 72-78

67 Lobos AT, Fernandes R, Ramsay T, et al. Team (MET) Activation: Disposition Depends on Who Activates the Team Patient Characteristics and Disposition After Pediatric Medical Emergency. *Hosp Pediatr* 2014;4(2):99-105.68

68 Lobos AT, Fernandes R, Williams K, et al. Routine Medical Emergency Team assessments of patients discharged from PICU: description of a Medical Emergency Team follow up program. *Pediatr Crit Care Med* 2015;16(4):359-365.

69 Paciotti B, Roberts KE, Tibbetts KM, et al. Physician Attitudes toward Family-Activated Medical Emergency Teams for Hospitalised Children. *Jt Comm J Qual Patient Saf* 2014;40(4):187-192.

70 Panesar R, Polikoff LA, Harris D, et al. Characteristics and outcomes of pediatric rapid response teams before and after mandatory triggering by an elevated pediatric early warning system (PEWS) score. *Hosp Pediatr* 2014;4(3):135-140.

71 Ray EM, Smith R, Massie S, et al. Family Alert: implementing direct family activation of a pediatric rapid response team. *Jt Comm J Qual Patient Saf* 2009;35(11)575-580.

72 Sen AI, Morgan RW, Morris MC, Variability in the Implementation of Rapid Response Teams at Academic American Pediatric Hospitals. *J Pediatr* 2013;163:1772-1774.

73 Sharek PJ, Parast LM, Leong K, et al. Effect of a Rapid Response Team on Hospital-wide Mortality and Code Rates Outside the ICU in a Children's Hospital. *JAMA* 2007;298(19):2267-2274.

74 Theilen U, Leonard P, Jones P, et al. Regular in situ simulation training of paediatric Medical Emergency Team improves hospital response to deteriorating patients. *Resuscitation* 2013;84:218-222.

75 Tibballs J, Kinney S, Duke T, et al. Reduction of paediatric in-patient cardiac arrest and death with a medical emergency team: preliminary results. *Arch Dis Child* 2005;90(11): 1148-1152.

76 Tibballs J, Kinney S. Reduction of hospital mortality and of preventable cardiac arrest and death on introduction of a pediatric medical emergency team. *Pediatr Crit Care Med* 2009;10(3): 306-312.

77 VandenBerg SD, Hutchison JS, Parshuram CS. A cross-sectional survey of levels of care and response mechanisms for evolving critical illness in hospitalized children. *Pediatrics* 2007;119(4): 940-946.

78 Van Voorhis KT, Willis TS. Implementing a pediatric rapid response system to improve quality and patient safety. *Pediatric Clin North Am* 2009;56(4): 919-933.

79 Wang GS, Erwin N, Zuk J, et al. Retrospective review of emergency response activations during a 13-year period at a tertiary care children's hospital. *J Hosp Med* 2011;6(3):131-135.

80 Winberg H, Nilsson K, Aneman A, Paediatric Rapid Response Systems: A literature review. *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand* 2008;52:890-896.

81 Zenker P, Schlesinger A, Hauck M, et al. Implementation and Impact of a Rapid Response Team in a Children's Hospital. *Jt Comm J Qual Patient Saf* 2007;33(7):418-425.

82 Azzopardi P, Kinney S, Moulden A, et al. Attitudes and barriers to a Medical Emergency Team system at a tertiary paediatric hospital. *Resuscitation* 2011;82:167-174.

83 Bonafide PC, Roberts KE, Weirich CM, et al. Beyond Statistical Prediction: Qualitative Evaluation of the Mechanisms by which Pediatric Early Warning Scores Impact Patient Safety. *J HospMed* 2013a;8(5):248-253.

26

84 Bonafide CP, Localio AR, Song L, et al. Cost-benefit analysis of a medical emergency team in a children's hospital. *Pediatrics* 2014b;134(2):235-241.

85 Brady PW, Goldenhar LM, A qualitative study examining the influences on situation awareness and the identification, mitigation and escalation of recognised patient risk. *BMJ Qual Saf* 2013;0:1-9.

86 Brady PW, Muething S, Kotagal U, et al. Improving situation awareness to reduce unrecognised clinical deterioration and serious safety events. *Pediatrics* 2013;131(1):e298-e308.

87 Demmel KM, Williams L, Flesch L, Implementation of the Pediatric Early Warning Scoring System on a Pediatric Hematology/Oncology Unit. *J Pediatr Oncol Nurs* 2010;27(4):229-240.

88 Duncan HP, Frew E, Short-term health system costs of paediatric in-hospital acute life-threatening events including cardiac arrest. *Resuscitation* 2009;80(5): 529-534.

89 Hayes LW, Dobyns EL, DiGiovine B, et al. A Multicenter Collaborative Approach to Reducing Pediatric Codes Outside the ICU. *Pediatrics* 2012;129(3):785-e791.

90 Kukreti V, Gaiteiro R, Mohseni-Bod H, Implementation of a Pediatric Rapid Response Team: Experience of the Hospital for Sick Children in Toronto. *Indian Pediatr* 2014;51:11-15.

91 Lobos AT, Costello J, Gilleland J, et al. An implementation strategy for a multicentre pediatric rapid response system in Ontario. *Jt Comm J Qual Patient Saf* 2010;36(6):271-280.

92 McCrory MC, Aboumatar H, Custer JW, et al. "ABC-SBAR" Training improves simulated critical patient hand-off by pediatric interns. *Pediatr Emerg Care* 2012;28(6):538-543.

93 McKay H, Mitchell I, Sinn K, et al. Effect of a multifaceted intervention on documentation of vital signs and staff communication regarding deteriorating paediatric patients. *J Paediatr Child Health* 2013;49;48–56

94 McLellan M, Connors JA, The cardiac children's hospital early warning score (C-CHEWS). *J Pediatr Nurs* 2013;28:171-178.

95 Randhawa S, Roberts-Turner R, Woronick K, et al. Implementing and Sustaining Evidence-Based Nursing Practice to Reduce Pediatric Cardiopulmonary Arrest. *West J Nurs Res* 2011;33(3):443-456.

96 Roberts KE, Bonafide CP, Paine CW, et al. Barriers to calling for urgent assistance despite a comprehensive pediatric rapid response system. *Am J Crit Care* 2014;23(3):223-229.

27

97 Tume LN, Sefton G, Arrowsmith P. Teaching paediatric ward teams to recognise and manage the deteriorating child. *Nurs Crit Care* 2013;19(4):196-203.

98 Hueckel RM, Turi JL, Cheoifetz IM, et al. *Beyond Rapid Response Teams: Instituting a "Rover Team" Improves the Management of At-Risk Patients, Facilitates Proactive Interventions, and Improves Outcomes.* http://www.ahrq.gov/professionals/quality-patient-safety/patient-safety-resources/resources/advances-in-patient-safety-2/vol3/advances-hueckel_27.pdf (Accessed 20 Sept 2016)

99 Deighton J, Edbrooke-Childs J, Stapley E. et al. Realistic evaluation of situation awareness for everyone (SAFE) on paediatric wards: study protocol. *BMJ Open* 2016;6: e014014

100 Hignett S, Lang A, Pickup L et al. More Holes than Cheese: what prevents the delivery of effective, high quality and safe healthcare in England? *Ergonomics* 2016;DOI: 10.1080/00140139.2016.1245446

101 Hignett S, Jones EL, Miller D. Human factors and ergonomics and quality improvement science: integrating approaches for safety in healthcare. *BMJ Qual Saf* 2015;24(4):250-4

102 Hood K, Powell C, Allen D, et al. Review of Paediatric Early Warning Systems (PEWS) and scores for clinical deterioration of children in hospital: their development and validation, effectiveness and factors associated with implementation and generative mechanisms. PROSPERO   2015:CRD42015015326. http://www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPERO/display_record.asp?ID=CRD42015015326 (Accessed 3 Jan 2017)

103 PUMA HS&DR - 12/178/17: PUMA - Paediatric early warning system (PEWS): Utilisation and Mortality Avoidance. A prospective, mixed methods, before and after study identifying the evidence base for the core components of an effective PEWS and the development of an implementation package for implementation and use in the UK http://www.nets.nihr.ac.uk/projects/hsdr/1217817 (Accessed 10 Sept 2016)

Databases
PUBMED, MEDLINE, CINAHL, EMBASE, COCHARNE

2742 papers identified
PubMed = 1219 papers
MEDLINE = 949 papers
CINAHL = 349 papers
EMBASE = 225 papers

Stage 1 screening: Titles/Abstracts Reviewed

2616 papers excluded
- Duplicates
- Adult focused
- Discussion papers; commentaries; conference abstracts etc.

126 papers potentially included

57 papers excluded
- Adult focused
- Unable to segregate child and adult data
- Not specifically focused on outcome of 'clinical deterioration'
- Not inpatient setting
- Focus on transportation
- Focus on severity/acuity of illness
- Discussion papers; commentaries; conference abstracts etc.

Stage 2 screening: Full Texts Reviewed

69 papers included; met inclusion criteria

21 papers included identified via
- secondary citations
- personal communications
- web-resources

**90 papers included in the review**

Figure 1: Flowchart of search strategy outputs and screening process

Figure 1: Flowchart of search strategy output and screening process

194x218mm (300 x 300 DPI)

Figure 2: Diagnostic predictive accuracy of PEW detection systems

Figure 2: Diagnostic predictive accuracy of PEW detection systems

163x112mm (300 x 300 DPI)

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

Online Supplementary Appendix 1: Population, Intervention, Comparison, Outcomes, Study Design

PICO	Indicative Terms
Population	▪ Newborn/neonate/infant/child/adolescent/young person patient ▪ Newborn/neonate/child/adolescent/young person acute patient ▪ Critically ill/deteriorating paediatric/pediatric patient ▪ Sepsis/septic infection/shock in newborn/neonate/infant/child/adolescent/young person patient
Intervention	▪ Neonatal/Paediatric/Pediatric Early Warning Score/System/Tool/Chart ▪ Neonatal/Paediatric/Pediatric Modified Early Warning Score/System/Tool/Chart ▪ Bedside PEWS/BPEWS ▪ Parent Activated Early Warning Systems ▪ Sepsis Six ▪ Track and Trigger Systems/Tools ▪ Instrument Validity/Reliability/Evaluation ▪ Calling Criteria/Rapid Response/Escalation Protocols/ Communication Tools/Situation Awareness ▪ Education/Training/ALERT™/COMPASS©
Comparison#	▪ Neonatal/Paediatric/Pediatric Early Warning Score/System/Tool/Chart ▪ Neonatal/Paediatric/Pediatric Modified Early Warning Score/System/Tool/Chart ▪ Bedside PEWS/BPEWS ▪ Parent Activated Early Warning Systems ▪ Sepsis Six ▪ Track and Trigger Systems/Tools ▪ Validity/Reliability/Evaluation ▪ Alert/Calling Criteria/Rapid Response/Escalation Protocols/ Communication Tools/Situation Awareness ▪ Education/Training/ALERT™/COMPASS© (comparison against each other or with no intervention)
Outcome	***Clinical outcomes*** Detection, and/or timely identification, of clinical deterioration of the newborn/neonate/child/adolescent/young person patient and all relevant *sequalae*; and diagnostic accuracy Instrument sensitivity/specificity ***Economic outcomes*** Costs and results ▪ Healthcare resource use ▪ Training/Education costs ▪ Staff time costs ▪ ICU outreach costs/additional referrals ▪ Results e.g. number of unplanned ICU admissions; number of cardio-pulmonary arrests; ongoing care costs, hospital mortality ▪ Immediate call to resuscitation team/MET (medical emergency team) team/CCRT (Critical Care Response Team) ▪ Cost savings ▪ Cost-effectiveness measures (e.g. ICER)
Study Design	Not specified as no limits were applied to study type/designs

Online Supplementary Appendix 2: Characteristics of included studies

Table 1: PEW detection systems (n=45)

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes/findings	Level of evidence & rationale for judgement
Agulnik et al. (2016) [14]	Boston Children's Hospital, Boston (USA)	Evaluate correlation of a PEW Score with unplanned PICU transfer in hospitalized oncology & hematopoietic stem cell transplant (HSCT) patients	Case–control Retrospective	All unplanned PICU transfers among hospitalized oncology & HSCT patients 110 paediatric oncology patients (42 oncology, 68 HSCT) 220 matched controls (not require PICU transfer)	Children's Hospital Early Warning Score, Boston Children's Hospital (adapted a modified PEWS-Brighton PEWS)	PEW Score highly correlated with need for PICU transfer overall (AUROC = 0.96) & in oncology & hematopoietic stem cell transplant group (AUROC = 0.95 & 0.96 respectively) Among cases, average max PEWS 24-hour pre transfer 4.6 for oncology & 5.7 for HSCT patients (p = 0.002) Patients with higher PEW scores pre transfer had increased PICU mortality (p = 0.028) & length of stay (p = 0.004)	2+ Well-conducted case control study Retrospective, controls matched to cases 2:1 using 4 developmental ages (<1yr, 1-6yr, 7-11yr, ≥12yr), 2 hospital services (oncology & HSCT) and length of stay (i.e. time from admission to PICU transfer)
Akre et al. (2010) [15]	Children's Hospitals & Clinics of Minnesota (USA)	Evaluate sensitivity of PEWS	Chart review Retrospective	170 RRT calls & 16 code blue events for 186 patients on medical surgical units	Adapted the Brighton PEWS	Sensitivity of PEWS 85.5% Median time from first critical PEWS to RRT or code event 11h 36min & latest critical score 30min For 97.3% of patients earliest median time to consult was 80min Oximetry monitoring added at median time of 6.9h for 43.5% of patients 7% of patients had increased nursing assessment. Sub-group of patients had critical PEWS, consult & addition of monitor. Median time for earliest critical PEWS for these patients was significant (p <0.001)	3 Non-analytic, case reviews Retrospective, descriptive
Bell et al. (2013) [16]	Texas Children's Hospital Houston (USA)	Examine psychometric properties of PAWS	Chart review Retrospective	150 infant & child charts randomly selected from 3 units; included if length of stay > 48 hours (general medicine, transplant; pulmonary, adolescent, endocrine; & cardiology units)	Texas Children's Hospital Paediatric Advanced Warning Score (PAWS) (adapted a modified PEWS-Tucker at al. who had adapted the Brighton PEWS)	Cronbach's alpha reliability co-efficient for PAWS score at final measurement was 0.75 (adequate instrument reliability)	3 Non-analytic, case reviews Retrospective, descriptive, 6 month period, 150 charts (reflected 0.7% of population)

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes/findings	Level of evidence & rationale for judgement
Bolger et al. (2015) [17]	National Children's Hospital, Tallaght (Republic of Ireland)	Determine if time taken to maximise clinical input into deteriorating children would reduce following introduction of PEWT	Before & after Retrospective	All charts of patients whose clinical condition resulted in a CRA, PEWT call or a critical illness transfer to another centre (included paediatric wards and emergency department)	Paediatric Early Warning Trigger (PEWT) (based on modified Bristol PEWS)	9/89 PEWTs resulted in patients remaining on ward; 48/89 patients had care escalated to HDU; 9 patients required transfer to PICU; 1 patient died Time from deterioration to senior clinician involvement reduced from 312min to 165min Rate of transfers to PICU (among triage category 1&2 patients – i.e. all patients who require assessment by a doctor within 10min of arrival to ED) reduced from 1:50 pre the study to 1:29, 1:118, 1:131 during the 3 years of the study Rate of CA reduced from 1:100 pre the study to 1:129, 1:216, 1:542 during the 3 years of the study	2- High risk of confounding or bias Retrospective, no control, audits of patient charts, 12mths pre & 3yrs post PEWT
Bradman & Maconochie (2008) [18]	St Marys Hospital London (UK)	Determine if PEWS can detect patients who need hospital admission or discharge home	Chart review Retrospective	424 patients who visited paediatric A&E	Brighton PEWS	PEWS ≥4; sensitivity 24%, specificity 98% PEWS ≥2; sensitivity 37%, specificity 88% Score had low sensitivity therefore limited value in predicting need for admission	3 Non-analytic, case reviews Retrospective audit of patients who attended ED over 2 week period
Bradman et al. (2014) [19]	Princess Margaret Hospital, Perth (Australia)	Compare published prediction tools (PRISA, PRISA II, PEWS, triage category) with triage nurse (TN) predictions	Chart review Prospective	All patients who presented to emergency department over 1 week study period (except patients presenting with psychiatric, dental, child protection concerns or non-medical presentations)	Comparing TN predictions for admission to PRISA (paediatric risk of admission score) ≥9 PRISA II (refined score) ≥2 Brighton PEWS ≥4 Triage category 1,2, 3	Of 1223 patients, 946 (83.6%) included (as had TN predictions) TNs had highest prediction accuracy (85.7%), followed by elevated PEWS (82.9%), triage category 1, 2, or 3 (82.9%) PRISA & PRISA II score had accuracy of 80.1% & 79.7% respectively	3 Non-analytic, case reviews Prospective, patients who attended ED over 1 week period, potential selection bias as not all patients had TN predictions performed
Breslin et al. (2014) [20]	Emergency department of urban tertiary care children's hospital (USA)	Determine association between PEWS at time of emergency department disposition & level of care	Chart review Prospective	383 patients; 239 discharged (62%); 126 admitted to acute care (33%); 18 admitted to ICU (5%)	Brighton PEWS	PEWS ≥ 1 = maximum discriminant ability for admission (sensitivity 63%; specificity 69%) PEWS ≥3 = maximum discriminant ability for ICU admission (sensitivity 56%; specificity 92%) Respiratory patients (n=97): PEWS ≥1 had maximum discriminant ability to distinguish admission from discharge with sensitivity 60% specificity 83%	3 Non-analytic, case reviews Prospective data, 10 month period, convenient sample (based on availability of study team member)
Chaiyakulsil & Pandee (2015) [21]	Ramathibodi Hospital, Mahidol University, Bangkok (Thailand)	Validate PEWS in predicting hospitalisation in children <15 years presenting in emergency department (ED)	Chart review Prospective	All consecutive children aged > 15 years who presented to ED at time of study (except patients presenting with trauma, psychiatric, dental	PAWS (Egdell)	Of 1136 patients,168 (14.8%) were admitted (162 to general ward & 6 to ICU) For overall admission, PEWS ≥1 sensitivity 78%, specificity 59.6%, PPV 27.7%, NPV 94.8%, AUC 0.71 For ICU admission, PEWS ≥3 sensitivity 100%, specificity 90.5%, PPV 4.8%, NPV 100%, AUC 0.98	3 Non-analytic, case reviews Prospective, descriptive, patients who attended ED over 3 month period

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes/findings	Level of evidence & rationale for judgement
				and surgical concerns)		For general ward admission, PEWS ≥1, sensitivity 77.2%, specificity 59.1%, PPV 23.5%, NPV 93.8%, AUC 0.71	
Chapman et al. (2010) [7]	Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children NHS Trust, London (UK)	Identify number and nature of PAC & evaluate their validity, reliability, clinical effectiveness and clinical utility	Review	Included 11 publications describing 10 PAC	Paediatric alert criteria (PAC)	Number of PAC small & diverse in purpose, content & thresholds for activation Potential of PACs to improve care of hospitalised children (i.e. early identification of those at risk of clinical deterioration) has not yet been demonstrated Evidence lacking/weak in support of PACs validity, reliability & utility	2++ High quality systematic review of observational/quasi-experimental studies Detailed description of search strategy/evidence reviewed; quality assessment in line with research design criteria; results summarised narratively
Chapman et al. (2016) [22]	Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children NHS Trust, London (UK)	Examine key characteristics of paediatric track and trigger systems (PTTS) Appraise evidence on PTTS validity, calibration, & clinical utility	Review (updated from Chapman et al. 2010)	33 PTTS identified from 55 studies	Paediatric Track & Trigger Systems	Considerable variety in number & type of parameters; all contained one or more vital signs. Low evidence to support PTTS implementation as a single intervention Majority of outcomes did not achieve statistical significance Moderate evidence of impact of PTTS on mortality & cardiac and respiratory arrests when delivered as a care package High (and increasing) number of system outcomes and metrics is a significant confounder	2++ High quality systematic review of observational/quasi-experimental studies Detailed description of search strategy/evidence reviewed; quality assessment in line with GRADE methodology; results summarised narratively
Duncan et al. (2006) [23]	Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto, Ontario (Canada)	Develop bedside score to identify children requiring resuscitation to treat actual or impending CPA	Case control Retrospective	Case patients: (n=87) had code blue calls made as part of care Control patients: (n=128) had no code blue event	Paediatric Early Warning System (PEWS) score	PEWS sensitivity 78%, specificity 95% at threshold score of 5 Score greater in case than control patients (mean max score 7.9 vs 3.2; P < 0.0001) & within each age category Score could discriminate between cases & controls & within each age category (AUROC 0.93-1.0) PEWS score identifies patients with at least 1-hour warning before code blue event	2+ Well-conducted case control study Frequency matched case control design, retrospective, 87 cases/128 controls
Ennis (2014) [24]	University Hospital Waterford (Republic of Ireland)	Support staff to recognise physiological changes & make appropriate decisions for early proactive intervention; & evaluate clinical utility & effectiveness (PEWS)	Quality Improvement Initiative Prospective	30 bed acute children's ward All children triggering PEWS of ≥3 during inpatient stay	PEWS track & trigger system; & ISBAR (Identify, Situation, Background, Assessment & Recommendation) (NHS Institute's PEWS Charts)	72 instances of PEWS ≥3 (35 children) 97% (34/35) with PEWS ≥3 had additional medical intervention following first PEWS alert/review 82% (59/72) resulted in specific intervention or change to treatment plan Medical responses to 18% of all PEWS alerts (n=13) was 'continue to monitor'; 12/13 were for children with an earlier PEWS review/intervention 85% (n=30) with PEWS ≥3 improved within 24h following initial rapid medical review/interventions Low (0.3%) incidence of ICU level care (n=5); emergency resuscitations or unpredicted ICU referrals	3 Non-analytic, case review Prospective, descriptive, cohort, chart review/audit 18 month period

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes/findings	Level of evidence & rationale for judgement
						3 children electively transferred to ICU for a higher level of care & 2 children received ICU-level monitoring and non-invasive respiratory support on the children's ward. Presence of experienced senior clinicians (registrars/consultants) at PEWS-triggered review was 82% of all PEWS reviews	
Edwards et al. (2009) [25]	Paediatric wards at University Hospital of Wales (UK)	Develop & evaluate predictability of PEWS (C&VPEWS)	Cohort Prospective	n=1000 patients 9075 observation sets	Cardiff &Vale PEWS (C&VPEWS)	As a single parameter: for threshold score of 1: 89.0% sensitivity, 63.9% specificity, 2.2% PPV, 99.8% NPV, AUROC 0.86. As a multiple parameter: 69.5% sensitivity, 89.9% specificity, 5.9% PPV, 99.7% NPV. Tool is sensitive but not specific with low PPV (positive predictive value) - high number of false positives	2+ Well-conducted cohort study Prospective, to test predictability of PEW system, all children admitted in a time period were eligible to participate, data collected on 1,000 children; follow-up across admission
Edwards et al. (2011) [26]	Paediatric wards at University Hospital of Wales (UK)	Test predictability of MAC of medical emergency team (MET)	Cohort Prospective	n=1000 patients 9075 observation sets. Data set from Edwards et al. (2009)	Melbourne criteria for activation (MAC) of MET (as described by Tibballs & Kinney)	MAC as single parameter: 68.3% sensitivity, 83.2% specificity, 3.6% PPV, 99.7% NPV, AUROC 0.79. Criteria had reasonable sensitivity but at cost of low specificity and low PPV which could result in high number of false positive triggers	2+ Well-conducted cohort study Prospective, to test predictability of activation system, all admissions to paediatric wards over 12 month period
Egdell et al. (2008) [27]	James Cook University Hospital, Middlesbrough (UK)	Design & validate physiology-based scoring system for assessment of children attending emergency department (ED)	Case control Retrospective	Case: (n=46) children admitted directly from ED to PICU. Control: (n=49) children admitted from ED to paediatric ward	Paediatric Advanced Warning Score (PAWS) Chart	PAWS score could discriminate between cases and controls, with AUROC curve of 0.86 (p<.0001). At threshold trigger score of 3, PAWS able to identify children requiring admission to PICU with sensitivity 70% & specificity 90%	2- High risk of confounding or bias Retrospective, pilot, 50 consecutive control patients
Fenix et al. (2015) [28]	Large tertiary children's hospital, Washington (USA)	Compare a prospectively validated PEWS to physician opinion in identifying patients at risk of deterioration	Chart Review Retrospective	All patient non-electively transferred to PICU	PEWS (modified Brighton)	97 patients non-elective transfer to ICU also eligible for placement on SSO (assignment to institutional senior sign-out) lists before PICU transfer) – 51 experienced deteriorating events. Patients experiencing a deterioration event in 12h after ICU transfer had max mean PEWS of 3.9 before PICU transfer compared with max mean PEWS of 2.9 in patients not experiencing a deterioration event (p = .01). Patients experiencing deterioration within 12 hours of PICU transfer were assigned to SSO lists 43% of the time, whereas patients without a deterioration event were assigned to SSO lists 30% of the time; this difference not statistically significant (p = .2). PEWS was significantly associated with ICU	3 Non-analytic, case review Retrospective, descriptive, chart review, single center, limited sample size, limited time period (9months)

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes/findings	Level of evidence & rationale for judgement
						deterioration whereas physician opinion was not	
Fuijkschot et al. (2015) [29]	Radboudumc Amalia Children's Hospital (Netherlands)	Design & implementation of a PEWS system	Cohort 1: Retrospective case review Cohort 2: Retrospective case review Cohort 3: Prospective cohort study	Case cohort 1: All patients admitted to 20 bed oncology ward over 3 month period Focus was clinical condition of patients with high scores (>8) Case cohort 2: Patients whose clinical course during admission (general ward) had deteriorated (i.e. cardiopulmonary arrest & unplanned PICU admission) Case cohort 3: All patients receiving emergency medical interventions	Modified Bedside PEWS	Case cohort 1: PEWS≥8 scored 56 times in 15/118 admissions (13%); specificity 88% (taking unplanned PICU admission as end point, sensitivity calculated as 100% (however this parameter is not reliable as only one unplanned PICU admission); n=15 (27%) false-positive scores; PPV 0.73. Case cohort 2: Of 24 patients, 16 scored PEWS of ≥8 at 2–6h pre PICU admission. Sensitivity 0.67 (threshold score ≥8 endpoint 2-6h pre unplanned PICU admission) Case cohort 3: 17 cases received emergency medical interventions); median PEWS 10 (range 8–15) at time of intervention; threshold score 8, no falsely negative scores detected (high sensitivity)	2+ Well-conducted case/cohort study Three case/cohort studies, appropriate sample and follow-up duration – two described as retrospective, one prospective
Gold et al. (2014) [30]	Nationwide Children's Hospital, Ohio (USA)	Explore if PEWS assigned in ED predicts need for ICU admission or clinical deterioration in admitted patients	Chart Review Prospective	Patients presenting to ED at time of study <u>2 outcome groups</u> Patients admitted to ICU (initially from the ED or subsequently from the floor) Patients admitted to the floor (with no ICU transfer)	Monaghan PEWS *P0* PEWS at initial assessment *P1* PEWS at time of admission	12,306 consecutively admitted patients, with 98.9% having a PEWS documented PEWS scores higher for patients in ICU group (P0 2.8 & P1 3.2, p < 0.0001) vs floor (P0 0.7 & P1 0.5, p < 0.0001) To predict need for ICU admission, optimal cut-off points on ROC are P0 =1 & P1 =2, with AUROC 0.79 & 0.86 respectively For every unit increase in P0 & P1, the odds of admission to ICU were 1.9 times greater (p < 0.0001) & 2.9 times greater (p < 0.0001) than to the floor	3 Non-analytic, case review Prospective, 12-month study period
Haines et al. (2006) [10]	Bristol Royal Hospital for Children (UK)	Develop & evaluate clinical & physiological tool for identifying acutely ill children	Cohort Prospective	Case: Children (*n* = 360) who triggered tool over a 6-month period Control: (*n* = 180) 5	Bristol PEWS	Of case (n=360) patients 73 (20%) required paediatric intensive or high dependency care. All fulfilled trigger criteria thus tool 100% sensitive for identification of patients requiring HDU/PICU; 63% specificity Modified tool (post research): 99% sensitivity &	2- High risk of confounding or bias Prospective, with a random control sample on day of data collection. Sample generated by nurse identification of previous

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes/findings	Level of evidence & rationale for judgement
		in hospital ward areas		random bed space numbers generated on each day of data collection		66% specificity	high-dependency nursing needs
Holme et al. (2013) [31]	Neonatal Unit Whittington Health (UK)	Design & validation of objective clinical scoring system to identify unwell neonates	Case cohort Retrospective	Group 1: n=193 (classed as 'unwell') All neonates born in study period admitted to NICU from labour or postnatal wards Group 2: n= 292 (classed as 'well') Neonates born during same study period not admitted to NICU	Neonatal Trigger Score (NTS)	AUROC 0.924 threshold score ≥2 predicting need for admission to NICU 79.3% sensitivity & 93.5% specificity; mean NTS significantly higher for neonates in group 1 (2.8 vs 0.35, p<.001) NTS out-performed PEWS, with significantly better sensitivity, particularly in neonates who deteriorated within the first 12 hours after birth (P <.001) or in neonates with sepsis or respiratory symptoms (P <.001).	2+ Well-conducted case cohort study Retrospective, 2 groups - 1 classed as 'unwell' and 1 class as 'well'
Kaul et al. (2014) [32]	Children's Hospital of Wisconsin (USA)	Determine if Bedside PEWS impacts on nurses ability to identify patients' at risk of CPA & enables nurses to share assessments & effectively manage deteriorating patients'	Cross-sectional survey	2 acute care medical units (1 with, & 1 without, Bedside PEWS) n=35 nurses (RR 46%) n=17 physicians (RR 81%)	Bedside PEWS	Nurses using Bedside PEWS significantly more likely to recognize risk for deterioration ($p < .04$) & significantly greater ability to initiate escalation of care when a patient was at risk for deterioration ($p < .01$) Physicians on the Bedside PEWS unit significantly more likely to indicate nurses able to effectively communicate concerns about deterioration in patient status ($p < .05$)	4 Expert opinion Electronic descriptive cross-section survey; small sample; one centre; self-report data
Mandell et al. (2015) [33]	Children's Hospital Los Angeles, CA (USA)	Evaluate association between PEWS at PICU discharge & 1st PEWS on paediatric ward with risk of early unplanned PICU readmission	Case-control Retrospective	Cases: 38 children readmitted to PICU within 48 hours after transfer to paediatric ward Control: 151 age-matched controls (not readmitted to PICU within 48 hours after transfer to paediatric ward)	PEWS (modified version of Brighton tool)	PEWS score pre PICU discharge higher for readmitted vs non-readmitted children p=.0003 First PEWS score on paediatric ward higher for readmitted vs non-readmitted children p<.0001 Higher PEWS scores pre PICU discharge & on paediatric ward associated with increased risk of PICU readmission p=.001 & p<.001 respectively No threshold score had adequate sensitivity and specificity to definitively identify children requiring PICU readmission within 48 hours of discharge	2+ Well-conducted case control study Age matched controls, retrospective, 38 cases/151 controls, controls randomly chosen by computer 1 case/3 control
McLellan et al. (2013) [3]	Boston Children's Hospital (USA)	Validation of Cardiac Children's Hospital Early	Cohort Retrospective	*Case:* All patients on inpatient cardiac unit experiencing a CPA or unplanned	C-CHEWS tool Comparison: Paediatric Early	For threshold score ≥3, PEWS sensitivity 54.7% vs 95.3% C-CHEWS; PEWS specificity 80.3% vs 76.2% C-CHEWS; PPV for PEWS 50.7% vs C-CHEWS 50.8%; NPV for PEWS 88.2% vs	2+ Well-conducted cohort study Retrospective, a specific high risk population, convenient comparison group

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes/findings	Level of evidence & rationale for judgement
		Warning Score (C-CHEWS) tool and its related three-tiered algorithm		ICU transfer (n = 64 with 10 arrests, 54 transfers) *Comparison:* 248 patients admitted to inpatient cardiac unit that did not experience CPA or unplanned ICU transfer	Warning Score (Monaghan 2005; Tucker et al 2008)	C-CHEWS 98.4% For threshold score ≥ 5, PEWS sensitivity 23.4% vs 67.2% C-CHEWS; PEWS specificity 97.6% vs 93.6% C-CHEWS; PPV for PEWS 71.4% vs C-CHEWS 72.9%; NPV or PEWS 83.2% vs C-CHEWS 91.7% C-CHEWS higher AUROC (0.917) compared with PEWS (0.785) (p < .001) Lead-time: for cut point ≥ 3, median for C-CHEWS 9.25h vs 2.25h for PEWS & for cut point ≥ 5, C-CHEWS median approx. 2h vs PEWS of 0h C-CHEWS achieved statistically significant higher discrimination than PEWS in identifying cardiovascular patients who may experience an arrest or ICU transfer	
Miranda et al. (2016) [34]	Federal University of Bahia, Salvador, Brazil (South America)	Review literature on use of Brighton PEWS as an instrument to identify signs of clinical deterioration in hospitalised children & possibilities of its application in a Brazilian context	Review	Included 11 research papers (using the Brighton PEWS)	Brighton PEWS	The Brighton PEWS was used, in most studies, as a tool to measure warning signs of clinical deterioration in hospitalized children Although some studies show limitations the Brighton PEWS proved to be easy to apply & user-friendly & was regarded as low complexity, short time & wider feasibility of application, since its use is quick & monitoring equipment is not required; The Brighton PEWS may be regarded as a scoring option to be used in Brazil	2+ Integrative review of 11 studies specifically focused on the validity & reliability of 1 PEWS; 2 databases searched with limited search terms; quality assessment not reported; results reported narratively/descriptively on non-controlled non-randomised studies; included English, Portuguese & Spanish language
Monaghan (2005) [35	Royal Alexandra Children's Hospital Brighton (UK)	Development of a PEWS to detect children at risk of deterioration	Chart review Retrospective	n=30 patients scored 4 on PEWS	Brighton PEWS	96% of patients seen within 15min of applying the Brighton PEWS 83% of patients improved following intervention 17% of patients deteriorated requiring PICU admission	3 Non-analytic, case review Descriptive pilot (of PEWS for 3 month period), followed by patient audit – retrospective
Murray et al. (2015) [36]	Boston Children's Hospital (USA)	Explore literature about the use of early warning system scores with paediatric patients	Review	Included 28 publications; 13 data/research based, 10 clinical practice articles & 5 conference abstracts	PEWS	Greater psychometric testing of tools is needed before any recommendations can be made regarding extensive implementation with paediatric population	2+ Integrative review of 28 publications of which 13 were research based and the remainder grey literature; search terms and databases outlined and acknowledged that due to limited search terms publications may have been missed; quality appraisal included ranking level of evidence; narrative/descriptive

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes/findings	Level of evidence & rationale for judgement
							presentation of findings
Nielsen et al. (2015) [37]	Seattle Children's Hospital (USA)	Determine association between MPEWS in the emergency department (ED) and inpatient ward-to-PICU transfer within 24 hours of admission	Case-control Retrospective	Cases: 50 children transferred to PICU within 24 hours Controls: 575 children remaining hospitalised on inpatient ward	Modified paediatric EWS (MPEWS) (modified from Duncan)	Children with MPEWS > 7 in ED more likely to experience ward-to-PICU transfer; sensitivity 18%, specificity 97.4%, AUROC 0.691 (using this threshold would have led to 167 unnecessary PICU admissions & identified only 9/50 patients requiring PICU care)	2+ Well-conducted case control study Retrospective, control-case ratio 5:1, 18-month study period
Niu et al. (2016) [38]	Children's Hospital of Michigan, Detroit (USA)	Assess feasibility & reliability of PEW scores in paediatric emergency department setting	Feasibility & reliability testing study Prospective	Emergency department patients aged 18 years or younger n=56 ED nurses	Modified PEWS (from Skaletzky et al. who modified Brighton PEWS)	PEW scores demonstrated high inter-rater reliability (intra-class correlation coefficient = 0.91) and intra-rater reliability (intra-class correlation coefficient = 0.90)	3 Non-analytic, case review Descriptive prospective reporting of feasibility and reliability testing in a small sample in one emergency department
Parshuram at al. (2009) [39]	Hospital for Sick Children Toronto (Canada)	Develop & validate a simple bedside score to quantify severity of illness in hospitalized children	Case control Prospective	Case: (n=60) patients admitted urgently to PICU from inpatient ward (not following a 'code-blue' call) Control: (n=120) patients admitted to inpatient ward (not PICU, NICU, OPD, ED) (no 'code-blue' call & not admitted to PICU)	Bedside PEWS score	AUROC 0.91; sensitivity 82%; specificity 93% at threshold score 8 Score increased over 24h pre-urgent PICU admission ($P < 0.0001$) & score higher in patients admitted to ICU ($P < 0.0001$) Bedside PEWS Score can differentiate sick patients & identify >80% of patients with at least 1h notice before urgent ICU admission	2+ Well-conducted case control study Prospective, frequency matched case control design (+ retrospective survey interview), risk recall bias, data abstraction not verified
Parshuram et al. (2011a) [40]	4 participating hospitals - Montreal, Edmonton, Toronto & Birmingham (Canada & UK)	Evaluate performance of Bedside PEWS score in large population at multiple hospitals	Case control Prospective Multicentre	4 hospitals Case: (n= 686) patients experiencing a clinical deterioration event resulting in immediate resuscitation team call or urgent ICU admission Control: (n=1388) patients cared for in an inpatient unit without resuscitation	Bedside PEWS scoring system	Threshold 7, sensitivity 64% & specificity 91% Threshold 8, sensitivity 57% & specificity 94% AUROC 0.87 with scores maintained across age groups, diagnoses and hospitals After inclusion of data from the hour immediately before near or actual CPA, AUROC increased from 0.87 to 0.88	2++ High quality case control study. Large multi-centre international, prospective, 1:2 frequency matched case control design (acc. to clusters of similar inpatient units and stratified patient age categorises), clinical data abstraction + nurse interview/recall of observations (+ retrospective survey global rating); missing data was a limiting factor

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes/findings	Level of evidence & rationale for judgement
				team call or urgent ICU admission			
Parshuram et al. (2011b) [41]	Community hospital (Canada)	Evaluate effect of implementation of Bedside PEWS in 22-bed community paediatric hospital	Before-and-after Prospective	1274 patient admissions Care provided for 842 patient-days before & 2350 patient-days after implementation	Bedside PEWS	Reduction from 2.4 to 0.43 significant clinical deterioration events per 1000 patient-days (P=0.013) Fewer stat calls to respiratory therapists per 1000 patient-days (9.5 vs 3.4; P<0.0001) & to paediatricians per 1000 patient-days (22.9 vs 5.1; P<0.0001) Increase in overall number of transfers per 1000 patient-days (5.9 vs 8.1; P=0.041)	2- High risk of confounding or bias No control group, prospective, 9-month period, small number of events, self-report subjective responses
Parashuram et al. (2015) [42]	Hospital for Sick Children Toronto (Canada)	Evaluate impact of Bedside PEWS on early identification of children at risk for near and actual CPA, hospital mortality, processes of care & ICU resource utilization	Protocol (for 22 hospital cluster randomised trial) EPOCH (evaluating processes & outcomes of children in hospital)	Randomization unit is participating hospitals with a PICU Eligible inpatient wards providing care to children other than NICU, PICU, operating rooms & other areas where anaesthetist-supervised procedures are performed Eligible patients >37 weeks gestational age & <18 years	Bedside PEWS vs standard care (no severity of illness score) Bedside PEWS 4 elements: Bedside PEW score, Bedside PEW documentation record, score-matched care recommendations & education program	Primary outcome: all-cause hospital mortality Secondary outcomes: (i) clinical outcomes: clinical deterioration, severity of illness at and during ICU admission & potentially preventable cardiac arrest; (ii) processes of care outcomes: immediate calls for assistance, hospital and ICU readmission & perceptions of healthcare professionals; (iii) resource utilization: ICU days and use of ICU therapies	NA
Rahman et al. (2016) [43]	New York-Presbyterian/Weill Cornell Medical Center (USA)	Investigation of the external validity of Burn PEWS	Chart review Retrospective	All patients aged 0-15.9 years admitted to the burn center for ≥3 days for treatment of a burn injury, inhalation injury, or toxic epidermal necrolysis syndrome n=50 charts	NewYork-Presbyterian/Weill Cornell Medical Center burn center pediatric early warning score (PEWS) - modified a general PEWS system to a burn specific PEWS	1612 PEWS from 1745 opportunities documented (92.4%); mean overall PEWS 0.9 ± 1.2 (0–10) From 1612 scores, PEWS were elevated greater than 0 for a total of 912 events (56.6%); mean elevated PEWS value greater than 0 was 1.61 ± 1.3 (1–10); parameters most frequently elevated were intake (95.6%) and output (7.9%) 129 PEWS increases (79.6%) were followed by an intervention that most commonly included text notation of score increase (93.7%), physician/physician assistant notification (70.5%), and feeding-tube insertion (25.6%)	3 Non-analytic, case review Retrospective, cohort small sample, single site, 12 month period
Robson et al. (2013) [2]	Children's Hospital in California (USA)	Validate & compare sensitivity & specificity of 3 previously	Case control Retrospective	Cases: n=96 triggered EMRT call due to critical illness with impending or actual CPA	Comparison of 3 PEWS PEW Tool (Haines); Bedside	PEW Tool: PEWS ≥1sensitivity 76.3%, specificity 61.5%, AUROC 0.75 Bedside PEW System Score: PEWS ≥7 sensitivity 56.3%, specificity 78.1%, AUROC 0.73	2+ Well-conducted case control Matched case control, on age, diagnosis and gender; retrospective

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes/findings	Level of evidence & rationale for judgement
		validated PEW scoring systems in predicting acute care patients at risk for impending or actual CPA		Controls: n=96 selected from internal database; matched to cases	PEW System Score (Parshuram); PEW System Score (Duncan)	PEW System Score: PEWS ≥5 sensitivity 86.6%, specificity 72.2%; demonstrated significantly greater accuracy (p<0.05) with AUROC of 0.85	
Roland et al. (2010) [44]	Neonatal Unit, Derriford hospital, Plymouth (UK)	Describes development, and assessment of effectiveness, of a Newborn Early Warning (NEW) system	Chart reviews x 2 Retrospective x 1 Prospective x 1	<u>Retrospective</u> Term infants > 2.5kg presenting to neonatal unit from either postnatal wards or transition care ward <u>Prospective</u> 117 at risk newborn infants (ARNI) - 84 charts available for review (71.2%).	Newborn Early Warning (NEW) System	<u>Retrospective</u> 122 term infants, 51% fulfilled ARNI criteria (84% were correctly identified as such) Only 48% (25/52) of infants recognised as ARNI had observations recorded, but half would have been reviewed earlier (13/25) by a neonatal doctor or nurse practitioner if their observations had been charted on the NEW chart <u>Prospective</u> Increase in retrievable observations to 72% NEW chart threshold criteria prompted management decisions in 9 (47.3%) of 19 infants who required intervention	3 Non-analytic, case reviews 2 chart review audits, 1 retrospective and 1 prospective (+ qualitative survey)
Roland et al. (2014) [45]	Paediatric Emergency Medicine Leicester Academic (PEMLA) Group, University of Leicester (UK)	Determine use of PEWS & RRT in paediatric units in Great Britain	Cross sectional survey	All hospitals with inpatient paediatric services in GB (n=157) 126 hospitals classified as district general hospital (DGH) & 31 tertiary children's hospitals		85% of units using PEWS & 18% had RRT (in 2005 <25% of UK hospitals used PEWS) Tertiary units more likely than district to have PEWS 90% vs 83%, & RRT 52% vs 10%. Large no. of PEWS in use, majority unpublished & invalidated systems; respiratory and heart rates most common criterion used in PEWS with > 50% of respondents using these and oxygen saturations, abnormal consciousness and effort of breathing Implementation of PEWS inconsistent with large variation in the PEWS used, activation criteria used, availability of RRT & membership of RRT	4 Expert opinion Electronic survey based on 2005 PEWS survey (+ follow up telephone survey for non-responders) of identified hospitals providing inpatient paediatric services in Great Britain, self-report data
Roland et al. (2016) [46]	Children's Emergency Department. Leicester Royal Infirmary (UK)	Validate/analysis performance of Paediatric Observation Priority Score (POPS)	Database Review Prospective	Convenience sample of 936 children 0-15 years presented to ED over 2 year period	Paediatric Observation Priority Score (POPS)	Majority of presentations were children of low clinical acuity when analysed by POPS, 59% of all attendees had total POPS of 2 or less. Inclusion of gut instinct and appearance factors into scoring of patients helped contextualise physiological parameter scoring i.e. additional 261 patients identified of lowest acuity & potentially suitable for discharge Those with total POPS score of 2 – 7 appear to stay in ED for longer than average waiting time & those with higher total POPS scores of 8 -10 stay in ED for less time than average	3 Non-analytic, case reviews Prospective data, convenient sample, patients who attended ED over 2 year period 2009-2011

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes/findings	Level of evidence & rationale for judgement
						Patients discharged from ED consume fewer resources than those admitted\nAverage number of investigations or interventions per person increases with increasing clinical acuity on presentation\nPOPS shows promise in assessing children presenting to EDs	
Sefton et al. (2015) [47]	Alder Hey Children's NHS Foundation Trust (UK)	Explore how introducing PEWS at a tertiary children's hospital affects emergency admissions to PICU	Before and after\n\nProspective	In-house cohort of emergency admissions to PICU\n\nExternal cohort of emergency admissions transferred to PICU from wards at District General Hospitals (without PEWs in place)\n\n958 unplanned PICU admissions over 2 years reviewed (1 year before and 1 year after PEWS)	Modified Bristol PEW	In-house cohort\nMedian Paediatric Index of Mortality (PIM2) reduced from 0.60 to 0.44 ($p < 0.001$)\nFewer admissions required invasive ventilation 62% vs 75% ($p = 0.015$) for a shorter median duration, dropping from 4 to 2 days\nMedian length of PICU stay reduced from 5 to 3 days ($p = 0.002$)\nNon-significant reduction in mortality ($p = 0.47$)\n\nExternal cohort\nNo comparable improvements in outcomes\n\nImpact on service delivery\n39% overall reduction in total number of bed days used for emergency PICU admissions which resulted in reduced cancellation of major elective surgical cases by 90% & 79% reduction in number of refused regional PICU referrals	2- High risk of confounding or bias\nCohort, prospective, before 12 month period and after 12 month period, 'in-house' cohort emergency admissions to PICU, comparative group 'external' admissions transferred from DGH (without PEWS)
Seiger et al. (2013) [48]	Erasmus MC - Sophia Children's Hospital, Rotterdam, (Netherlands)	Compare validity of 10 different PEWS to predict ICU admission or hospitalization in large population of children visiting a paediatric emergency department (ED)	Cohort\n\nProspective	n= 17,943 ED patients; 16% (n=2828) admitted to hospital and 2% (n=373) admitted to ICU or died in ED	10 different PEWS (Monaghan; Akre; Skaletzky; Duncan; Parshuram; Egdell; Tibballs; Edwards; Haines; Brilli)	For ICU admission range for the 10 PEWS: sensitivity 61.3-94.4% & specificity 25.2-86.7%\n\nFor hospitalization range for the 10 PEWS: sensitivity 36.4-85.7% & specificity 27.1-90.5%\n\nDiscriminative ability of PEWS (AUROC) moderate-to-good for ICU admission (range: 0.60-0.82); poor-to-moderate for admission to the hospital (range: 0.56-0.68).\n\nNone of PEWS showed both high sensitivity & specificity	2+ Well-conducted cohort study\nProspective collected data during triage assessments, all admissions to ED, 10 different PEWS evaluated
Sinitsky & Reece (2016) [49]	Royal Free London NHS Foundation Trust & West Hertfordshire	In paediatric patients can a PEW trigger or scoring system predict serious clinical deterioration?	Review	Included one systematic review & 12 research papers validating PEWS in paediatric inpatient settings	PEWS	No evidence to recommend the use of any one specific PEWS in paediatric inpatient settings\n\nNo PEWS yet validated in large multi-centre RCT; although results are awaited from 1st international cluster RCT for Bedside PEWS (EPOCH study)	2- Commentary review of validation of PEWS; unsure risk of bias\nSearch terms delineated, search restricted to specific databases & limited reporting of methodology (i.e. selection & screening

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes/findings	Level of evidence & rationale for judgement
	Hospitals NHS Trust (UK)						process, quality assessment, data synthesis etc.) underpinning the review
Skaletzky et al. (2012) [50]	Miami Children's Hospital (USA)	Validate modified version of Brighton PEWS tool for assessment of at-risk children in less acute care hospital areas	Case control Retrospective	Case: (n=100) all patients admitted to medical–surgical wards & transferred to PICU Controls: (n=250) patients admitted to medical–surgical wards but not transferred to the PICU	Modified Brighton PEWS score	Max PEWS score significantly higher p<.0001 for cases; AUROC 0.81; sensitivity & specificity of PEWS score 2.5 for transfer to higher level of care was 62% & 89%, respectively	2+ Well-conducted case control study Retrospective, 1:3 matching controls for each case, matched for age, ward of admission, month of admission, admitting diagnosis
Solevag et al. (2013) [51]	Akershus University Hospital (Norway)	Assess correlation of modified version of Brighton PEWS with other indictors of severe illness/patient characteristics	Chart review Retrospective	n=761 patients (PEWS forms collected)	Modified and translated version of Brighton PEWS	16.2% patients PEWS ≥ 3 & 83.8% PEWS ≤ 2 Transfer to higher level of care was significantly (p = 0.04) more frequent among patients with PEWS ≥3 (4.9%) as compared to PEWS 0-2 (1.7%) Patients with PEWS ≥3 had a higher proportion of admissions compared to patients with PEWS 0-2 Children with PEWS ≥3 received fluid resuscitation, oxygen supplementation & IV antibiotics significantly more often than those with PEWS 0-2	3 Non-analytic, case review Quality improvement project, retrospective data (3 month period – 761 PEWS forms)
Tucker et al. (2009) [6]	Cincinnati Children's Hospital (USA)	Evaluate use of PEWS for detecting clinical deterioration among hospitalised children	Chart review Prospective	n=2979; all patients admitted to a medical unit	Adapted Brighton PEWS tool	n=51 transferred to PICU (1.8%); PEWS discriminated between children who required transfer to PICU (AUCROC = 0.89, p<.001) For PEWS of 3 (lowest score requiring additional intervention) sensitivity 90.2%, specificity 74.4%, PPV 5.8%, NPV 99.8%. For PEWS of 9, sensitivity 7.8%, specificity 99.9%, PPV 80%, NPV 98.4% Inter-rater reliability high (intra-class correlation coefficient = 0.92, p<.001)	3 Non-analytic, case review Prospective, descriptive, all patients admitted to one unit over 12 month period, data recorded by charge nurse using localised tool
Tume (2007) [52]	Large specialist children's hospital based in North West of England (UK)	Examine extent of inpatient deterioration & critical care unit admission	Chart review Prospective	n=341 children admitted to PICU (65 children (19%) were unplanned admissions from wards); 346 children admitted to HDU, 16% (n = 52) unplanned admissions from wards	Bristol Children's PEWS Melbourne Activation Criteria (MAC)	121 children required unplanned HDU & ICU admission; mostly (55%) for respiratory distress (predominantly (59%) occurred out of office hours) When matched, 88% (n = 29) of ICU-admitted children would have triggered the Bristol PEW tool & 88% (n = 29) would have also triggered MAC 83% (n =27) of HDU admitted patients would have triggered the Bristol Children's tool & 85% (n = 28) would have also triggered MAC	3 Non-analytic, case review Prospective audit, 4 month period, descriptive analysis, child physiological data retrospectively matched against two PEW tools

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes/findings	Level of evidence & rationale for judgement
Zhai et al. (2014) [53]	Cincinnati Children's Hospital (USA)	Develop & evaluate performance of an EHR-based automated algorithm to predict need for PICU transfer & compare effectiveness of this new algorithm with 2 published PEWS	Case control Retrospective	Cases: n=526 patients admitted to PICU within 24 hours of admission Control: n=6772 patients never transferred to PICU	EHR-based automated prediction algorithm for PICU transfer Comparison: Monaghan PEWS tool & Bedside PEWS	Algorithm achieved 0.849 sensitivity, 0.859 specificity & 0.912 AUC; the algorithm's AUC was significantly higher by 11.8 and 22.6%, than two published PEWS Bedside PEWS (sensitivity 0.736, specificity 0.717, AUC 0.816) & Monaghan's PEWS (sensitivity 0.684, specificity 0.816, AUC 0.744)	2- High risk of confounding or bias Retrospective, to test algorithm

Table 2: PEWS response mechanisms (n=29)

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes	Level of evidence and rationale for judgement
Bonafide et al. (2014a) [54]	Children's Hospital of Philadelphia (USA)	Evaluate impact of paediatric RRS implementation on critical deterioration	Interrupted time series Retrospective	1810 unplanned transfers from medical/surgical wards to PICU/NICU	Hospital-wide RRS inclusive of MET and an early warning score	Absolute reductions in ward cardiac arrests (from 0.03 to 0.01 per 1000 non–intensive care patient-days) and deaths during ward emergencies (from 0.01 to 0.00 per 1000 non–intensive care patient-days), but these were not statistically significant (p =0.21 and p =0.99, respectively) Among all unplanned transfers, critical deterioration was associated with a 4.97-fold increased risk of death (p < .001)	2- High risk of non-causal relationships Retrospective, historical records, potential exposure to unmeasured confounding
Bonafide et al. (2012) [55]	Children's Hospital of Philadelphia (USA)	Develop a valid pragmatic measure for evaluating & optimizing RRSs over shorter periods of time	Cohort Retrospective .	724 medical emergency team (MET) & 56 code-blue team (CBT) activations	Rapid Response System including an early warning score & a MET	Critical deterioration (1.52 per 1000 non-ICU patient-days) >8 times more frequent than CHCA (Child Health Corporation of America) metric & associated with >12-fold increased risk of death among patients who received treatment from MET & CBT Critical deterioration metric sensitivity 76.0%; specificity 83.1%; PPV 16.7%; NPV 98.7%; relative risk of death 13.1 (95% CI:5.4–32.1) vs CHCA metric sensitivity 20.8%; specificity 98.8% ; PPV 41.7%; NPV 96.5%; relative risk of death 12.0 (95% CI:5.4–26.6)	2- High risk of confounding or bias Retrospective, review of MET activations, chart and unit review
Brilli et al.	Free standing	Implement & evaluate	Chart review	Hospital medical	Medical Emergency	Code rate (respiratory + cardiopulmonary	3 Non-analytic, case

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes	Level of evidence and rationale for judgement
(2007) [56]	children's hospital (USA)	effectiveness of MET & develop a 'trigger tool' (like PEWS)	Retrospective	records 44 patients who had CRA (cardiac respiratory arrest)	Team (MET)	arrests) post-MET 0.11 per 1,000 patient days compared with baseline 0.27 (p=.03) For codes outside ICU, pre-MET mortality rate 0.12 per 1,000 days compared with 0.06 post-MET (p =.13); overall mortality rate for outside ICU codes 42%	reviews Described as a performance improvement project, pre-post chart review + a staff performance assessment survey
Chan et al. (2010) [57]	Dept. of Internal Medicine, Mid America Heart Institute at St Luke's Hospital, University of Missouri–Kansas City (USA)	Assess effect of RRT implementation in reducing rates of CPA & hospital mortality; examine cumulative temporal trend on outcomes of RRTs & evaluate degree to which mortality reductions are explained by lower rates of CPA	Review	17 articles identified 5 child specific studies	Rapid Response Team (RRT)	37.7% reduction in rates of CPA outside ICU & 21.4% reduction in hospital mortality rates (pooled analysis); however this pooled mortality estimate in children was not robust to sensitivity analyses Although RRTs have broad appeal, robust evidence to support their effectiveness in reducing hospital mortality is lacking	2++ High quality systematic review of observational/quasi-experimental studies Search strategy detailed, 5 child specific studies of varying quality; all before/after studies with one time series study; results analysed at study not patient-level data; meta-analysis limited by extensive heterogeneity in reported outcomes and variation in research designs
Chen et al. (2014) [58]	Adult and children's hospitals with PICUs (USA)	Determine prevalence, characteristics & opinions of RRTs in hospitals with PICUs	Cross sectional survey	Survey sent to 210 US hospitals, 130 included - 103 completed by PICU medical directors Response rate 64%	Rapid Response Teams	103 (79%) had an RRT (most implemented in last 5 years); all available 7 days a week, 24 hours a day. 80% of institutions had RRT separate from cardiopulmonary resuscitation team Family activations present in 69% of hospitals Composition: median of 3 members composed of physicians in 77%; nurses in 100% and respiratory therapists in 89% of institutions Respondents with RRTs more likely to agree RRTs improve patient safety than respondents from institutions without RRTs (76% vs 52%) & more likely to disagree that RRTs are not worth the money invested (82% vs 63%)	4 Expert opinion Surveys (designed by investigators & piloted) distributed online and via mail, targeted selected US hospitals with PICU only, surveyed PICU physicians – data self-reported practices and beliefs, potential for non-response bias
Dean et al. (2008) [59]	Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh of the University of Pittsburgh	Develop paediatric patient safety program to give families a voice in their child's medical care	Quality Improvement Initiative	42 calls from patients/parents to Condition HELP team over 24 month study	Condition Help Call	Main reason for each call - communication breakdown between patient/parents & clinical staff (physician/nurse)	4 Expert opinion Descriptive account of 2 year analysis of Condition Help

BMJ Open

Page 46 of 62

bmjopen-2016-014497 on 13 March 2017. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on April 20, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes	Level of evidence and rationale for judgement
	Medical Center (USA)			period			
Hanson et al. (2010) [60]	North Carolina (USA)	Determine effects of multifaceted paediatric RRS on duration of predefined clinical instability & subsequent rate of cardiac arrests	Interrupted time series Retrospective	All patients in the hospital during the study period	Paediatric Rapid Response Team (PRRT)	Increase in mean time interval between cardiac arrests from 2512 to 9418 patient days Median duration of clinical instability decreased from 9h 55min to 4h 15min in unplanned PICU admissions (p=0.028) Ward cardiac arrest rate/1000 ward admissions 1.27 before & 0.45 after PRRS (p=0.126) Ward death rate/1000 ward admissions 1.5 before & 0.45 after PRRS (p=0.070)	2- High risk of non-causal relationships Retrospective (+ chart review); potential exposure to unmeasured confounding
Haque et al. (2010) [61]	Aga Khan tertiary care University Hospital (Pakistan)	Report before & after implementation of a PRRT in paediatric wards to determine effect & outcome of the intervention	Chart review Retrospective	All paediatric admissions pre & post intervention	Paediatric rapid response team (RRT)	Code rate per 1000 admissions outside the PICU decreased from 5.2 to 2.7 (p=0.004) Mortality rate of patients admitted in PICU from wards decreased from 30% to 15% (p=0.001)	3 Non-analytic case review Audit, retrospective data, before and after, 9 month post-implementation period, all children admitted, data form completed by RRT and later collected by one investigator for review
Heath et al. (2016) [62]	Birmingham Children's Hospital (UK)	Development, and pilot of, a tool to support parents in communicating & escalating concerns about their child's clinical condition when in hospital	Quality improvement initiative	51 parents & 49 staff completed evaluation questionnaire	'Listening to You' communication bundle (poster, booklets, planning care together sheet) for parents and staff	<u>Implementation</u> 24/51 parents reported seeing the poster & 20/51 the booklet; only 3 parents reported using these resources; reasons for non-usage were-lack of awareness or lack of need 38/49 staff reported being aware of the project & 4 reported been involved in parent-initiated discussions using the resources <u>User feedback</u> Of the 3 parents who used the 'Listening to You' resources, 2 felt the materials led to increased confidence in raising concerns & having them listened to Of the staff who had seen or used the staff resources, approximately half reported they were easy to use, gave them confidence to elicit & discuss parental concerns & helped with parent-professional communication	4 Expert opinion Outlines local quality improvement initiative including a purposive national survey of current practice (31 wards 14 hospitals contacted over 1 month period via telephone/email), a literature review (30 papers mainly adult focused), semi-structured interviews (10 parents, 14 health professionals); describes intervention development & local user feedback

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes	Level of evidence and rationale for judgement
						Incidents and complaints Prior to implementation of 'Listening to You', two SIRIs relating to staff not listening to parent concerns were recorded. No incidents or complaints had been reported at the end of the pilot. **PEW Scores (parental concerns box)** On two cardiac wards reviewed, 81% of parental/nurse concern boxes were completed & of the completed boxes, 4% had documented a parental concern	
Hueckel et al. (2012) [63]	Duke University Hospital - Children's Health Center (USA)	Increase nursing & family awareness about Condition H	Quality improvement initiative	**PBMTU** n=38 families eligible for teaching Those who received teaching ranged from 64-90% monthly with mean of 80% n=32 eligible to complete survey on family understanding **Intermediate ward** n=159 patients admitted during study period; n=107 families received Condition H teaching – weekly range 53% - 85% (mean 68%)	Condition Help .	**PBMTU** 88% completed survey – all indicated they had heard about Condition H and could provide reason for calling Condition H; only 1 family needed additional instruction on how to call Condition H **Intermediate ward** n=81 (81%) participated - about 2 families (98%) heard about Condition H; 64 (74%) could describe reason for calling Condition H and 66 (76%) answered correctly when asked how to call a Condition help. **Rapid response and Condition H Activations** 2 family initiated calls - in both cases parents were following up on signs & symptoms they had been told by medical staff to watch for; both appropriate & did not need higher level of care	4 Expert opinion Describes education process for teaching families about Condition Help & follow up survey to evaluate family understanding
Humphreys & Totapally (2016) [64]	Miami Children's Hospital, Florida (USA)	Evaluate times & disposition of rapid response alerts & outcomes for children transferred from acute care to intensive care	Cohort Retrospective	542 rapid response calls	Rapid response (RR) calls	321/542 (59.2%) RR calls were during daytime 323 children (59.6%) transferred to PICU 164 (30.3%) remained on acute care unit 19 (3.5%) required resuscitation (and were eventually transferred to PICU) More children transferred to PICU after rapid response alerts (p = .048) during day (66%) than night (59%) time	2- High risk of confounding or bias Retrospective, RR calls reviewed

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes	Level of evidence and rationale for judgement
						Mortality rate among children transferred from acute care units (3.8%) to PICU significantly higher (p < .001) than other PICU admissions (1.4%)	
Hunt et al. (2008) [65]	Johns Hopkins Children's Medical and Surgical Center (USA)	Effect of a PMET intervention on prevention of respiratory arrest & cardiopulmonary arrest	Before-and-after Retrospective & Prospective	Admitted patients who had either code team or PMET called or who had a CRA	Paediatric medical emergency team (PMET)	No change in the rate of CPA Respiratory arrests decreased by 73% (0.23 to 0.06 per 1000 patient-days p=.03) Combined rate of respiratory and CPAs on the wards decreased 51% after transition to the PMET, but not significantly Consistent decrease (not statistically significant) in survival of patients who had a respiratory or CPA after the intervention	2- High risk of confounding or bias No control group, retrospective & prospective
Kotsakis et al. (2011) [66]	4 academic paediatric hospitals in Ontario (Canada)	Examine effectiveness of a paediatric rapid response system (PRRS)	Before-and-after Retrospective & Prospective	Data extracted from hospital administrative databases for 2 years before & after PRRS implementation	Rapid Response System using a physician led MET	No difference in rate of actual CPA 1.9 vs 1.8 per 1000 hospital admissions (p =.68) No change in rate of PICU mortality after urgent PICU admission 1.3 vs 1.1 per 1000 hospital admissions (p =.25) There was reduction in PICU mortality rate after PICU readmission 0.3 vs 0.1 death per 1000 hospital admissions (p =.05)	2- High risk of confounding or bias Interdisciplinary multi-centre study, no control group; retrospective & prospective
Lobos et al. (2014) [67]	Children's Hospital, of Eastern Ontario, Ottawa (Canada)	Explore whether health care staff activate MET differently and if so whether the difference was associated with patient disposition	Cohort Retrospective	Patients < 18 years who received MET activation during hospitalisation	Rapid Response System using a physician led MET	Physicians were most common MET activators 53.3% vs 47.7% generated by nurses Physicians had statistically significant higher PICU admission rates when compared with nurses (25.2% vs 15.0%, *p* =.001).	2- High risk of confounding or bias Retrospective, MET activations reviewed
Lobos et al. (2015) [68]	Children's Hospital, of Eastern Ontario, Ottawa (Canada)	Describe MET activity in follow-up program of all patients discharged from PICU	Cohort Retrospective	Discharged paediatric patients from PICU	Rapid Response System using a physician led MET – follow-up program of 2 planned MET visits within 48 hours post PICU discharge	1,805 patients followed after PICU discharge 36 patients (2%) readmitted at some point during follow-up period of which 11 (30%) occurred at time of 1st planned MET visit As comparison to 2 years preceding RRS the PICU readmission rate was significantly higher 6.8 vs 2% p=0.0001) Interrupted time-series analysis demonstrated a statistically significant immediate change in PICU readmission rate (−5.5%, *p* =0.0001) During the 48-hour planned follow-up period,	2- High risk of confounding or bias Data from prospectively maintained rapid-response system database over 41-month period

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes	Level of evidence and rationale for judgement
						4% (64) of patients received an unplanned MET visit & 13% received an active intervention Multiple diseased organs were associated with major MET support after initial visit for recent surgical patients ($p = 0.03$)	
Paciotti et al. (2014) [69]	Children's Hospital of Philadelphia (USA)	Explore physician views on families facilitating identifying deteriorating children & possible options of enabling families to independently activate MET	Qualitative - interviews	30 physicians (21 medical & 9 surgical)	FAMET (family activated medical emergency team).	Physicians depend on families to explain child's baseline condition & identify changes; 63% (n=19) Families should not be able to directly activate an MET; 93% (n=28) Reasons why not; Family activation would lead to misuse of resources (64%, n=18) Families lack training & clinical knowledge to determine when MET call is indicated (43%, n=12) Family activation would undermine therapeutic relationship between clinicians & families (25%, n=7) Availability of Family Activation burdens families/increases anxiety (18%, n=5) Evidence demonstrating a relationship between FAMET implementation & improved patient outcome is needed (18% n=5) One FAMET call activated by family member - primary reason for call = communication breakdown between family & staff	4 Expert opinion Semi-structured interviews based on expert opinions of 30 physicians selected purposively, single site, constant comparative analysis
Panesar et al. (2014) [70]	Stony Brook Long Island Children's Hospital (USA)	Examine changes in characteristics of RRT calls before & after implementation of mandatory hospital policy	Database review Retrospective	Before mandatory triggering: 44 RRT calls (40 patients) After mandatory triggering: 69 RRT calls (63 patients)	Paediatric RRT	Number of night time events increased by 17.5% (p =.07) Main trigger for activations was tachycardia - an increase of 26.1% (p =.004) Reduction of 22.9% (p =.009) in RRTs called due to acute change in mental status/agitation Increase of 15.1% of RRTs required no intervention with mandatory triggering Trend toward decreased frequency of PICU transfers in post group by 17.9% (p = .06) with no change in number of code blue calls or mortality	3 Non-analytic, case review Quality assessment project, retrospective RRT database review, > 2 year period, before and after implementation

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes	Level of evidence and rationale for judgement
Ray et al. (2009) [71]	North Carolina Children's Hospital (USA)	Implementation of family-activated paediatric RRS; issues that arise during process and strategies for overcoming challenges	Quality improvement initiative	140 bed hospital	Family activation RRT	Random in-person surveys of 276 families show on average only 27% of families understand when and how to activate RRT. Family awareness has been as high as 58% and as low as 6% Family concern was noted as a reason for activation in 5% of calls; 2 calls directly activated by families Insufficient data to evaluate impact of family activation on cardiac arrests	4 Expert opinion Descriptive localised account of implementing a family activated Paediatric RRS, random in-person surveys with families
Sen et al. (2013) [72]	30 academic US paediatric hospitals (USA)	Examination of standard paediatric RRT practice, focusing on large US academic institutions	Cross-sectional survey	34 hospitals (identified using top US News & World Report rankings) Response rate 88% (n=30) Respondents were arrest committee chairpersons or PICU medical directors		All responding hospitals maintained 24 hour/day-7 day/week arrest teams and RRTs RRTs vary in terms of triggers, composition, response time and follow-up 33% of hospitals had a dedicated emergency team nurse; none had a dedicated physician Only 73% RRT had physician member 23% provide additional support (e.g. salary) 60% received family-activated calls 52% of RRT calls led to PICU transfer 73% of hospitals track RRT call times with 82% reporting majority of calls occur in daytime Limited standardisation (incl. definition) of outcome measures Best outcome measure for determining effectiveness of paediatric RRTs is unclear	4 Expert opinion Telephone survey, focused on prominent academic paediatric hospitals in US, self-report data
Sharek et al. (2007) [73]	Lucile Packard Children's Hospital (LPCH) (USA)	Evaluate effect of RRT implementation on hospital-wide mortality rates and code (respiratory & cardiopulmonary arrests) rates outside ICU in paediatric inpatients	Cohort Retrospective & Prospective	Patients admitted to LPCH during the study period; spent at least 1 day on the non-obstetric, non-nursery-based, non-ICU medical or surgical wards	Paediatric RRT	After RRT implementation, mean monthly mortality rate decreased by 18% (1.01 to 0.83 deaths per 100 discharges; p=.007) Mean monthly code rate per 1000 admissions decreased by 71.7% (2.45 to 0.69) & mean monthly code rate per 1000 patient-days decreased by 71.2% (0.52 to 0.15) Estimated code rate per 1000 admissions for post-intervention group 0.299 times that for pre-intervention group (p=.008) Estimated code rate per 1000 patient-days for post-intervention group 0.288 times that for pre-intervention group (p=.007)	2+ Well-conducted cohort study Described as before and after, uses historic data as 'control', cannot definitively say clinical outcome changes result of RRT intervention potential variance between pre and post intervention populations
Theilen et al. (2013) [74]	Royal Hospital for Sick	Evaluate impact of regular team training on hospital response to	Cohort Prospective	All deteriorating in-patients requiring	Paediatric Medical Emergency Team (pMET)	Deteriorating patients recognised more promptly (before/after pMET median time 4/1.5h, p < 0.001); more often reviewed by	2+ Well-conducted cohort study Prospective, audit, all

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes	Level of evidence and rationale for judgement
	Children, Edinburgh (UK)	deteriorating in-patients with evolving critical illness and subsequent patient outcome		admission to PICU the year before & after introduction of pMET & concurrent team training	Concurrent with weekly in situ simulation team training	consultants (45%/76%, p = 0.004); more often transferred to high dependency care (18%/37%, p = 0.021) & more rapidly escalated to intensive care (median time 10.5/5h, p = 0.024) (improvements most marked in out-of-hours) Trend towards fewer PICU admissions, reduced level of sickness at time of PICU admission, reduced length of PICU stay & reduced PICU mortality Introduction of pMET coincided with significantly reduced hospital mortality (p < 0.001)	admissions to ICU, 1 year period, before & after MET & concurrent team training, uncontrolled, Hawthorne effect bias
Tibballs et al. (2005) [75]	Royal Children's Hospital, Melbourne (Australia)	Determine impact of MET on cardiac arrest, mortality, and unplanned admission to intensive care in a paediatric tertiary care hospital.	Chart review Comparison of retrospective & prospective data	Cardiac arrest & death incidences pre & post intervention (excluded non-inpatients, infants in N/PICU, patients with DNR decisions or receiving palliative care & arrests under anaesthesia)	MET .	Risk of cardiac arrest 0.19/1000 admissions before MET; reduced to 0.11/1000 admissions with MET (p=0.32) Risk of death 0.12/1000 admissions before MET; reduced to 0.06/1000 admissions with MET (p=0.28) Incidence of transgression of MET call criteria in patients who arrested decreased from 17 to 0 (risk difference 0.16/1000, p=0.0158) & in those who died, decreased from 12 to 0 (risk difference 0.11/1000, p=0.0426) after introduction of MET Unplanned admissions to ICU from wards increased from mean of 20 to 24 per month (p=0.074), representing increase from 17.3% to 21.3% of total ICU admissions	3 Non-analytic, case review Quality assurance exercise, preliminary results, before & after, compared retrospective data pre-MET (41 month period) with prospective data post-MET (12 month period)
Tibballs & Kinney (2009) [76]	Royal Children's Hospital Melbourne (Australia)	Determine effect of MET service on incidence of unexpected cardiac arrest and death in a paediatric hospital	Chart review Comparison of retrospective & prospective data	104780 admissions during a 41 month period pre-MET 138424 admissions during a 48 month period post-MET	Paediatric MET	Incidence of hospital deaths decreased from 4.38 to 2.87/1000 admissions (*p* < 0.0001) Incidence of unexpected in-hospital ward deaths decreased from 0.12 to 0.04/1000 (p=0.03) Incidence of total unexpected ward cardiac arrest did not change from 0.19 to 0.17/1000 (p=0.75)	3 Non-analytic, case review Before & after, compared retrospective data pre-MET (41 month period) with prospective data post-MET (48 month period)

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes	Level of evidence and rationale for judgement
						Among patients whose condition fulfilled MET calling criteria (preventable cardiac arrest), incidence of arrest decreased from 0.16 to 0.07 (p=0.04) & incidence of subsequent death decreased from 0.11 to 0.01/1000 admissions (p=0.001) Among patients whose condition did not fulfil MET calling criteria (non-preventable cardiac arrest), incidence of arrest increased from 0.03 to 0.10/1000 (p=0.03) but incidence of subsequent death did not increase. Survival from cardiac arrest increased from 7 of 20 patients to 17 of 23 (p=0.01)	
VandenBerg et al. (2007) [77]	Canadian and American hospitals with >=50 paediatric acute care beds or >=2 paediatric wards (Canada)	Describe levels of care, frequency of near or actual cardiopulmonary arrest (code-blue events), identification mechanisms & responses to evolving critical illness in hospitalized children	Cross-sectional survey	964 health care professionals from 388 hospitals (response rate 84%); of responding hospitals 181 (47%) met inclusion criteria; 16 (8%) were Canadian hospitals; 165 (92%) were American; 85 (47%) were freestanding paediatric acute care hospital		All responding hospitals had immediate-response teams; they were activated 4676 times in previous 12 months 24% of hospitals had activation criteria for immediate-response teams Urgent-response teams to treat clinically deteriorating children (not at immediate risk of cardiopulmonary arrest) were available in 75% hospitals; 17% had formal METs and 51% consulted PICU Code-blue events were more common in hospitals with extracorporeal membrane oxygenation therapy, cardiopulmonary bypass, and larger PICU size.	4 Expert opinion Telephone survey (designed by investigators), of selected Canadian/American hospitals ≥50 paediatric acute care beds or ≥2 paediatric wards, self-report data – accuracy not verified
Jagt (2013) [8]	Dept. of Paediatrics, University of Rochester (USA)	Identify what is known about use & organization of paediatric resuscitation teams (code teams) & PRRS	Review	Search strategy, screening process and number of eligible papers included in the review not specified	Paediatric rapid response team (PRRT)	Exact details of RRT implementation varies among paediatric institutions Critical that data is collected in a standardised fashion across institutions so that best possible RRS can be designed	2- Narrative review of components of RRS; unsure risk of bias Methodology (i.e. search strategy, screening process, quality assessment, data synthesis) underpinning the review not reported
VanVoorhis & Willis (2009)	North Carolina	Highlight process of developing a	Case examples x 2	*Case example 1* North Carolina	Paediatric rapid response system (PRRS)	Case example 1: Mean time interval between cardiac arrests increased from 2512 to 9418	3 Non-analytic, case review

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main outcomes	Level of evidence and rationale for judgement
[78]	Children's Hospital & Levine Children's Hospital (LCH), North Carolina (USA)	paediatric rapid response system (PRRS) & measuring its effects on patient safety		Children's Hospital *Case example 2* Levine Children's Hospital	Institution-wide/Paediatric Early Response Team (PERT)	days, indicating a decrease in non-ICU cardiac arrests. Median duration of predefined clinical instability before assessment by ICU personnel decreased from 9h 55min to 6h 15min post intervention (p = .028) Case example 2: Mean rate of non-ICU codes decreased from 4 to 1.5/1000 discharges	Descriptive presentation of case examples from 2 US hospitals
Wang et al. (2011) [79]	Children's hospital Denvor (USA)	Describe demographic & clinical variables including outcomes of emergency response team (ERT) activations	Database review Retrospective	n=1334 ERT activations analysed	Emergency Response Team (ERT)	A total of 39% (511) of all ERT activations occurred in patients under the age of 1 year Statistically, there were significantly more ERT activations during day as compared to night shifts (P < 0.001); no statistical significance between summer and winter months Most common admission diagnosis category was cardiac disease Survival rate after an ERT itself was 90%, with an overall survival rate to discharge of 78%	3 Non-analytic, case review Descriptive retrospective, database of ERT activations, 13 year period
Winberg et al. (2008) [80]	Queen Silvia Children's Hospital, Gothenburg (Sweden)	Evaluate & summarise current knowledge about paediatric RRSs	Review	Included 8 articles published in peer-reviewed journals	Paediatric Rapid Response System (PRRS)	PRRSs are used extensively internationally 1 study reported a statistically significant decrease in mortality rate after implementation; 2 studies showed a non-significant association with decreased mortality rate Cardiac and/or respiratory arrest rates decreased in 4 before-after studies with statistical significance in 2 studies Concluded that existing data supports effectiveness of paediatric RRS; however limited guidance on most optimal system	2+ Review reporting on observational / quasi-experimental studies Outline of search strategy provided; quality assessment not reported; results reported narratively on non-controlled non-randomised studies
Zenker et al. (2007) [81]	Children's Hospitals and Clinics of Minnesota (USA)	Evaluate effectiveness & impact of implementing RRT	Pre-post design Retrospective & Prospective	Post-RRT implementation 150 activations (2 requested by parents) Rates of 12.84 RRT activations per 1000 discharges & 3.06 per 1000 patient-days	Paediatric Rapid Response Team	Mortality rate unchanged from 22561 discharges pre-implementation to 11682 discharges during implementation phase (4.3 vs 4.5 per 1000 discharges p=.57) Incidence of arrests both cardiac and respiratory decreased from 8 to 5.1 per 1000 discharges a decrease of 36% (p=.19)	2- High risk of confounding or bias No control group, retrospective & prospective

Table 3: PEWS implementation strategies (n=16)

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main Outcomes	Level of evidence and rationale for judgement
Azzopardi et al. (2011) [82]	Royal Children's Hospital Melbourne (Australia)	Assess value/attitudes placed on MET by clinical staff & identify barriers to activation of MET	Cross-sectional survey	n=407 (280 nurses & 127 doctors) Of the 407 participants, 305 were MET callers & 102 were MET responders	MET	MET highly valued for obtaining urgent assistance for seriously ill patients by 85% nurses & 83% doctors Amongst MET callers more nurses than doctors (p = 0.01) disagreed that MET reduces their skills in managing sick patients and agreed that MET teaches them how to better manage severely ill patients (p = 0.09) Doctors who were MET responders agreed that MET increases their workload when caring for sick patients compared to MET callers (p < 0.01) Amongst nurses, MET responders were more likely to agree that MET was overused compared to MET callers (p < 0.01) Amongst MET callers, medical staff were more likely to agree that MET was overused compared to nurses (p < 0.01)	4 Expert opinion Electronic survey, modified version of a previously developed & validated questionnaire, all clinical staff (medical and nursing) invited to complete; 1 month time-period; self-report expert opinion, potential for non-response bias
Bonafide et al. (2013a) [83]	Children's Hospital of Philadelphia (USA)	Identify mechanisms beyond statistics to predict clinical deterioration by which physicians and nurses use EWS to support their decision making	Qualitative - interviews	n=57 (27 nurses & 30 physicians) General medical & surgical wards	Rapid Response System (EWS based on Bedside Paediatric Early Warning System + MET)	EWS facilitates safety by alerting physicians & nurses to concerning vital sign changes prompting critical thinking about possible deterioration EWS provides less-experienced nurses with age-based vital sign reference ranges Having concrete evidence of clinical changes in form of an EWS empowers nurses to escalate care & communicate their concerns For patients who are stable; patients with abnormal physiology baselines who consistently have high EWSs & patients experiencing neurologic deterioration EWS may not help with decision-making	4 Expert opinion Semi-structured interviews, expert opinion of nurses and physicians in one context, potential social desirability response bias
Bonafide et al (2014b) [84]	Children's Hospital of Philadelphia (USA)	Model the financial costs & benefits of operating a MET & determine annual reduction in critical deterioration (CD) events required to off-set MET costs	Cohort Retrospective	Unplanned transfer of child classified as CD if any life-sustaining interventions (ventilation or vasopressor infusion) were required within 12 hours of ICU	MET team	Patients who had CD cost $99,773 (p < .001) more during their post-event hospital stay than transfers to ICU that did not meet CD criteria Annual MET operating costs ranged from $287,145 for a nurse & respiratory therapist team with concurrent responsibilities to $2,358,112 for a nurse, respiratory therapist, & ICU attending physician freestanding team	2- High risk of confounding or bias Retrospective review

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main Outcomes	Level of evidence and rationale for judgement
				transfer. 1,759 unplanned transfers occurred during study period; 1,396 patients met inclusion criteria; 378 (27.1%) met CD criteria		In base-case analysis, a nurse, respiratory therapist, & ICU fellow team with concurrent responsibilities cost $350,698 per year, equivalent to a reduction of 3.5 CD events	
Brady & Goldenhar (2013) [85]	Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center (USA)	Learn about factors that influence front-line healthcare providers' ability to achieve and maintain SA	Qualitative – focus group interviews	n=3 focus groups with charge nurses (n=3,3,4) n=3 focus groups bedside nurse/RT groups (n=3,3,5) n=1 resident focus group (n=10)	NA	**Team based care (social system input)** *Family empowerment* – listening to, engaging & giving families power to escalate their concerns *Nurse empowerment* - having a powerful, equal and welcomed voice in huddles and within patient care team *Unit culture that supports teamwork, accountability & safety* - support trusting relationships, encourage communication & willingness to ask for second opinions **Availability of standardised data (technological system input)** *Standardised data elements/scores* e.g. objective algorithms (e.g. PEWS) + gut feeling *Tools for entering, displaying and monitoring data and data trends* e.g. electronic health record & its ability to display data over time **Standardised processes and procedures (organisational system input)** *Shared training and language regarding patient risk* - e.g. watcher - having a gut feeling about a patient that is at risk for deterioration or close to the edge; having experienced providers; peer coaching & debriefing *Structure to proactively identify and plan for risk* e.g. huddles, frequent scheduled assessments, check-ins by charge nurses & physicians, MRT calling criteria, planning tools and explicit contingency planning *Structure to support handoffs and continuity of care* e.g. clear and standardised handoff practices and knowledge of the patient's initial and current status and the patient's family *Structure that supports adequate workload/staffing* e.g. improved staff-to-patient ratio; experienced &	4 Expert opinion Localised focus group interviews with nurses, respiratory therapists and physician, potential for group think bias & presentation of beliefs and opinions rather than actual behaviours/actions

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main Outcomes	Level of evidence and rationale for judgement
						diverse team of providers available on all shifts; extra resources available	
Brady et al. (2013) [86]	Cincinnati Children's Hospital Centre (USA)	Design a system to identify, mitigate, & escalate patient risk by using principles of high-reliability organizations	Time series	Checklist-based form followed flow of situation awareness algorithm; completed by charge nurse (collected from each unit on each nursing shift)	Situation Awareness intervention	Rate of UNSAFE (unrecognized situation awareness failures events) transfers/10000 non-ICU inpatient days were significantly reduced from 4.4 to 2.4; days between inpatient SSEs (serious safety events) also increased significantly	2- High risk of non-causal relationships Retrospective, potential exposure to unmeasured confounding, no measure for situation awareness
Demmel et al. (2010) [87]	Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center (USA)	Implement PEW Scoring System on a Paediatric Haematology/Onc ology	Chart review Quality improvement initiative (PDSA cycles) PEWS team & historical data (unplanned ICU transfers from oncology unit)	Haematology/ oncology/bone marrow transplant unit	PEWS scoring process & 'watchful eye' action algorithm	Immediately prior to implementation of PEWS, no. of days between CPA on unit = 299; Post-implementation, days between CPA on unit increased to 1053; sustained at that level for nearly 2 years Staff evaluation: PEWS scoring process improved multidisciplinary team communication & defined clear actions for new, less experienced staff High level of charge nurse involvement helped keep the initiative going	3 Non-analytic, case reviews Describes implementation of PEWS tool & action algorithm, prospective and retrospective data, ongoing cycles using plan-do-study-act
Duncan & Frew (2009) [88]	Teaching specialist children's hospital (UK)	Determine additional short-term health service costs of in-hospital acute life threatening events in children to inform a cost-effectiveness analysis of prevention strategies	Cost-analysis exercise	All life-threatening event calls over a 27 month period Control group of age and specialty matched patients	Cardio-pulmonary resuscitation attempts	120 acute life-threatening event calls (36 cardiac & 80 respiratory arrest; 4 for another event); average 12.8 staff members attended each call Total cost of a CPR attempt (actual attempt & preparedness) £3,663/attempt Mean cost of post-event length of stay in hospital was £22,562 for cardiac arrest, £26,335 for other acute life-threatening events, and £26,138 for urgent PIC admissions. Cost per survivor to hospital discharge £53,289	3 Non-analytic, case reviews Prospective
Hayes et al. (2012) [89]	20 Child Health Corporation of America (CHCA) hospitals (USA)	Implement suite of prevention, detection & correction strategies to reduce number of inpatient paediatric cardiopulmonary arrests and improve patient safety culture	Quality improvement initiative	Ward areas: each team identified target units from noncritical care inpatient units, ED, operating rooms, and ICUs.	Foundational changes e.g. SBAR Midlevel changes e.g. RRT Advanced changes e.g. FARRT	PEWS implemented in 92% of hospitals within 12 months of end of collaborative period Code rate for collaborative did not decrease significantly (3% decrease) 12 hospitals reported additional data after collaborative & saw significant improvement in code rates (24% decrease) Patient safety culture scores improved by 6.5% to 8.5%.; the only statistically significant improvement was seen in "non-punitive response to error" (P = .02)	4 Expert opinion Multi-centre multi-disciplinary collaborative based on Model for Improvement (plan-do-study-act); monthly data submissions over 12 month study period and preceding 12 month period as baseline data, + safety culture survey at 3 time points
Kukreti et	Hospital for	Implementation &	Quality	4 Paediatric	Paediatric MET	>95% satisfied with quality & timeliness of MET	4 Expert opinion

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main Outcomes	Level of evidence and rationale for judgement
al. (2014) [90]	Sick Children in Toronto (Canada)	evolution of a paediatric rapid response team; process, barriers, and ongoing challenges	improvement initiative	Academic Health Science Centres, Ontario granted funding to initiate paediatric Program introduced in 3 phases at Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto	program	>90% MET had positive impact on patient care 3 perceived benefits of MET were: Education provided on hospital floors/clinics Satisfaction of service users (patients, nurses & physicians) Empowerment of bedside staff No significant reduction in code blue rate or readmission rate to CCU	Describes local experience of implementing RRT, presented some data on pre-post implementation survey and MET activity
Lobos et al (2010) [91]	Toronto & Children's Hospital of Eastern Ontario; McMaster Children's Hospital, Hamilton; Children's Hospital London (Canada)	Describe standardised implementation of RRS using a MET across 4 paediatric hospitals.	Quality improvement initiative	2 free-standing paediatric hospitals & 2 paediatric units in adult hospitals	Paediatric RRS using physician-led MET	44 activations/1000 admissions during 1st years with respiratory concerns most common activation reason (46%) Resulted in significant reductions in total code blue events & PICU mortality following unplanned PICU admissions and PICU readmissions from the ward	4 Expert opinion Multi-centre study on standardised implementation of RRS, based on Social Marketing principles, phases of implementation described
McCrory et al. (2012) [92]	John Hopkins University Hospital Simulation Center (USA)	Evaluate education intervention of teaching ABC-SBAR to paediatric interns	Pre-post design	n=27 paediatric interns 26 (96%) of 27 interns agreed to have their pre-and post-intervention video-recorded hand-off data included 52 total hand-offs included for analysis	Education session: Rapid Response: why, when and how (incl. ABC-SBAR training) Video-recorded mock patient hand-off (before & after education session)	After training: Mean score of hand-offs improved significantly (3.1/10 pre- vs 7.8/10, P<0.001) Hand-offs including airway or breathing assessment improved (9/26 [35%] to 22/26 [85%], p = 0.001) & this information was stated earlier (25 vs 5 seconds, p<0.001) Hand-offs including an assessment or recommendation by interns significantly increased (1/26 [4%] vs 22/26 [85%], p<0.001). Hand-offs with ABCs or situation prioritized before background increased (≤5% vs ≥77%) Elapsed time to stated essential content items significantly decreased (19 vs 7 seconds, p<0.001) Total hand-off duration increased (29 vs 35 seconds, P = 0.004)	2- High risk of confounding or bias No control group, simulated environment not patient care environment
McKay et al. (2013) [93]	Tertiary hospital providing regional paediatric care (Australia)	Evaluate impact of newly designed PEWS & accompanying education package COMPASS	Before & after study	2 inpatient paediatric wards Pre-intervention n=1059 Post-intervention	Education package: COMPASS (e-learning package and a 3-hour face-to-face low-	Patient outcomes Reduction in the number of patients requiring unplanned admission to paediatric HDU (3.8% vs. 2.7%, P = 0.22) Vital sign documentation Significant improvement in daily documentation of vital signs including: level of consciousness (0 vs.	2- High risk of confounding or bias Prospective, controlled, potential selection bias at one site and potential for Hawthorne effect (sustainability unknown)

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main Outcomes	Level of evidence and rationale for judgement
				n=899 Random subgroup Pre-intervention n=262 Post-intervention n=221	fidelity simulation)	7.8, p < 0.001), respiratory effort (0.0 vs. 7.8 p < 0.001), capillary refill (0 to 1.1 p < 0.001) and blood pressure (0.0 vs. 0.0), p = 0.007) Fewer children breached MET criteria (38.9% (n =102) vs. 20.4% (n = 45)) Communication and medical review Significant improvement in number of documented communication episodes (8.5% vs. 40.9%, p < 0.001)	
McLellan & Connors (2013) [94]	Children's Hospital Boston (USA)	Implementation & modifications of CHEWS & its companion Escalation of Care Algorithm for paediatric cardiovascular patients	Chart reviews 3 pilot studies	Inpatient paediatric cardiovascular unit Pilot 1: 27 patients & 157 observations Pilot 2: 33 patients & 312 observations Pilot 3: 20 patients & 119 observations	Children's Hospital Early Warning Score (CHEWS) & Escalation of Care Algorithm	Pilot 1: 29.6% of patients had lower CHEWS scores than the acuity severity of their clinical presentation Pilot 2: 7.5% of patients' C-CHEWS scores did not correlate with acuity of their clinical picture Pilot 3: 100% of C-CHEWS scores matched the acuity of patients' clinical presentations Unplanned CICU transfers after C-CHEWS implementation Chart review of patients who had an unplanned transfer to the CICU or experienced an arrest on the cardiac unit typically had elevated C-CHEWS scores with exception to sudden onset of compromising arrhythmia; in comparing rate (transfers per 1000 patient days) of these events 1 year pre- and 1 year post- C-CHEWS implementation, there was a reduction in unplanned transfers	3 Non-analytic, case reviews Describes modification and implementation of a PEWS tools and escalation of care algorithm for cardiac patients, processes implemented over course of 3 pilot studies which incorporated retrospective chart reviews/audits + clinician interviews
Randhawa et al. (2011) [95]	Children's National Medical Center, Division of Nursing, Washington (USA)	Describe process & outcomes of implementing & sustaining use of PEWS at unit & organizational level to reduce paediatric cardiopulmonary arrest	Quality improvement initiative - cycles of change	First cycle: 15-bed cardiology & nephrology unit Second cycle: 39-bed general medical unit Third cycle: All acute care areas (additional 136 beds, including haematology/oncology, surgical, respiratory, short stay &	PEWS & escalation algorithm	First cycle: Frequency of codes of CPA's reduced from 0.98/1000 to 0.62/1000 patient-days Second cycle: Frequency of codes/1,000 patient-days reduced from 0.65/1000 to 0.49/1000 patient-days Third cycle: CPA reduced from 0.15/1000 patient-days to 0.12/1000 patient-days 23.4% reduction in CPA organizationally (0.21 codes/1000 patient days) 19.4% reduction in CAT Team activations across all acute units	4 Expert opinion Single site, description of 3 cycles of change related to the process and outcome implementation of PEWS, underpinned by plan-do-check-act methodology

Author(s); Date	Setting	Aim	Design	Sample	Intervention	Main Outcomes	Level of evidence and rationale for judgement
				neurosciences units)			
Roberts et al. (2014) [96]	Children's Hospital of Philadelphia (USA)	Identify & understand barriers to calling for urgent assistance in a children's hospital where an rapid response system (RRS) was implemented	Qualitative - interviews	n=57 (27 nurses & 30 physicians) General medical/surgical wards	RRS consisting of calling criteria, EWS & MET	Nurses & physicians valued RRS; believed it enhanced patient safety & improved relationships between clinicians in general care and ICU areas Reported on barriers that shaped decision to activate MET see Table 4	4 Expert opinion Semi-structured interviews, based on expert opinion of select nurse (n=27) and physician (n=30) participants in single setting, modified grounded theory approach used to analyse data
Tume et al. (2013) [97]	Large children's hospital in the North West of England (UK)	Describe development of the RESPOND course, including preliminary evaluation of 1st 4 courses	Course evaluation survey	Course participants over 4 separate days n=65 (multi-professional) 63 of 65 (97% response rate) paper evaluations of 4 RESPOND courses completed	RESPOND (Recognising Signs of Paediatric hOspital iNpatients Deterioration) (1-day course)	Most useful aspects of RESPOND: Discussion/review of real life cases Learning to use SBAR - improved communication between doctors & nurses & working more as a team Multi-professional approach improved understanding among each professional group when dealing with deterioration cases Stated that in-hospital cardiac arrests had reduced from mean of 21.3 to 13 post introduction of RESPOND course	4 Expert opinion Small preliminary evaluation of a training course, post-course paper evaluation form and 3-month post-course electronic survey (low response rate – non-response bias); descriptive

Online Supplementary Appendix 3: Original PEWS Tools

PEWS Tool	Origin	Development
Brighton-Paediatric Early Warning Score (Monaghan 2005) [35]	Royal Alexandra Hospital for Sick Children (UK)	Multidisciplinary working group; developed on available adult systems (not specified)
Pediatric Early Warning System score (Duncan et al. 2006) [23]	Hospital for Sick Children Toronto (Canada)	Expert group of nurses utilised a modified Delphi approach to achieve consensus on parameters and ranges
Paediatric Early Warning (PEW) Tool (Haines et al. 2006) [10]	Bristol Royal Hospital for Children (UK)	Expert group; pilot tool based on un-validated tool developed at Derriford Hospital Plymouth with modifications from criteria developed at Melbourne Children's Hospital Australia & similar adult systems. Modifications made by expert opinion of investigating team including study research nurse, two supervisors, a PICU intensivist & PICU consultant nurse
Paediatric Advanced Warning Score (Edgell et al 2008) [27]	James Cook University Hospital (UK)	Not reported
Bedside Paediatric Early Warning System Score (Parshuram et al. 2009) [39]	Hospital for Sick Children Toronto (Canada)	Expert group & statistical methods (evaluated alongside score comparison & score progression)
Cardiff & Vale Paediatric Early Warning System (Edwards et al. 2009) [25]	University Hospital of Wales (UK)	Developed using physiological parameters based on 2005 advanced paediatric life support guidelines for recognition of sick child Expert group - general paediatricians, regional nurse educator & paediatric intensivist –reviewed other EWS to modify age-related normal ranges & identify other parameters for inclusion; the group reached a consensus opinion to agree 8 parameters & trigger criteria
Newborn Early Warning System (Roland et al 2010) [44]	Neonatal Unit, Derriford Hospital, Plymouth (UK)	Not reported
Cardiac Children's Hospital Early Warning Score (McLellan et al. 2013) [3]	Boston Children's Hospital (USA)	Expert group; developed from CHEWS - a multidisciplinary panel assessed which risk factors were unique to cardiovascular patients & incorporated these risks into new tool
Neonatal Trigger Score (Holme et al 2013) [31]	Neonatal Unit London (UK)	Developed by expert group (5 consultant neonatologists, NICU nurses & midwives) consensus & guidance from Neonatal Life Support, National Institute for Clinical Excellence Postnatal Care & a neonatal scoring chart
Paediatric Observation Priority Score (POPS) (Roland et al. 2016) [46]	Children's Emergency Department Leicester Royal Infirmary (UK)	POPS was developed locally using current evidence and the experience of senior paediatric emergency clinicians; the physiological parameters were chosen based on APLS guidance and their utilisation in other scoring systems. The visual style was based on feedback from nurses over a 1 month period which was constantly refined based on feedback. A small pilot phase in 100 patients (presented at a regional paediatric meeting) demonstrated acceptability and feasibility.

PRISMA 2009 Checklist

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Reported on page #
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.	√ 1
ABSTRACT			
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary including, as applicable: background; objectives; data sources; study eligibility criteria, participants, and interventions; study appraisal and synthesis methods; results; limitations; conclusions and implications of key findings; systematic review registration number.	√ 2
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.	√ 4,5
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).	√ 5
METHODS			
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate if a review protocol exists, if and where it can be accessed (e.g., Web address), and, if available, provide registration information including registration number.	√ 6
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify study characteristics (e.g., PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale.	√ 6
Information sources	7	Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and date last searched.	√ 6
Search	8	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	√ 6
Study selection	9	State the process for selecting studies (i.e., screening, eligibility, included in systematic review, and, if applicable, included in the meta-analysis).	√ 6,7
Data collection process	10	Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	√ 7
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made.	√ 6
Risk of bias in individual studies	12	Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies (including specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), and how this information is to be used in any data synthesis.	√ 7
Summary measures	13	State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means).	na
Synthesis of results	14	Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, if done, including measures of consistency (e.g., I^2) for each meta-analysis.	√ 7

PRISMA 2009 Checklist

Page 1 of 2

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Reported on page #
Risk of bias across studies	15	Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies).	√ 7
Additional analyses	16	Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified.	na
RESULTS			
Study selection	17	Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram.	√ 8,9
Study characteristics	18	For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations.	√ 9
Risk of bias within studies	19	Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12).	√ 9
Results of individual studies	20	For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot.	√ 10-37
Synthesis of results	21	Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency.	√ 38-41
Risk of bias across studies	22	Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15).	na
Additional analysis	23	Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]).	na
DISCUSSION			
Summary of evidence	24	Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers).	√ 42-45
Limitations	25	Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias).	√ 45
Conclusions	26	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research.	√ 45-46
FUNDING			
Funding	27	Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review.	√ 47

From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(6): e1000097. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed1000097

For more information, visit: **www.prisma-statement.org**.

Page 2 of 2