

Example Scenario 1:

In any average adult patient seen in routine circumstances by an average general practitioner with AKI stage 3 with NO history of acute illness, but with co-morbidities of CKD stage 4/5 AND chronic heart failure AND moderate hyperkalaemia ($K^+=6.0$ to 6.4 mmol/l), what is the most appropriate next step?

(with 1 indicating an `extremely inappropriate next step` and 9 indicating an `extremely appropriate next step`)

- **Seek immediate admission** – 9 panellists rated “9” and with 1 panellist rating “7” (agreement and appropriate as $\geq 80\%$ of panel members rating 7–9)
- **A response within 6 hours** – Sorted ratings were “1,3,3,3,4,5,7,8,8,9” (disagreement as 30% of scores in 1–3 AND also 30% in 7–9)
- **A response within 24 hours** – 8 panellists rated “1” with the final two rating “2” and “3” respectively (agreement and inappropriate as $\geq 80\%$ of panel members rating 1–3)
- **A response within 72 hours** – All 10 panellists rated “1” (agreement and inappropriate as $\geq 80\%$ of panel members rating 1–3)

Therefore seeking immediate admission was clearly the most appropriate next action and the disagreement of a response within 6 hours was not significant. There was also agreement that an inappropriate next step would be a response within 24 or 72 hours.

Example Scenario 2:

In any average adult patient seen in routine circumstances by an average general practitioner with AKI stage 2, with NO history of acute illness and normal potassium, but with co-morbidities of CKD stage 4/5 AND chronic heart failure, what is the most appropriate next step?

(with 1 indicating an `extremely inappropriate next step` and 9 indicating an `extremely appropriate next step`)

- **Seek immediate admission** – Sorted ratings were “1,2,2,4,5,5,6,7,7,8” (Disagreement as 30% of scores in 1–3 AND also 30% in 7–9)
- **A response within 6 hours** – Sorted ratings were “3,6,6,7,7,7,8,8,8,9” (Agreement with uncertain benefit as 80% of ratings fell between 6-8)
- **A response within 24 hours** – Sorted ratings were “3,3,3,3,5,5,6,6,7,9” (equivocal result as no criteria satisfied)
- **A response within 72 hours** – 8 panellists rated “1” with the final two rating “2” and “7” respectively (agreement and inappropriate as $\geq 80\%$ of panel members rating 1–3)

Therefore by RAND criteria an appropriate next step was not agreed upon. However, there was agreement that a response within 72 hours would be inappropriate.