



42 Introduction:

43 Immunizations are a critical component of adolescent preventive medicine, and the adolescent  
44 population has increasingly been recognized as a source for multiple immunization preventable  
45 diseases.<sup>1</sup> Unfortunately, adolescents have some of the lowest immunization rates of any age  
46 group, and only 48% of adolescents aged 13-15 years received the recommended HPV  
47 immunization doses by 2018 which is far from the Healthy People 2030 objective of 80%.<sup>2</sup>  
48 Therefore, a more comprehensive strategy for delivering immunizations to adolescents is needed,  
49 including the delivery of immunizations in non-traditional times and settings, such as during  
50 hospitalization.

51

52 Over 5 million children and over 700,000 adolescents are hospitalized each year and this  
53 presents a unique opportunity to provide preventive care services, including immunizations, to  
54 this vulnerable population.<sup>3,4</sup> Indeed, two recent studies in the United States evaluated the  
55 immunization status of inpatient pediatric patients of all ages and found that adolescents  
56 accounted for the majority of those under immunized.<sup>5,6</sup> To address this, multiple interventions  
57 to improve immunization rates for hospitalized pediatric patients have been studied, varying  
58 from simply identifying the under immunized and offering immunizations to implementing  
59 complete immunization teams.<sup>5,7-9</sup> Electronic medical record (EMR) reminders, increasing  
60 nursing participation, creating clinical practice guidelines and adding “under immunization” to  
61 the inpatient problem list have been shown to improve the immunization rates of hospitalized  
62 pediatric patients.<sup>7,10,11</sup>

63

64 One challenge to providing immunizations to hospitalized adolescents is obtaining accurate  
65 immunization records.<sup>7</sup> Multiple studies have assessed validity of parental recall compared to  
66 medical records and found that parental recall overestimates or underestimates the immunization  
67 status of pediatric patients.<sup>5,7,12-16</sup> Accuracy of provider documented immunization status in the  
68 EMR is another challenge to providing immunizations to adolescents.<sup>17</sup> One study found that  
69 Pediatric Emergency Department and inpatient providers documented 92% of pediatric patients  
70 presenting for an acute respiratory illness up-to-date on their immunizations while only to 42%  
71 of those patients were documented as up-to-date in the immunization registry.<sup>18</sup> Another study  
72 found that accuracy of immunization status documentation for inpatient adolescents did not

73 change despite modifying discharge order sets in the EMR and providing training seminars to  
74 providers about the administration of the HPV immunization.<sup>19</sup>

75

76 Our objectives were to investigate the accuracy of provider documentation of immunization  
77 status of hospitalized adolescents and evaluate the prevalence of delayed immunization status  
78 among this population.

79

80 Methods:

81 *Study Setting/Participants:*

82 A retrospective chart review was performed from July 2017 to June 2018 of adolescent patients  
83 (aged 11-19 years) discharged from the pediatric hospitalist service at a 150-bed tertiary care  
84 academic medical center located in the Pacific Northwest. All documentation was present in the  
85 electronic medical record (EMR) and care for all patients was provided by resident and attending  
86 physicians. No inpatient program existed to provide adolescents immunizations.

87

88 *Inclusion and Exclusion criteria:*

89 All adolescent patients discharged from the pediatric hospitalist service from July 2017 to June  
90 2018 were included in the study. This population consisted of patients admitted to the hospitalist  
91 service from an outside hospital ward, ICU or emergency department, and those patients  
92 transferred from the PICU or admitted from the emergency department within our own  
93 institution. In order to screen out patients who may have received immunizations in other states,  
94 patients needed at least one non-influenza immunization documented in the immunization  
95 registry to be included. If the patient had multiple admissions over the study time frame, the data  
96 from the first admission was only included in the analysis. No patients were excluded based on  
97 diagnosis. Participants were excluded if their primary home address in the EMR was outside the  
98 state of Oregon and if they did not have at least one non-influenza immunizations documented in  
99 the ALERT Immunization Information System in the EMR. In the state of Oregon, the ALERT  
100 Immunization Information System (ALERT IIS) is used to track patient immunization status  
101 through the use of medical records. ALERT IIS is a lifetime, statewide immunization registry  
102 that encompasses patients of all ages and consolidates immunization reports into a single record  
103 for each patient. All pediatric clinics, family medicine clinics, pharmacies, rural health clinics,

104 migrant health centers, local health department clinics, federally qualified health centers and  
105 school-based health centers in the state of Oregon report to ALERT IIS. All providers  
106 participating in the “Vaccines for Children” program in the State of Oregon are required by the  
107 CDC to report all immunizations to ALERT IIS within 14 days.<sup>20</sup>

108

109 *Data Collection:*

110 Patients discharged from July 2017 to June 2018 were identified from the billing database of the  
111 hospital. The principal investigator trained two research assistants to be the primary data  
112 extractors. The research assistants would flag charts for review by the principal investigator if  
113 they had questions regarding data collection. Data were collected and entered into a secure  
114 REDCap database.

115

116 Data were collected on immunizations recommended for the adolescent population: quadrivalent  
117 meningococcal (MenACWY or MCV), tetanus and reduced diphtheria toxoids and acellular  
118 pertussis (Tdap), human papillomavirus (HPV) and influenza.<sup>21</sup> The admission history and  
119 physical, transfer note (if applicable) and discharge summary were reviewed for provider  
120 documentation of immunization status. The admission history and physical note template  
121 included a section to free text immunization status while the transfer and discharge summary  
122 note templates did not include a dedicated section for immunization status. Resident physicians  
123 completed the majority of history and physical, transfer and discharge summary notes. The ACIP  
124 guidelines for adolescent vaccines and the patient’s age on the date of admission were used to  
125 determine the patient’s status for each vaccine using the ALERT IIS.<sup>22</sup> The ALERT IIS  
126 immunization record is embedded in the EMR under an “Immunizations” tab in each patient’s  
127 chart. A patient was only considered overdue for the influenza immunization when it was  
128 available for administration from September 2017 to April 2018. The total number of non-  
129 influenza immunizations documented in ALERT IIS was also obtained from the EMR to serve as  
130 a marker for overall immunization history.

131

132 *Dependent Variables:*

133 The primary outcome of interest was the concordance between provider documentation of  
134 immunization status and the immunization status present in the ALERT IIS. A secondary

135 outcome of interest was the prevalence of delayed immunization status among the hospitalized  
136 adolescent population. Other outcomes of interest included the number of immunizations  
137 provided to this patient population during their hospitalizations.

138

139 *Independent Variables:*

140 Demographic data including age, gender, race, ethnicity, insurance type and technology  
141 dependence, and admission data including primary discharge diagnosis category, length of stay,  
142 admit or transfer information and gender of admitting resident were obtained from the EMR.

143

144 *Statistical Analysis:*

145 Immunization data were initially analyzed using descriptive statistics. Sensitivity, specificity,  
146 positive likelihood and negative likelihood ratios were calculated for each immunization using  
147 IBM SPSS Statistics.<sup>23</sup> For these calculations, provider documentation of the patient needing the  
148 immunization was considered “positive test” while documentation of the patient being eligible to  
149 receive the immunization in the ALERT IIS was considered “disease positive.” No provider  
150 documentation of the patient needing the immunization was considered “negative test”. If the  
151 patient was up-to-date on the immunization in ALERT IIS, this was considered “disease  
152 negative.” Thirty-three percent of patients had provider documentation that the immunization  
153 status was unknown, or no immunization information was documented by a provider.

154

155 *Ethics:*

156 This study was deemed exempt by our Institutional Review Board. All charts were reviewed by  
157 study team members, and no personal health information was shared outside of the organization.

158

159 Results:

160 *Sample Characteristics:*

161 A total of 207 adolescent patients were discharged from the pediatric hospitalist service during  
162 the study period. After EMR review, 160 patients were included in primary statistical analysis  
163 (Figure 1). Overall, the average age was 14.4 years and 53% of patients identified as female  
164 (Table 1). The majority were white, non-Hispanic, with public health insurance. The most  
165 common primary discharge diagnosis category was intentional ingestion, and the average length

166 of stay was roughly 5 days. After reviewing the ALERT IIS, patients up-to-date on their  
167 immunizations had longer hospital stays compared to patients needing catch up immunizations  
168 (mean 8.6 days vs 4.3 days,  $P = 0.003$ ).

169

170 *Accuracy of Provider Documented Immunization Status:*

171 Provider documentation of immunization status underreported the need for immunizations when  
172 compared to the immunization registry ALERT IIS in the EMR. Providers documented that  
173 patients needed immunizations at the following rates: HPV 8%, MCV 6%, Tdap 2% and  
174 influenza 21% (Figure 2). On review of the ALERT IIS, 59%, 51%, 19% and 76% of patients  
175 needed the HPV, MCV, Tdap and influenza immunizations, respectively. Forty-eight percent of  
176 patients were documented by providers as up-to-date on their immunizations whereas 16% of  
177 patients were up-to-date in the ALERT IIS (Figure 2). The 95% confidence intervals for provider  
178 documented immunization status were statistically different compared with the 95% confidence  
179 intervals obtained from review of the ALERT IIS for all of the immunizations studied including  
180 when providers documented patients as up-to-date on their immunizations (Figure 2, Table 2).  
181 Thirty-three percent of the patients did not have provider documentation of their immunization  
182 status, or the immunization status was documented as unknown in the history and physical,  
183 transfer or discharge summary notes.

184

185 Provider documentation of immunization status for the HPV, MCV and Tdap immunizations  
186 displayed a low sensitivity (10-11%) but a high specificity (97-100%) using the ALERT IIS  
187 system as the standard (Table 2). If the patient was due to receive the immunization in ALERT  
188 IIS, providers only documented 10-11% of those patients as due for the immunization in the  
189 history and physical, transfer or discharge summary notes. Conversely, provider documented  
190 immunization status for the influenza immunization was associated with a high sensitivity (86%)  
191 and a low specificity (26%) (Table 2). If the patient was eligible to receive the influenza  
192 immunization in the ALERT IIS, providers documented that 86% of those patients needed the  
193 immunization. Provider documentation of up-to-date immunization status had a sensitivity of  
194 60% and specificity of 55%.

195

196 Provider documented immunization status for the HPV, MCV, Tdap and influenza  
197 immunizations had positive likelihood ratios (LR+) of 3.5, 8.5, infinity, and 1.2 with negative  
198 likelihood ratios (LR-) of 0.9, 0.9, 0.9 and 0.5, respectively (Table 2).

199

#### 200 *Immunizations Given During Hospitalization:*

201 Of the 84% (135/160) of patients eligible to receive one or more immunizations in the ALERT  
202 IIS, 24% were provided immunizations prior to discharge. These 32 patients received 35 total  
203 immunizations: 3 HPV, 1 MCV, 1 Tdap, 28 influenza and 2 other immunizations. Of the patients  
204 eligible to receive the adolescent immunizations (HPV, MCV, Tdap) in the ALERT IIS, 1-3% of  
205 those patients received those immunizations prior to discharge. One patient received the HPV,  
206 MCV, Tdap and influenza immunizations. Of the 90 patients eligible to receive the influenza  
207 immunization in the EMR, 28 received influenza immunizations prior to discharge.

208

#### 209 Discussion:

210 Our study illustrates that delayed immunizations are highly prevalent in hospitalized adolescents  
211 with 84% (135/160) of patients needing at least one immunization. Additionally, provider  
212 documentation of immunization status for hospitalized adolescent underreports the need for  
213 immunizations compared to the immunization registry ALERT IIS. This was true for all major  
214 recommended immunizations for this age group and for influenza. While our study illustrates the  
215 opportunity to improve the immunization rates of this population, few immunizations outside of  
216 seasonal influenza were actually provided.

217

218 Published literature illustrates that adolescents are particularly at risk for under  
219 immunization.<sup>1,2,5,6</sup> Multiple studies evaluating pediatric patients of all ages found adolescents to  
220 account for the majority of patients under immunized and increasing age was a risk factor for  
221 being under immunized.<sup>5,6</sup> Adolescents are less likely to have a medical home and seek routine  
222 health care less than any other age group, illustrating the importance of using every opportunity,  
223 including hospitalizations, to provide immunizations to this vulnerable population.<sup>1,3,24</sup>

224

225 Obtaining accurate immunization records is a barrier to providing immunizations in the inpatient  
226 setting.<sup>5,7</sup> In this study, when comparing the immunization registry ALERT IIS to provider



227 documented immunization status, overestimation of immunization status by providers was  
228 statistically significant for all immunizations investigated. Provider documented immunization  
229 status for the three immunizations primarily administered during adolescence (HPV, MCV,  
230 Tdap) had a low sensitivity and high specificity. In contrast, provider documented immunization  
231 status for the influenza immunization had a high sensitivity and a low specificity. In addition, the  
232 positive likelihood ratios of 3.5 and greater for the provider documented immunization status for  
233 HPV, MCV and Tdap illustrate that patients had a higher probability of needing that  
234 immunization if it was documented by a provider. For context, a positive likelihood ratio of 2  
235 and 10 increases the probability of a disease being present by 15% and 45%, respectively.<sup>25,26</sup> In  
236 this study, we defined “disease positive” as being eligible to receive at least one adolescent or  
237 influenza immunization based on review of the immunization registry ALERT IIS. The negative  
238 likelihood ratios for provider documented immunization status ranged from 0.5-0.9 for all  
239 immunizations including when providers documented patients as up-to-date on all  
240 immunizations. A LR- of 0.5 and 0.1 decreases the probability of disease or needing the  
241 immunization in this study by 15% and 45%, respectively.<sup>25,26</sup> Provider documentation of  
242 immunization status was less predictive of the patient’s true immunization status when the  
243 provider documented the patient up-to-date on their immunizations. This highlights the  
244 importance of asking about age-specific immunizations needed, rather than asking generically if  
245 the patient is up to date, during the initial hospital intake. Alternatively, for patients in states with  
246 robust immunization registries, providers may query the registry and confirm the immunizations  
247 needed with the patients or families. This strategy may be especially valuable in light of COVID-  
248 19 vaccination.

249  
250 To address the issue of inpatient immunization delivery, multiple strategies have been studied in  
251 the pediatric population ranging from identifying those under-immunized and offering  
252 immunizations to creating immunization teams.<sup>5,7-9</sup> Studies evaluating administration of the  
253 influenza immunization to hospitalized pediatric patients found that provider reminders, nurse  
254 driven screening protocols and immunization ordering tools improved the rates of  
255 immunization.<sup>7,27-29</sup> One study by Moore et al. demonstrated improved immunization rates for  
256 the HPV and meningococcal immunizations for hospitalized adolescents by including  
257 immunization status in discharge order sets and conducting provider training seminars on the



258 administration of the HPV immunization.<sup>19</sup> However, accuracy of immunization status  
259 documentation by providers remained unchanged despite improvements in the immunizations  
260 rates.<sup>19</sup> Another study by Dempsey et al. evaluated multiple studies to identify strategies to  
261 improve adolescent immunization and found promising interventions at the parent and patient  
262 level, practice level and population level.<sup>1</sup> “Practice alerts” embedded into the EMR  
263 demonstrated improved HPV immunization rates for the adolescent population in the outpatient  
264 setting.<sup>1,30,31</sup> While these improvements in HPV immunization rates are encouraging, accuracy of  
265 provider documentation of immunization status must improve, or states must adopt robust  
266 immunization registries, to better immunize this population across outpatient and inpatient  
267 settings.

268

#### 269 *Limitations:*

270 This study has several limitations. This study was conducted at a single urban tertiary care  
271 academic children’s hospital with a fairly homogenous population and the results may not be  
272 able to be extrapolated to other populations. In addition, 33% of patients in this study either had  
273 documentation that the immunization status was unknown, or no documentation of immunization  
274 status was present in the admission history and physical, transfer note or discharge summary in  
275 the EMR. This represents a large percentage of our study population upon which we were unable  
276 to capture provider documentation data of immunization status.

277

278 We used the ALERT Immunization Information System (IIS) to determine actual need for  
279 immunizations. However, this system may not be 100% accurate and may underrepresent the  
280 number of immunizations children receive in the state. ALERT IIS does not currently participate  
281 in interstate data exchange so immunizations provided to patients outside the state may not be  
282 documented in the system.<sup>13</sup> In this study, we excluded any patients with zero immunizations in  
283 ALERT IIS which may underrepresent the number of unimmunized patients in the population.

284

#### 285 Concluding Summary:

286 This study illustrates that delayed immunizations are prevalent in the hospitalized adolescent  
287 population and provider documentation in EMR notes does not accurately reflect their  
288 immunization status in the inpatient setting. In our study, 84% of patients were eligible to receive

289 at least one immunization but only one fourth of those eligible were provided an immunization  
 290 before discharge. This study illustrates the need for better identification and delivery of  
 291 immunizations to hospitalized adolescents.

292

293 Acknowledgements:

294 Assistance with study: none.

295 Financial support and sponsorship: none.

296 Conflicts of interest: none.

297 Presentation: data presented at trainee research forum.

298

299

300

301 Table 1. Demographic differences between patients up-to-date on their immunizations and those  
 302 needing catch up immunizations based on review of the ALERT IIS in the EMR.

303 N (percentage)

	Total Population: 160 patients	Up-to-date: 25 patients	Delayed: 135 patients
Age in years, mean (SD)	14.4 (2.2)	15.1 (2.1)	14.4 (2.2) P=0.106
Gender			P=0.477
• Male	72 (45)	13/72 (18)	59/72 (82)
• Female	85 (53)	12/85 (14)	73/85 (86)
• Gender non-conforming	3 (2)	3 (100)	0
Race			P=0.822
• White	135 (84)	21/135 (16)	114/135 (84)
• Asian	9 (6)	2/9	7/9
• Other	16 (10)	2/16	14/16
Ethnicity			P=0.797
• Hispanic	28 (17)	5/28 (18)	23/28 (82)
• Non-Hispanic	131 (82)	20/131 (15)	111/131 (85)
• unknown	1 (1)	0	1
Insurance Type			P=0.379
• Private	71 (44)	9/71 (13)	62/71 (87)
• Public	87 (55)	15/87 (17)	72/87 (83)
• Uninsured	0 (0)	0	0
• unknown	2 (1)	1/2	1/2
Medical technology dependence			P=0.183
• Yes	28 (18)	8/34	26/34
• No	132 (82)	17/126	109/126

Primary discharge diagnosis category			P=0.111
• Intentional Ingestion	42 (26)	6/42 (14)	35/42 (86)
• Skin/MSK	25 (16)	5/25 (20)	20/25 (80)
• Respiratory	23 (14)	3/23 (13)	20/23 (87)
• Neurologic	18 (11)	6/18 (33)	12/18 (66)
• GI	16 (10)	3/16 (19)	13/16 (81)
• Psych	12 (8)	0/12 (0)	12/12 (100)
• GU	9 (6)	0/9 (0)	9/9 (100)
• other	15 (9)	3/15 (20)	12/15 (80)
Admit vs Transfer to Peds Hospitalist group			P=0.803
• Admit	114 (71)	18/114	96/114
• Transfer	46 (29)	9/46	37/46
Length of Stay in days, mean (SD)	5.3 (7.7)	8.6 (12.0)	4.3 (5.1) P = 0.003
Gender of admit resident			P=0.489
• Male	49 (31)	6/49	43/49
• Female	111 (69)	19/111	92/111

304

305 Table 2. Sensitivity, Specificity and Likelihood Ratios (LR) of Provider documentation of  
306 Immunization Status

307

Immunization	Sensitivity	Specificity	Positive LR	Negative LR
HPV	11%	97%	3.5	0.9
MCV	11%	99%	8.5	0.9
Tdap	10%	100%	∞	0.9
Influenza	86%	26%	1.2	0.5
Up to date	60%	55%	1.3	0.7

308 HPV = human papilloma virus immunization

309 MCV = meningococcal immunization

310 Tdap = tetanus, diphtheria and acellular pertussis immunization

311 LR: likelihood ratio

312

313

314

315 References:

316

- 317 1. Dempsey A, Zimet G. Interventions to Improve Adolescent Vaccination. *American*  
318 *Journal of Preventive Medicine and Elsevier Ltd.* 2015;49:S445-S454.
- 319 2. Services UDoHaH. Healthy People 2030 Objectives: Increase the proportion of  
320 adolescents who get recommended doses of the HPV vaccine. 2020.
- 321 3. Woodwell DA, Cherry DK. National Ambulatory Medical Care Survey: 2002 Summary.  
322 *Advance Data.* 2004(346):1-44.
- 323 4. Witt W, Weiss A, Elixhauser A. Overview of Hospital Stays for Children in the United  
324 States, 2012: Statistical Brief 187. *Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project.* 2014.
- 325 5. Pahud B, Clark S, Herigon JC, et al. A Pilot Program to Improve Vaccination Status for  
326 Hospitalized Children. 2015;5(1):35-41.
- 327 6. Weddle G, Jackson MA. Vaccine Eligibility in Hospitalized Children: Spotlight on a Unique  
328 Healthcare Opportunity. *Journal of Pediatric Health Care.* 2014;28(2):148-154.
- 329 7. Mihalek AJ, Kysh L, Pannaraj PS. Pediatric Inpatient Immunizations: A Literature Review.  
330 *Hospital Pediatrics.* 2019;9(7):550-559.
- 331 8. Bell LM, Pritchard M, Anderko R, Levenson R. A program to immunize hospitalized pre-  
332 school aged children: evaluation and impact. *Pediatrics.* 1997;100(2):192-196.
- 333 9. Shingler S, Hunter K, Romano A, Graham D. Opportunities taken: the need for and  
334 effectiveness of secondary care opportunistic immunisation. *Journal of Paediatrics and*  
335 *Child Health.* 2011;48(3):242-246.
- 336 10. Eckode C, Church N, III WJE. Implementation and evaluation of a nursing  
337 assessment/standing orders-based inpatient pneumococcal vaccination program.  
338 *American Journal of Infection Control.* 2007;35:508-515.
- 339 11. Elia S, Perrett K, Newall F. Providing opportunistic immunisations for at-risk inpatients in  
340 a tertiary paediatric hospital. *Journal for Specialists in Pediatric Nursing.* 2017;January  
341 2017.
- 342 12. Goldstein K, Kviz F, Daum R. Accuracy of immunization histories provided by adults  
343 accompanying preschool children to a pediatric emergency department. *Europe PMC.*  
344 1993;270:2190-2194.
- 345 13. Lumana ET, Rymana TK, Sablanb M. Estimating vaccination coverage: Validity of  
346 household-retained vaccination cards and parental recall. *Vaccine.* 2008;27(19):2534-  
347 2539.
- 348 14. Williams ER, Meza YE, Salazar S, Dominici P, Fasano CJ. Immunization histories given by  
349 adult caregivers accompanying children 3-36 months to the emergency department: are  
350 their histories valid for the Haemophilus influenzae B and pneumococcal vaccines?  
351 *Pediatric Emergency Care.* 2007;5:285-288.
- 352 15. Miles M, Ryman TK, Dietz V, Zell E, Luman ET. Validity of vaccination cards and parental  
353 recall to estimate vaccination coverage: a systematic review of the literature. *Vaccine.*  
354 2013;31(12):1560-1568.
- 355 16. Dorell C, Jain N, Yankey D. Validity of parent-reported vaccination status for adolescents  
356 aged 13-17 years: National Immunization Survey-Teen, 2008. *Public Health Reports.*  
357 2011:60-69.

- 358 17. Lu P-j, Dorell C, Yankey D, Santibanez TA, Singleton JA. A comparison of parent and  
359 provider reported influenza vaccination status of adolescents. *Vaccine*.  
360 2012;30(22):3278-3285.
- 361 18. Bryan M, Hofstetter A, deHart M, Zhou C, Opel D. Accuracy of Provider-Documented  
362 Child Immunization Status at Hospital Presentation for Acute Respiratory Illness.  
363 *Hospital Pediatrics*. 2018;8(12):769-777.
- 364 19. Moore E, Bauer SC, Rogers A, McFadden V. An Opportunity in Cancer Prevention:  
365 Human Papillomavirus Vaccine Delivery in the Hospital. *Hospital Pediatrics*.  
366 2022;12:e157-e162.
- 367 20. Authority OH. Oregon Vaccines for Children Vaccine Management Guide. In: Authority  
368 OH, ed. [www.oregon.gov](http://www.oregon.gov): Oregon Health Authority; 2019:1.
- 369 21. Robinson C, Romero J, Kempe A, Pellegrini C, Szilagyi P, et al. Advisory Committee on  
370 Immunization Practices Recommended Immunization Schedule for Children and  
371 Adolescents Aged 18 Years or Younger - United States, 2017. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly*  
372 *Rep*. 2017;66(5):134-135.
- 373 22. Authority OH. ALERT Immunization Information System. Oregon Health Authority.  
374 [https://www.oregon.gov/oha/PH/PreventionWellness/VaccinesImmunization/alert/Pag](https://www.oregon.gov/oha/PH/PreventionWellness/VaccinesImmunization/alert/Pages/index.aspx)  
375 [es/index.aspx](https://www.oregon.gov/oha/PH/PreventionWellness/VaccinesImmunization/alert/Pages/index.aspx). Published 2019. Accessed 01/06/2020.
- 376 23. *IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows* [computer program]. Version 25.0. Armonk, NY: IBM  
377 Corp; 2017.
- 378 24. Holman D, Benard V, Roland K. Barriers to Human Papillomavirus Vaccination Among US  
379 Adolescents: A Systemic Review of the Literature. *JAMA Pediatrics*. 2014;168(1):76-82.
- 380 25. Glen S. Likelihood Ratio (Medicine): Basic Definition, Interpretation. Statistics How To  
381 Web site. <https://www.statisticshowto.com/likelihood-ratio/>. Published 2016. Accessed  
382 May 25, 2021.
- 383 26. McGee S. Simplifying Likelihood Ratios. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*.  
384 2002;17:647-650.
- 385 27. Rao S, Fischman V, Kaplan D, Wilson K, Hyman D. Evaluating Interventions to increase  
386 influenza vaccination rates among pediatric inpatients. *Pediatric Quality and Safety*  
387 2018;3(5).
- 388 28. Pollack AH, Kronman MP, Zhou C, Zerr DM. Automated screening of hospitalized  
389 children for influenza vaccination. *Journal of Pediatric Infectious Diseases Society*.  
390 2014;3(1):7-14.
- 391 29. Freedman JL, Reilly AF, Powell SC, Bailey LC. Quality improvement initiative to increase  
392 influenza vaccination in pediatric cancer patients. *Pediatrics*. 2015;135(2):e540-e546.
- 393 30. Mayne S, Karavite D, Grundmeier R, et al. The Implementation and Acceptability of an  
394 HPV Vaccination Decision Support System Directed at Both Clinicians and Families. *AMIA*  
395 *Annual Symposium Proceedings Archive*. 2012;2012:616-624.
- 396 31. Fiks A, Grundmeier R, Mayne S, et al. Effectiveness of Decision Support for Families,  
397 Clinicians, or Both on HPV Vaccine Receipt. *Pediatrics*. 2013;131(6):1114-1124.  
398

Figure 1. Flow diagram of inclusion and exclusion criteria.




Figure 2: Parent/Patient self-report of immunization status compared to review of ALERT IIS

