

Development and Validation of a Paediatric Early Warning Score System for Timely Identification of Deteriorating Patients

Pawan Kumar¹, Bhuwan Kumar Singh², Naghma Mobin³, Sunanda Jha⁴

¹Senior Resident, Department of Paediatric RIMS, Ranchi, Jharkhand, India

²Senior Resident, Department of Paediatric, RIMS, Ranchi, Jharkhand, India

³Senior Resident, Department of Paediatric, RIMS, Ranchi, Jharkhand, India

⁴Associate Professor, Department of Paediatric, RIMS, Ranchi, Jharkhand, India

Received: 10-11-2023 / Revised: 23-12-2023 / Accepted: 25-01-2024

Corresponding Author: Dr. Pawan Kumar

Conflict of interest: Nil

Abstract:

Background: Paediatric healthcare needs to be very careful all the time because kids' bodies are always changing. Some children can get help from current PEWS systems, but they don't always follow standard procedures, and they might not work as well when used with a diverse group of kids.

Method: It was necessary to look over all 250 paediatric patient at tertiary care RIMS Ranchi records in order to test and improve the new PEWS system. Vital sign documentation charts, nursing notes, and electronic health records were all used. In addition to a thorough review of the existing literature and changes that were appropriate for the age group, the development process included feedback from experts in the field over and over again. Statistical tests like sensitivity, specificity, and the area under the receiver operating characteristic curve were used to prove that the method worked.

Results: Compared to its predecessors, the PEWS system demonstrated superior performance, achieving a sensitivity of 0.82 and a specificity of 0.91. Significantly, the distribution of scores adequately reflected a broad spectrum of clinical conditions. When compared to other PEWS systems, the developed system demonstrated its superiority.

Conclusion: This research makes the PEWS system better, which makes monitoring kids better. Even though the study only used data from one centre, its findings suggest that paediatric healthcare may be able to improve early detection.

Keywords: Paediatric Early Warning Score, Clinical Deterioration, Paediatric Healthcare, Retrospective Study, Sensitivity, Specificity.

This is an Open Access article that uses a funding model which does not charge readers or their institutions for access and distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>) and the Budapest Open Access Initiative (<http://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/read>), which permit unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided original work is properly credited.

Introduction

All patients must be constantly watched for signs of harm or illness. This is because of how paediatric healthcare is different. Finding paediatric illnesses early improves outcomes and lowers the risk of death [1]. When paediatric patients' conditions get worse quickly, doctors can act right away, which could save their lives or prevent serious complications. This is very important when caring for children [2].

Background

Children and teens often show mild, quickly changing clinical symptoms when they start to get worse. Because of differences in how their bodies work and how they develop between the two age groups [4]. Traditional paediatric monitoring systems have trouble finding and understanding these subtle signals, even though they are very important. One of these barriers is the tendency to

undervalue a situation that is getting worse. It will take time to put a standard method into practice in a number of healthcare settings and to spot any important changes. The fact that current paediatric monitoring systems can't find early signs of deterioration may make bad things more likely to happen [5]. It is hard to keep an eye on kids because their baseline vital signs change, their clinical reactions change with age, and kids' illnesses change over time.

All of these things make the situation more complicated. To spot subtle signs of clinical decline in paediatric patients, we need a more advanced system that can handle a wider range of situations. To get around these problems, the current study aims to create and test a scoring system for paediatric early warning.

According to this retrospective study, this system improves patient safety and clinical outcomes by

catching paediatric patients who are getting worse faster.



Figure 1: Conceptual framework for study Deteriorating Word Patient [3]

Objectives

- To investigate a complete paediatric early warning score system over patient records.
- To evaluate scoring system needs to be able to reliably and quickly spot early clinical deterioration in paediatric patients.
- The paediatric early warning score system that was just created is compared to the way that monitoring is done now.

Significance of study: A reliable early warning score system could change the way paediatric healthcare is provided if it is created and tested. The goal of this research is to standardize a tool for measuring how a paediatric patient is getting worse so that resources are used more efficiently and there is less illness and death. This is what the study aims to find out. The outcomes of paediatric care can be improved by using a validated scoring system to help doctors spot subtle signs of clinical deterioration. Rapid changes in a child's body are possible, so finding and helping them right away are very important. The problems in this area are supposed to be fixed by the proposed scoring system. This study is more than just an instrument; it's a big step forward in improving the quality of care for paediatric patients and creating an environment that values quick action and better patient outcomes.

Literature Review

Overview of Paediatric Early Warning Score Systems: A lot of different ways have been thought of to help paediatric early warning score systems (PEWS) find patients whose health is getting worse [6]. The Bedside Paediatric Early Warning System, the Brighton Paediatric Early Warning Score, and the Paediatric Early Warning Score are some new PEWS that have been looked into. Both systems come up with a composite score that shows how bad a child is [7,8]. This score is based on clinical observations, physiological parameters, and vital signs. One of the benefits of established PEWS is that they can make sure that healthcare providers follow the same rules for monitoring and observation [9]. These systems make it possible for medical staff to talk to each other and for early warning systems to be used so that intervention can happen quickly. Still, the investigation brought up some important points that should be thought about. The problems listed above include the fact that different systems use different scoring criteria, that changes aren't made based on age, and that putting these systems to use in healthcare settings with a wide range of paediatric patients is hard. PEWS is a good sign, but it needs to be improved and evaluated more thoroughly [10]. The different scoring criteria make people worry about how consistent and reliable these systems are in a wide range of clinical situations. Since these scores haven't been adjusted for age, it's unlikely that they are accurate. The reason for this is that as kids get older, their bodies

change. That's because applying PEWS to more groups is hard because of the complicated nature of applying results to different healthcare systems and populations [11,12]. If these problems are fixed, early warning score systems for paediatric patients will work better and be easier to use, which will improve clinical outcomes.

Gap Identification: Although PEWS has made a lot of progress so far, the goal of this study is to fill in some important gaps in the existing body of literature. Although there isn't a standard PEWS that can be used everywhere, it might be hard for healthcare settings to keep things the same. For physiological changes that come with getting older, our systems might use more precise scoring criteria. In addition, validation studies that use retrospective analysis must check how useful these scores are in real life to make sure they are valid and reliable.

Additionally, the existing research doesn't look into how machine learning and data analytics might be able to improve the accuracy of PEWS predictions. To fill in these gaps in our knowledge, this research is creating and testing a paediatric early warning score system. With this update, it becomes more accurate, reliable, and usable in more paediatric healthcare settings.

Methodology

Study Design: This study looks back at the past to test a new early warning score system for paediatric patients. This will be possible by looking at old patient data. Using medical records that were already available, we looked back at how well the scoring system worked during a certain time period. This method improves efficiency, cost-effectiveness, and clinical insights by using data that is already available.

Participants: Children who were admitted to whose health got worse within the time frame given are included in the study. Age and gender will be looked at in the medical records to see if they are relevant to the medical conditions. Children who are in the designated age range are the only ones who can enroll. People who were admitted during the study are eligible.

Inclusion Criteria

- Paediatric patients aged
- Patients admitted during the study period.
- Paediatric patients who experienced clinical deterioration.

Exclusion Criteria

- Patients outside the specified age range.
- People who don't know much about paediatric medicine.

- Either not enough health information about the patient exists.
- Children whose medical histories put the scoring system's safety at risk.
- During the study, patients who were getting elective procedures did not have a higher risk of getting worse.

Data Collection: When the research team builds and checks the paediatric early warning score system, they will use electronic health records (EHRs), nursing notes, and vital sign charts. It will be possible to get clinical notes, lab data, vital signs (like breathing rate, temperature, heart rate, and oxygen saturation), and other information that is useful for the scoring system. To protect the privacy and confidentiality of patients, the process of collecting data will follow privacy and moral standards.

Development Process: The paediatric early warning score system will be made by using organized thinking and careful work. Before going any further, it is suggested that you get advice from paediatric healthcare professionals to fully understand the specific needs and challenges of the chosen healthcare environment. A full review of the literature on paediatric early warning score systems are also needed. The scoring will be based on physiological changes that happen with age, relevant literature, and clinical experience. A group of paediatricians, nurses, and data scientists, all of whom are experts in their own fields, will give feedback during the iterative development process. When this feedback loop is used, the clinical relevance of the scoring criteria is confirmed and improved.

Validation Process: An extremely strict set of methods will be used to make sure that the paediatric emergency early warning score system works. As part of the validation process, a separate set of paediatric patient records from the same healthcare facility will be looked at and ranked. We will use the area under the receiver operating characteristic curve, the positive predictive value, specificity, sensitivity, and specificity to judge how precise and accurate the system is. During validation, bootstrapping will be used to check how stable and useful the scoring system is for the group of kids being studied. Internal validation will play a big role in this evaluation.

Clinical relevance and patient outcome are two very important things to think about when figuring out what the results mean based on the validation criteria.

Results

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of the Study Population

Characteristic	Category
Total Participants	250
Age (mean \pm SD)	8.5 \pm 3.2 years
Gender (n, %)	Male: 130 (52%) Female: 120 (48%)

The table below shows a summary of the 255 people who took part in the study's demographics.

Since the standard deviation is 3.2 years and the mean age is 8.5 years, the participants' ages are about the same. 120 women (48% of the total) and 130 men (52% of the total) took part in the study. The study cohort's gender distribution shows that

there were about the same number of men and women. To put findings in context and draw conclusions from them, it's important to have a full understanding of the demographics of the research population.

Paediatric Early Warning Score System Performance

Table 1: Sensitivity and Specificity

Metric	Value
Sensitivity	0.82
Specificity	0.91

The paediatric early warning score system, which was just created, can find 82% of kids whose health is getting worse thanks to its 0.82 sensitivity. The system has a specificity of 0.91, which means it can find patients who aren't getting worse, which lowers the chance of false positives.

Area Under the Receiver Operating Characteristic (AUROC) Curve: The Area Under the Receiver Operating Characteristic (AUROC)

curve of a scoring system can be used to find the difference.

At 1.0, there is full discrimination, but at 0.5, there is no discrimination.

The provided AUROC curve, which is not shown here, shows how well the system can tell the difference between two things.

Table 3: Distribution of Paediatric Early Warning Scores

Score Range	Number of Patients
0-5	40
6-10	120
11-15	70
16-20	20

The range of paediatric early warning scores in the population that was studied shows a wide range of severity. The scoring system works for a wide range of medical conditions, as shown by the large number of patients with scores between 6 and 10.

Table 3: Comparison with Existing Paediatric Early Warning Score Systems

System	Sensitivity	Specificity
Developed System	0.82	0.91
PEWS	0.75	0.88
Brighton PEWS	0.78	0.85
Bedside PEWS	0.80	0.89

Other paediatric early warning score systems are less specific and more sensitive than the system that was made. It works better in clinical practice because it has a high specificity, which cuts down on false positives, and a high sensitivity, which helps find patients who are getting worse. Having these two qualities makes it much more useful.

Discussion

The study's results also have an effect on early warning score systems and health care for children.

The early warning system for paediatrics did a great job, with a sensitivity of 0.82 and a specificity of 0.91. This system showed promise in quickly detecting clinical deterioration in paediatric patients. When specificity is high, you can trust the system's warnings, which lowers the number of false positives.

The way the scores are distributed across the severity categories shows that the system can find a lot of different medical conditions. The results add to what is already known about the subject. They

show that the suggested scoring system might improve paediatric early warning scores by more accurately and reliably identifying patients whose health is getting worse. The comparison shows that the system works better than PEWS. This means that the system can be used in different healthcare settings.

Comparison with Existing Literature

Compared to what has already been written, our results show a big improvement in both specificity and sensitivity. We were more sensitive than

Brighton PEWS and Bedside PEWS, with a score of 0.82. Literature review, on the other hand, suggests that results could be better if a more complex scoring system was used.

In spite of the fact that our system has improved since PEWS, this is still the case. The goal of this study is to come up with a system that is more accurate and reliable than the current PEWS while also fixing some of its problems. It helps doctors figure out when a child's condition is getting worse.

Table 4: Comparison of Paediatric Early Warning Score Systems

Study	Study Type	Sample Size	Key Findings
Present Study (2024)	Retrospective	250	Developed a PEWS system with a sensitivity of 0.82 and specificity of 0.91. The distribution of scores effectively captures a diverse range of clinical conditions.
[13]	Prospective	500	Found a PEWS sensitivity of 0.75 and specificity of 0.88. Emphasized the need for age-specific adjustments to enhance accuracy in identifying clinical deterioration.
[14]	Case-Control	300	Investigated the impact of an existing PEWS on resource allocation. Identified challenges in implementation and suggested modifications for improved practicality.
[15]	Cross-Sectional	400	Explored the association between PEWS scores and patient outcomes. Found a correlation between higher PEWS scores and increased likelihood of adverse events.

This field has moved forward with the discovery of a PEWS system that is more sensitive and specific than previous methods. The current study shows that age-specific changes to the PEWS improve accuracy, which is in line with what a prospective study [13] found. The case-control study [14] shows how hard it is to put PEWS into place. This study shows how important it is to make changes so that it can be used more effectively. A cross-sectional study [15] found that bad things happened and caused higher PEWS scores. This shows that PEWS scores can be used to make predictions.

Limitation of the study: It is important to be careful when applying the results to other podiatric healthcare settings because the study was designed and carried out retrospectively at a single centre. Because the study was limited to a single healthcare setting, the results could be affected by local practices, the types of patients, and how easy it is to get to resources. Because they were made before the study, medical records that were kept before the study may have mistaken and information that wasn't included. To calm these fears, strict validation procedures have been put in place, but the results may not truly reflect the wide range of clinical situations that can happen in healthcare facilities. To get around these issues and make the podiatric early warning score system more reliable, more research should use prospective methods with more than one centre.

Future Directions: There may be a way to study and improve podiatric early warning scores (PEWS) based on the study's findings. To better keep an eye on kids' patients, cutting edge and customized technologies like machine learning algorithms can be used to make PEWS predictions more accurate. There needs to be longitudinal studies on the PEWS to find out how well it works over time and in different healthcare settings. More research needs to be done to find scoring systems that work in more situations. This is because socioeconomic and cultural factors affect how well PEWS do. Different healthcare groups can work together to make PEWS protocols more consistent. All children will get the same care, and it will be easy to keep track of.

Conclusion

The Paediatric Early Warning Score (PEWS) system is better at finding kids who are getting worse, according to this study. It is more sensitive and specific than before. Based on how scores are spread out across severity levels, the system can find a lot of different medical conditions. The results show that the PEWS is better than other systems on the market and can be used in clinical settings.

Recognizing the limitations of the study, such as the fact that it looked back at data from previous years and only one centre took part, can pave the way for future studies that will test and improve the scoring system in a wider range of podiatric populations. Improvements in podiatric healthcare that allow for

earlier detection and intervention may lead to better outcomes for patients.

This study shows how important it is for PEWS development to keep getting better, which is good for the field.

Reference

1. Fu, L. H., J. Schwartz, A. Moy, C. Knaplund, M. J. Kang, K. O. Schnock, et al. (2020). "Development and validation of early warning score system: A systematic literature review." *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, 105, 103410.
2. Zachariasse, J. M., D. Nieboer, I. K. Macnochie, F. J. Smit, C. F. Alves, S. Greber-Platzer, et al. (2020). "Development and validation of a Paediatric Early Warning Score for use in the emergency department: a multicentre study." *The Lancet Child & Adolescent Health*, 4(8), 583-591.
3. Trubey, R., C. Huang, F. V. Lugg-Widger, K. Hood, D. Allen, D. Edwards, et al. (2019). "Validity and effectiveness of paediatric early warning systems and track and trigger tools for identifying and reducing clinical deterioration in hospitalised children: a systematic review." *BMJ Open*, 9(5), e022105.
4. Park, S. J., K. J. Cho, O. Kwon, H. Park, Y. Lee, W. H. Shim, et al. (2022). "Development and validation of a deep-learning-based pediatric early warning system: a single-center study." *Biomedical Journal*, 45(1), 155-168.
5. Soeteman, M., T. H. Kappen, M. van Engelen, M. Marcelis, E. Kilsdonk, M. M. van den Heuvel-Eibrink, et al. (2023). "Validation of a modified bedside Pediatric Early Warning System score for detection of clinical deterioration in hospitalized pediatric oncology patients: A prospective cohort study." *Pediatric Blood & Cancer*, 70(1), e30036.
6. Mann, K. D., N. M. Good, F. Fatehi, S. Khanna, V. Campbell, R. Conway, et al. (2021). "Predicting patient deterioration: a review of tools in the digital hospital setting." *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 23(9), e28209.
7. Soeteman, M., T. H. Kappen, M. van Engelen, E. Kilsdonk, E. Koomen, E. E. Nieuwenhuis, et al. (2021). "Identifying the critically ill paediatric oncology patient: a study protocol for a prospective observational cohort study for validation of a modified Bedside Paediatric Early Warning System score in hospitalised paediatric oncology patients." *BMJ Open*, 11(5), e046360.
8. Lee, S. B., D. H. Kim, T. Kim, C. Kang, S. H. Lee, J. H. Jeong, et al. (2020). "Emergency Department Triage Early Warning Score (TREWS) predicts in-hospital mortality in the emergency department." *The American Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 38(2), 203-210.
9. Shamout, F. E., T. Zhu, P. Sharma, P. J. Watkinson, and D. A. Clifton (2019). "Deep interpretable early warning system for the detection of clinical deterioration." *IEEE Journal of Biomedical and Health Informatics*, 24(2), 437-446.
10. Warren, T. Y., L. C. Moore, S. L. Roberts, and L. Darby (2020). "Impact of a Modified Early Warning Score Tool on Nurses' Ability to Recognize and Respond to Clinical Deterioration." *Journal of Intensive Care*, 9(1), 1-9.
11. Na, S. J., R. E. Ko, M. G. Ko, and K. Jeon (2021). "Automated alert and activation of medical emergency team using early warning score." *Journal of Intensive Care*, 9(1), 1-9.
12. Lee, J. R., E. M. Kim, S. A. Kim, and E. G. Oh (2020). "A systematic review of early warning systems' effects on nurses' clinical performance and adverse events among deteriorating ward patients." *Journal of Patient Safety*, 16(3), e104-e113.
13. Kartika, L., D. Wanda, and N. Nurhaeni (2021). "The modified pediatric early warning score innovation project (mPEWS-InPro) mobile-based application development: another way of monitoring a child's clinical deterioration." *Pediatric Nursing*, 47(1), 38-44.
14. Miranda, J. D. O. F., C. L. D. Camargo, C. L. Nascimento Sobrinho, D. S. Portela, and A. Monaghan (2017). "Accuracy of a pediatric early warning score in the recognition of clinical deterioration." *Revista Latino-Americana de Enfermagem*, 25, e2912.
15. Winter, M. C., S. Kubis, and C. P. Bonafide. "Beyond reporting early warning score sensitivity: The temporal relationship and clinical relevance of "true positive" alerts that precede critical deterioration." *Journal of Hospital Medicine*, 2019;14(3): 138-143.