

1 **Title**

2 Derivation of a prognostic model for critically ill children in locations with limited resources

3

4 **Short title**

5 Paediatric critical illness in resource-constrained settings

6

7 **Authors**

8 Arjun Chandna,^{1,2} Suy Keang,^{1,3} Meas Vorlark,³ Bran Sambou,¹ Chhay Chhingsrean,¹ Heav Sina,¹ Pav
9 Vichet,¹ Kaajal Patel,^{1,4} Eang Habsreng,³ Arthur Riedel,⁴ Lazaro Mwandigha,⁵ Constantinos Koshiaris,⁵
10 Rafael Perera-Salazar,⁵ Paul Turner,^{1,2} Ngoun Chanpheaktra,⁶ and Claudia Turner^{1,2,6}

11

12 **Affiliations**

13 1. Cambodia Oxford Medical Research Unit, Angkor Hospital for Children, Siem Reap, Cambodia

14 2. Centre for Tropical Medicine & Global Health, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom

15 3. Department of Intensive Care Medicine, Angkor Hospital for Children, Siem Reap, Cambodia

16 4. Department of Global Child Health, Angkor Hospital for Children, Siem Reap, Cambodia

17 5. Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom

18 6. Angkor Hospital for Children, Siem Reap, Cambodia

19

20 **Corresponding author**

21 Dr Arjun Chandna

22 Cambodia Oxford Medical Research Unit, Angkor Hospital for Children, Siem Reap, Cambodia

23 Email: arjun@tropmedres.ac

24 Tel: +855-85-712-586

25

26 **Key words**

27 Paediatrics; critical care; intensive care; prediction model; risk stratification; resource-limited

28 **Abstract**

29 *Background*

30 Capacity and demand for paediatric critical care are growing in many resource-constrained
31 contexts. However, tools to support resource stewardship and promote sustainability of critical care
32 services are lacking.

33

34 *Methods*

35 This study assessed the ability of nine severity scores to risk stratify children admitted to a
36 paediatric intensive care unit (PICU) in Siem Reap, northern Cambodia. It then developed a bespoke
37 clinical prediction model to enable risk stratification in resource-constrained PICU contexts. The
38 primary outcome was death during PICU admission.

39

40 *Results*

41 1,550 consecutive PICU admissions were included, of which 97 (6.3%) died. Most existing
42 severity scores achieved comparable discrimination (area under the receiver operating characteristic
43 curves [AUCs] 0.71-0.76) but only three scores demonstrated moderate diagnostic utility for triaging
44 admissions into high- and low-risk groups (positive likelihood ratios 2.65-2.97 and negative likelihood
45 ratios 0.40-0.46). The newly derived model outperformed all existing severity scores (AUC 0.84, 95%
46 CI 0.80-0.88; $p < 0.001$). Using one particular threshold, the model classified 13.0% of admissions as
47 high-risk, amongst which probability of mortality was almost ten-fold greater than admissions
48 triaged as low-risk (PLR 5.75; 95% CI 4.57-7.23 and NLR 0.47; 95% CI 0.37-0.59). Decision curve
49 analyses indicated that the model would be superior to all existing severity scores and could provide
50 utility across the range of clinically plausible decision thresholds.

51

52 *Conclusions*

53 Existing paediatric severity scores have limited potential as risk stratification tools in
54 resource-constrained PICUs. If validated, the prediction model developed herein would provide a
55 readily implementable mechanism to support triage of critically ill children on admission to PICU and
56 could be tailored to suit a variety of contexts where resource prioritisation is important.

57 Introduction

58 Historically, paediatric critical care has often been perceived as too complex, expensive, or
59 unethical to provide in settings where resources are scarce.¹ These presumptions are countered by
60 data which suggest that simple, low-cost interventions can result in substantial improvements in
61 health outcomes and the premise of comprehensive healthcare as a universal human right.²⁻⁵
62 Consequently, demand and capacities for paediatric critical care are growing in many resource-
63 limited settings.^{6,7}

64 Notwithstanding these welcome developments, need for critical care often outstrips supply.⁸
65 Evidence-based approaches to support resource stewardship are essential to promote equitable and
66 sustainable critical care services. This is especially true in rural regions of many low- and middle-
67 income countries (LMICs) where maldistribution of healthcare professionals and resources results in
68 considerable disparities in access to paediatric critical care.^{1,3,4,9-12}

69 Risk stratification tools can help target scarce resources optimally. However, tools developed
70 for use in paediatric intensive care units (PICUs) in high-income settings are time-consuming to
71 compute and require diagnostic tests not routinely available in resource-constrained regions of
72 LMICs.^{13,14} Furthermore, prognosis is influenced by the level of care available and underlying host
73 susceptibility states, and hence adapted tools are required to support context-specific clinical
74 decision making.^{9,15,16} Consequently, there have been calls both to validate existing severity scores in
75 resource-constrained PICUs and to develop new risk stratification tools appropriate for use in these
76 settings.^{9,17} Unfortunately, most studies from LMIC PICUs to date have been limited to urban
77 centres, hampered by small sample sizes, and used methods incompatible with development of
78 robust clinical severity scores or prediction models.¹⁸⁻²²

79 Using data from children admitted to the PICU at the Angkor Hospital for Children (AHC) in
80 Siem Reap, Cambodia, this study reports the external validation of nine existing paediatric severity
81 scores in a resource-limited PICU setting. Secondly, it presents the development of a bespoke clinical
82 prediction model, derived specifically to support risk stratification in resource-constrained PICU
83 contexts.

84

85 Methods

86 This retrospective cohort study screened consecutive admissions to the PICU at AHC
87 between 01/01/2018 and 01/01/2020. All non-elective admissions of children aged > 28 days and ≤
88 16 years were included. The study was approved by the AHC Research Committee (AHC 0656/20),

89 Cambodian National Ethics Committee for Health Research (NECHR 257), and the Oxford Tropical
90 Research and Ethics Committee (OxTREC 565-20), and is reported in accordance with the
91 Transparent Reporting of a multivariable prediction model for Individual Prognosis Or Diagnosis
92 (TRIPOD) guidelines (Appendix 1).²²

93

94 *Study setting*

95 AHC is a non-governmental paediatric healthcare organisation with a nationwide catchment
96 area providing comprehensive primary-to-tertiary care. The hospital, located in Siem Reap, northern
97 Cambodia, has 89 inpatient beds situated on two medical wards, a surgical ward, a special care baby
98 unit, and neonatal and paediatric intensive care units. The 14-bedded PICU has approximately 1,000
99 annual admissions and is staffed by a team of 30 nurses, four senior doctors, five doctors in training,
100 and receives medical and nursing students from Cambodia's three main medical schools. The unit
101 provides the only critical care service for children in the north of the country and is the only PICU
102 located outside of the capital city, Phnom Penh. Clinical staff have completed or are undertaking
103 training in paediatric intensive care medicine. The unit (Level II or Community PICU)^{11,23} provides
104 mechanical and non-invasive ventilation (oxygen cylinders are delivered fortnightly), inotropic
105 therapy, peritoneal dialysis, and specialist nursing care (minimum 1:3 nurse-patient ratio) for
106 critically ill children at AHC and those transferred from other health facilities. A backup generator
107 ensures continuity of electrical supply during infrequent power outages.

108

109 *Data collection*

110 PICU admissions were identified from the electronic Hospital Information System (HIS) and
111 cross-checked against the admission logbook located on the unit. Clinical records were retrieved and
112 data extracted onto structured case report forms (CRFs) by a team of research nurses/assistants who
113 had been trained by a Principal Investigator (AC). Data extraction occurred between 27/11/2020 and
114 14/12/2021. It was not possible to blind the research team to outcome status during data extraction.
115 The hospital admission and PICU vital sign proforma (Appendix 2) helped standardise data extraction
116 and all variables were prospectively defined in a data dictionary to ensure consistency of
117 interpretation across the research team. Each CRF was reviewed by a study doctor (AC or SK) in
118 consultation with the clinical records, with particular focus on explanatory and outcome variables.
119 Data were entered into an electronic study database and 10% of CRFs underwent review by the
120 study Data Manager (VP) to ensure a data entry error rate of < 0.5%. Data profiling was conducted to
121 identify missing and implausible values.

122

123 *Shortlisting of existing severity scores*

124 The results of two recent systematic reviews were supplemented by searching PubMed
125 using synonyms of “paediatric” AND “severity score OR prediction model”.^{24,25} Forty-nine scores or
126 models were longlisted and assessed for suitability for external validation (Appendix 3): 15 were
127 excluded as they required diagnostic tests unavailable in resource-limited PICU settings (for
128 example, arterial blood gases, creatinine, or serum electrolyte estimations) and 14 were excluded as
129 they contained variables not relevant to the intended-use context and/or population (for example,
130 arrival via emergency medical services, presence of an indwelling central venous catheter). A further
131 five were excluded as the information required to calculate the score was not provided in the
132 original manuscript, and another eight were excluded as they contained variables not available in
133 the AHC clinical records and no suitable proxy variables could be identified. Ultimately, nine severity
134 scores were shortlisted for external validation (Table 1). Neither the setting, population, nor
135 outcome used for the derivation were prerequisites for selection of a score for external validation.

136

137 *Candidate predictors*

138 Baseline variables at the time of PICU admission were extracted from the clinical records.
139 For admissions occurring from the AHC Emergency Room (ER) the first set of vital signs was
140 abstracted. For inter- and intra-hospital transfers the vital signs recorded at the time the decision to
141 transfer was made were abstracted. If weight and height were not recorded at the time of PICU
142 admission the closest values during the same hospital stay were used. Laboratory parameters
143 measured within 24 hours of PICU admission were considered available on admission. A sensitivity
144 analysis restricting this period to between two hours prior and up to four hours after admission was
145 performed (Appendix 4).²⁶

146 For derivation of the new model, candidate predictors were selected a priori based on
147 existing literature, expert knowledge, feasibility for implementation, and availability of data in the
148 clinical records. Variables were divided into five ‘domains’: background, illness journey,
149 cardiovascular, respiratory, and neurological. Candidate predictors were selected across all domains
150 to ensure holistic assessment of critical illness and inclusion of important contextual determinants of
151 outcome often neglected by clinical risk scores developed in high-income settings. The 11 selected
152 predictors were age, comorbidity status, weight-for-age z-score, estimated travel time to hospital,
153 route of admission to PICU, heart rate, central capillary refill time (CRT), respiratory rate, oxygen
154 saturation (SpO₂), receipt of supplemental oxygen, and mental status.

155

156 *Outcomes*

157 The primary outcome was death during PICU admission. Participants who were discharged
158 from PICU to die at home were classified as meeting the primary outcome. A sensitivity analysis was
159 conducted excluding these participants as well as those whose death was judged by either of the
160 study doctors (AC or SK) to have been related to a separate illness acquired during the PICU stay
161 (Appendix 4).

162 The secondary outcome was death in the 12 months following a PICU discharge. Caretakers
163 of participants for whom post-discharge outcomes could not be determined from the clinical records
164 or HIS were telephoned to ascertain vital status 12 months after PICU discharge.

165

166 *Sample size*

167 Routinely collected data from the hospital indicated that approximately 100 deaths on the
168 PICU were expected over two calendar years (mortality rate of ~5%), which would ensure sufficient
169 outcome events for external validation of the existing severity scores.²⁷ At this prevalence, and
170 assuming a conservative Nagelkerke R^2 of 0.15, up to 10 candidate predictors (events per parameter
171 [EPP] = 9.7) could be used to build the new prediction model (R package: *pmsampsize*).^{28,29} In order
172 to allow for inclusion of interaction terms between age and heart rate and age and respiratory rate
173 penalisation was used to shrink regression coefficients and permit inclusion of up to 13 parameters
174 whilst still minimising the risk of overfitting.

175

176 *Missing data*

177 Missing data were summarised for the existing scores and for each candidate predictor in
178 the new model (Appendix 5; R package: *naniar*).³⁰ For the existing scores, missingness ranged from
179 5.4% (qPELOD-2) to 15.6% (FEAST-PET). Amongst the 11 candidate predictors for the new model
180 missingness ranged from 1.1% for heart rate and prolonged CRT to 6.9% for respiratory rate, whilst
181 four predictors had no missing data. Given the relatively low proportion of missing data, single
182 (median) imputation grouped by outcome status was proposed to address missingness. Sensitivity
183 analyses comparing this to a full-case approach, as well as best- and worst-case imputation,
184 produced similar results (Appendix 5), confirming that single (median) imputation was appropriate
185 for the primary analysis.

186

187 *Statistical methods*

188 Discrimination and calibration of each existing score was assessed by quantifying the area
189 under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC; R package: *pROC*)³¹ and plotting the
190 proportion of admissions that met the primary outcome at each level of a score. Positive and
191 negative likelihood ratios (PLRs and NLRs) were reported at each of the scores' cut-offs to quantify
192 the change in pre-test probability that a PICU admission would result in death. As a rule-of-thumb, a
193 PLR > 10 or NLR < 0.1 is often deemed conclusive, a PLR between 5-10 or NLR between 0.1-0.2
194 considered substantial, a PLR between 2-5 or NLR between 0.2-0.5 regarded as small but important,
195 and a PLR between 1-2 or NLR between 0.5-1 likely clinically insignificant.³²

196 Prior to model building the relationship between continuous predictors and PICU survival
197 status was examined using a loess smoothing approach to determine if transformations were
198 required. Age-specific relationships for heart rate and respiratory rate (< 12 months; 12-59 months;
199 5-12 years; > 12 years) were explored to account for known changes in these parameters associated
200 with physiological maturation. Stratum-specific odds ratios (ORs) and likelihood ratio tests (LRTs)
201 were used to identify important interactions between age and each of heart rate and respiratory
202 rate, as well as between SpO₂ and receipt of supplemental oxygen. Penalised (ridge) logistic
203 regression was used to derive the model and adjust for optimism (R package: *ridge*).³³ All predictors
204 were prespecified and no predictor selection was performed during model development.

205 Discrimination (AUC), calibration (calibration intercept, slope, and plots), and classification
206 indices at clinically-relevant decision thresholds (R package: *reportROC*)³⁴ were reported to
207 summarise model performance. Recognising that the relative value of a true positive (TP; admission
208 correctly identified as at high-risk of death) and false positive (FP; admission incorrectly identified as
209 at high-risk of death) will be context-dependent (for example, depending on the human and material
210 capacities of a high-acuity area that at-risk admissions might be triaged to), the clinical utility of the
211 new model was compared to the best-performing existing scores using decision curves to visualise
212 their net-benefits over a range of clinically-plausible decision thresholds (R package: *dcurves*).^{35,36}

213 All analyses were done in R, version 4.2.2.³⁷

214

215 **Results**

216 *Study population*

217 Between 01/01/2018 and 01/01/2020 there were 2,066 admissions to the hospital's PICU, of
218 which case notes were located for 2,021 (97.8%; 2,021/2,066). In total, 1,550 non-elective

219 admissions were eligible for inclusion in the study (eligibility rate 76.7%; 1,550/2,021; Appendix 6).
220 There were 1,366 unique children in the cohort, with 91.1% (1,245/1,366) admitted to the PICU only
221 once during the study period. Median age at PICU admission was 14.0 months (interquartile range
222 [IQR] 4.0-73.0 months) and 59.8% of admissions (927/1,550) were for male children (Table 2). Nearly
223 one in five admissions had a WAZ < -3 (271/1,550; 17.5%) with a similar proportion having a WAZ
224 between -3 and -2 (261/1,550; 16.8%).

225

226 *Illness journeys*

227 Admissions originated from 23 of Cambodia's 25 provinces (Appendix 7) and median travel
228 time from a child's residence to the hospital was 69 minutes (IQR 27-156 minutes). Children had
229 been sick for a median of three days (IQR 2-5 days) prior to admission to the study site, with the
230 majority (1,160/1,550; 74.8%) seeking care from at least one other healthcare provider prior to
231 presentation. Approximately one in five children (268/1,550; 17.3%) had been admitted overnight at
232 another healthcare facility. A similar proportion were inter-hospital transfers (318/1,550; 20.5%), the
233 majority referred from the hospital's satellite clinic (194/318; 61.0%) located approximately 45
234 minutes from the main site.

235 Over two-thirds of PICU admissions originated from the hospital's ER (1,067/1,550; 68.8%),
236 whilst 294 (294/1,550; 19.0%) were intra-hospital transfers from one of the hospital's three acute
237 wards. Most children were admitted with febrile illnesses (1,128/1,540; 79.1%). Common reasons
238 for PICU admission included respiratory distress (989/1,550; 63.8%), circulatory instability
239 (545/1,550; 35.2%), and impaired consciousness (352/1,550; 22.7%).

240

241 *Baseline characteristics*

242 Children with known comorbidities, as well as those sick for longer, admitted elsewhere
243 prior to presentation, residing further from the hospital, and intra-hospital transfers were all less
244 likely to survive their PICU admission ($p < 0.001$ to 0.07). Presentations with hypothermia, lower
245 SpO₂, impaired consciousness, and signs of cardiovascular (prolonged CRT, weak pulses, or cool
246 extremities) or respiratory compromise were all more likely to meet the primary outcome ($p < 0.001$
247 to 0.01). Baseline tachycardia and tachypnoea were associated with death during PICU stay for
248 children aged five years and older ($p < 0.001$ to 0.05) but this association was not observed for
249 younger children. Statistically significant differences between admissions that did and did not meet
250 the primary outcome were observed for a number of laboratory parameters, however only for
251 haemoglobin was this association compatible with a potentially clinically important difference (96.0

252 vs. 109.0 g/dL; $p < 0.001$). All nine clinical severity scores were higher in admissions that resulted in
253 death ($p < 0.001$).

254

255 *Clinical outcomes*

256 Vital organ support was provided to 41.7% (647/1,550) of PICU admissions: 516 /1,550
257 (33.3%) were non-invasively ventilated, 354/1,550 (22.8%) mechanically ventilated, 98/1,550 (6.3%)
258 received inotropic therapy, and 4/1,550 (0.3%) received peritoneal dialysis. Median length of stay on
259 the unit was two days (IQR 1-4 days). The most frequent discharge diagnoses included pneumonia
260 (501/1,550; 32.3%), bronchiolitis (319/1,550; 20.6%), and dengue (221/1,550; 14.3%).

261 The PICU mortality rate was 6.3% (97/1,550), with 85 children dying during their PICU stay
262 and a further 12 discharged to die at home. The most common causes of death were pneumonia
263 (52/97; 53.6%), undifferentiated sepsis (15/97; 15.5%), and cardiac failure (9/97; 9.3%), although 28
264 children (28/97; 28.9%) had more than one cause of death implicated (Appendix 8). Median time to
265 death was four days (IQR 1-7 days; Appendix 9a).

266 Of the 1,453 admissions surviving to leave PICU, vital status 12 months post-PICU discharge
267 could be ascertained for 782 (53.8%; 782/1,453). Of these, 33/782 admissions (4.2%) had resulted in
268 death (25/672 [3.7%] individual children), a median of one month (IQR 1-4 months) post-discharge
269 (Appendix 9b).

270

271 *External validation of existing severity scores*

272 All scores achieved comparable discrimination (Figure 1a; AUCs 0.71-0.76) with the
273 exception of SIRS, for which discrimination was poorer (AUC 0.59; 95% CI 0.53-0.65). Across all
274 scores, admissions with higher baseline scores were more likely to progress to meet the primary
275 outcome, although this association was less pronounced for PEWS-RL and SIRS (Appendix 10). For
276 scores with multiple levels (PAWS, PEWS, and PEWS-IRISH) the increase in the proportion of
277 admissions meeting the primary outcome across lower levels was modest, indicating redundancy in
278 these more granular scoring systems.

279 At a cut-off of ≥ 1 , the qPELOD-2 score demonstrated a sensitivity of 0.71 (95% CI 0.62-0.80)
280 and specificity of 0.73 (95% CI 0.71-0.75). No other score achieved a sensitivity and specificity of $>$
281 0.70 at any cut-off (Appendix 11). Three scores demonstrated potential for stratifying PICU
282 admissions into low- and high-risk groups (Figure 1b), achieving small but important changes in pre-
283 test probability using a single cut-off: qPELOD-2 at a cut-off of ≥ 1 (PLR 2.65; 95% CI 2.28-3.09 and

284 NLR 0.40; 95% CI 0.29-0.54), qSOFA at a cut-off of ≥ 2 (PLR 2.97; 95% CI 2.52-3.50 and NLR 0.42; 95%
285 CI 0.31-0.56), and PAWS at a cut-off of ≥ 5 (PLR 2.40; 95% CI 2.04-2.82 and NLR 0.46; 95% CI 0.34-
286 0.61).

287

288 *Derivation of a new prediction model for resource-constrained PICU contexts*

289 Assessment of the relationship between continuous candidate predictors and the primary
290 outcome did not identify serious violations of linearity (Appendix 12). Age-dependent relationships
291 between the primary outcome and heart rate and respiratory rate were evident and this was
292 confirmed via examination of stratum-specific ORs and LRTs for interaction ($p < 0.001$). Examination
293 of stratum-specific ORs and an LRT for interaction between SpO₂ and supplemental oxygen status
294 did not indicate evidence of interaction ($p = 0.92$) and thus only the main effects for these
295 parameters were included in the model. The full model, including the formulae to calculate the
296 probability that a PICU admission will result in death, is presented (Table 3).

297 Discrimination of the new model (Figure 2a; AUC 0.84; 95% CI 0.80-0.88) was significantly
298 better than all of the existing scores (DeLong test; $p < 0.001$). Calibration appeared best at lower
299 predicted probabilities (Figure 2b), with the model underestimating risk for admissions with
300 observed probabilities of death > 20 -25%.

301 The ability of the model to triage PICU admissions into high- and low-acuity groups at cut-
302 offs of 2.5%, 5%, 7.5%, 10%, and 15% is presented (Table 4). A cut-off of 10% reflects a triage
303 strategy whereby all admissions with a predicted probability of death $\geq 10\%$ are directed to a high-
304 acuity area (where human and material resources are concentrated) and all other admissions are
305 managed on the main unit. At this cut-off, admissions triaged to the high-acuity area would have a
306 probability of death almost five times that of the general PICU population (PLR 5.75; 95% CI 4.57-
307 7.23), whereas the probability amongst those triaged to the low-acuity area would be less than half
308 that of the general PICU population (NLR 0.47; 95% CI 0.37-0.59), and almost a tenth of those triaged
309 to the high-acuity area. At the 10% cut-off, approximately 13.0% of all admissions would be triaged
310 to the high-acuity area, resulting in a ratio of 3:1 incorrect to correct (FP:TP) high-acuity triages.

311

312 *Generalisability and applicability*

313 There is great heterogeneity in the approach to critical care provision across different
314 resource-constrained contexts, with the relative value of a TP and FP depending on the available
315 human and material resources. Decision curve analyses accounting for these differing contexts

316 indicate that using the model to support triage decisions could provide utility at cut-offs $\geq 7.5\%$
317 (Figure 3), or simply put, in contexts where it might be desirable and feasible to manage up to a
318 quarter (22.7%) of critical care admissions in a high-acuity area and tolerate up to 5:1 incorrect to
319 correct (FP:TP) high-acuity triages.

320

321 Discussion

322 This study reports the ability of nine paediatric severity scores to risk stratify children on
323 admission to an intensive care unit in Cambodia and compares their performance to that of a novel
324 clinical prediction model derived specifically for locations where critical care resources are scarce.
325 Whilst three scores (qPELOD-2, qSOFA, PAWS) appear to have moderate diagnostic utility, the new
326 model proved superior and, if validated, could be a practical and flexible tool to support risk
327 stratification of critically ill children in a variety of resource-constrained contexts.

328 With the exception of SIRS, which is known to be non-specific and perform poorly for risk
329 assessment of acutely unwell children,^{38,39} the other eight existing scores demonstrated comparable
330 discrimination. However, discrimination is a poor indicator of clinical utility.⁴⁰ Only three scores were
331 associated with meaningful changes in the pre-test probability that a PICU admission might result in
332 death, such that a single cut-off could be used to triage children into high- and low-risk groups.
333 Whilst separate cut-offs could conceivably identify high- and low-risk admissions, in settings where
334 resources are scarce it is unclear how a middle or 'indeterminate' group might be managed, and
335 dividing admissions into multiple risk categories may not be practical on the ground.

336 Discrimination and classification of FEAST-PET, qSOFA, and qPELOD-2 were comparable to
337 their original development studies,^{38,41,42} which may reflect similarities in the population (critically ill
338 children), outcome (mortality), and for the FEAST-PET study, contextual factors (access to care, etc.).
339 Performance of LqSOFA was inferior to the original development study,⁴³ which is not unexpected as
340 LqSOFA is known to perform best as a screening tool outside of PICU.^{43,44} It is notable that
341 discrimination and classification of PAWS, PEWS, and PEWS-RL were considerably worse in this
342 study.^{43,45-47} These scores are *diagnostic* scores (aiming to predict events occurring very shortly [< 24
343 hours] after the time of calculation) and it is therefore unsurprising that their ability to prognosticate
344 more distal outcomes is sub-optimal.

345 The new model developed in this study considers the background of a child, their illness
346 journey, and vital organ status to provide a contextualised assessment of critical illness and estimate
347 the probability that a child will die prior to discharge, given the resources available in a typical Level

348 II PICU located outside of a major urban centre in Southeast Asia. Discrimination of the model was
349 considerably better than all existing severity scores evaluated. It provided good diagnostic value and
350 was well calibrated over the threshold probabilities (cut-offs) of interest. In contexts where it might
351 be feasible to resource a particular clinical area to manage up to a quarter of the highest risk
352 admissions, if validated, the model could provide a readily implementable mechanism to identify
353 children whom might benefit most from being cared for in such an area. Importantly, as the output
354 of such a model is continuous (as opposed to discrete as is the case for points-based scores), the cut-
355 off (threshold probability) for triage to the high-acuity area could be tailored to account for unit
356 capacity, seasonal bed-pressures, hospital policy, and other dynamic contextual factors.

357 It is essential that risk stratification tools do not inadvertently concentrate all available
358 resources on patients with untreatable and terminal illnesses.¹ This is particularly important in
359 contexts where resources are at a premium and prolonged hospitalisation can be associated with
360 catastrophic expenditure for patients' families. The PICU is often an environment where more
361 resources are available to manage the end of life.⁴⁸ Data-driven risk stratification can help reduce
362 pressure on individual doctors and provide a framework for discussions related to dignified
363 withdrawal of care.⁸

364 In addition to patient triage, accurate severity assessment tools, such as the one developed
365 in this study, offer ancillary benefits. Severity-adjusted mortality rates can help standardise inter-
366 unit comparisons and interpret impact of new interventions such as training programmes,
367 therapeutics, or organisational changes.⁴⁹ Risk scores and models can also improve transparency and
368 consistency in the way policies are applied, and increase focus on care pathways to promote
369 equitable and practical delivery of critical care.⁵⁰ It is important to note that this risk prediction
370 model is not intended to replace clinical assessment but rather to provide an additional data point to
371 assist busy healthcare professionals plan and organise care for children who are critically ill.

372 This study provides one of few descriptions of paediatric critical care delivery in regions of
373 LMICs where critical care demand and services are growing. Although preceding illness duration was
374 reportedly short, children often had protracted journeys, consisting of multiple care encounters
375 involving both the private and public health systems. The short average length of stay on PICU is
376 striking and likely reflects the fact that in many resource-limited settings effective intensive care
377 consists of providing simple, life-saving interventions for critically ill children with readily reversible
378 conditions.^{1,4} The ~4% post-PICU discharge mortality rate is in keeping with other studies and is likely
379 an underestimate due to considerable losses to follow-up.^{51,52}

380 Amongst this study's strengths include its relatively unique setting in a PICU outside of a
381 major urban tertiary centre in a country with high under-five mortality. Best-practice methods were
382 followed for external validation of the existing scores and derivation of the new model, with
383 particular care taken to prespecify and limit the number of candidate predictors and use penalised
384 regression to avoid overfitting.²² Important contextual determinants of outcome absent in tools
385 developed in high-income settings were included in the model and likely contributed to its promising
386 performance.

387 The main limitation of this study is the lack of external validation of the new model.
388 Although we took steps to avoid overfitting, assessment of the model's performance in new data is
389 required before it can be recommended for clinical use and to enable a fairer comparison with the
390 pre-existing severity scores that were assessed in this study. A prospective validation study is
391 underway.

392 Due to the retrospective nature of this study, travel time had to be estimated based on a
393 child's location of residence. This may not reflect actual travel time, which will be influenced by their
394 mode of transport and interruptions to their journey. It was not possible to evaluate the
395 performance of all longlisted scores. In particular, only two of the nine included scores were
396 developed in LMICs and it is disappointing that seven LMIC-derived scores had to be excluded.^{41,47}

397 Almost 60% of the cohort were male children, which may reflect their predisposition to
398 severe infections or gender biases in care seeking, although the latter is not known to be prevalent
399 in Cambodia.^{53,54} Nevertheless, the findings may be biased towards males. The use of routine records
400 means that clinical parameters will not have been measured in a standardised manner. However,
401 the existence of structured admission and vital signs proforma partially mitigate this issue and
402 helped keep missingness low. Use of clinical records did ensure that the new model contains
403 predictors feasible for collection under routine circumstances and will hopefully increase the
404 likelihood of successful out-of-sample validation.

405 This study presents a new clinical prediction model for estimating the probability that a child
406 admitted to a PICU in a resource-constrained context will not survive to discharge. The model
407 contains predictors from multiple domains to ensure holistic assessment of critical illness. It
408 outperformed nine existing paediatric severity scores and, if validated, offers a readily
409 implementable and flexible mechanism to support risk stratification of critically ill children in
410 resource-constrained contexts.

411

412 **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

413 AC, SK, KP, AR, PT, NC, and CT conceptualised the study. AC shortlisted the existing severity scores.
414 AC, SK, BS, CC, and HS collected the data. AC and SK reviewed the case report forms. AC, BS, CC, HS,
415 and PV entered the data. PV conducted data entry checks. AR calculated the travel times. AC curated
416 and cleaned the data. AC, SK, VM, NC, and CT selected the variables for the clinical prediction model.
417 AC conducted the analysis under the supervision of LM, CK, and RPS. AC wrote the original draft of
418 the manuscript. AC, SK, MV, BS, CC, HS, PV, KP, EH, AR, LM, CK, RPS, PT, NC, and CT reviewed, edited,
419 and approved the manuscript. AC verified the underlying data.

420

421 **DATA SHARING**

422 De-identified, individual participant data from this study will be available to researchers whose
423 proposed purpose of use is approved by the data access committees at the Angkor Hospital for
424 Children and the Mahidol-Oxford Tropical Medicine Research Unit. Inquiries or requests for the data
425 may be sent to datasharing@tropmedres.ac or arjun@tropmedres.ac.

426

427 **FUNDING**

428 This research was funded by the UK Wellcome Trust [219644/Z/19/Z]. RPS acknowledges part
429 support from the NIHR Applied Research Collaboration Oxford & Thames Valley, the NIHR Oxford
430 Medtech and In-Vitro Diagnostics Co-operative and the Oxford Martin School. CK is supported by a
431 Wellcome Trust/Royal Society Sir Henry Dale Fellowship [211182/Z/18/Z]. For the purpose of open
432 access, the author has applied a CC BY public copyright license to any Author Accepted Manuscript
433 version arising from this submission.

434

435 **DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

436 The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

437

438 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

439 The authors are grateful to Soputhy Chansovannara and Phann Ysoun for their assistance with data
440 collection, to Real Sophanith for her assistance with data entry, and to Thatsanun Ngernseng for
441 setting up the study database.

442 **Table 1. Severity scores selected for external validation.** Scores were selected for external validation irrespective of the setting, population, and outcome
 443 used for the original derivation study. The only prerequisites were that the score had to be calculable with the available data (with the exception that
 444 systolic blood pressure could be dropped if CRT was included),⁴³ relevant to the study population, and feasible for implementation in a resource-limited
 445 PICU context. AVPU = Alert Voice Pain Unresponsive scale; CRT = capillary refill time; ED = emergency department; FEAST-PET = Fluid Expansion as
 446 Supportive Therapy-Pediatric Emergency Triage; GCS = Glasgow Coma Scale; LqSOFA = Liverpool quick Sequential Organ Failure Assessment; PAWS =
 447 Paediatric Advanced Warning Score; PEWS = Pediatric Early Warning System; PEWS-RL = PEWS-Resource Limited; PICU = paediatric intensive care unit;
 448 qPELOD-2 = quick Pediatric Logistic Organ Dysfunction-2; SIRS = systemic inflammatory response syndrome; SpO₂ = oxygen saturation.

Score	Range	Predictors	Adjustments	Original setting, population, and outcome
FEAST-PET	0-10	Heart rate, temperature, CRT, pulse character, work of breathing, lung crepitations, mental status, pallor	Cut-off for CRT increased to ≥ 3 seconds; deep breathing omitted from work of breathing; age-adjusted WHO criteria for severe anaemia used as a proxy for pallor; ⁵⁵ mental status dichotomised and assessed using AVPU or GCS, reducing the maximum possible score to 9	Score to predict 48-hour mortality on admission to secondary and tertiary-care hospitals in East Africa in children with severe febrile illness ⁴¹
LqSOFA	0-4	Respiratory rate, heart rate, CRT, mental status	Mental status assessed using AVPU or GCS	Score to predict PICU admission or death in febrile children presenting to ED in the United Kingdom ⁴³
PAWS	0-21	Respiratory rate, heart rate, temperature, CRT, mental status, SpO ₂ , work of breathing	Mental status assessed using AVPU or GCS; CRT, mental status, and work of breathing dichotomised, reducing the maximum possible score to 17	Score to predict need for PICU admission in children presenting to ED in the United Kingdom ⁴⁵
PEWS	0-26	Respiratory rate, heart rate, systolic blood pressure, CRT, SpO ₂ , supplemental oxygen, work of breathing	Systolic blood pressure omitted; work of breathing dichotomised, reducing the maximum possible score to 20	Score to predict need for PICU admission in children hospitalised on a general paediatric ward in a tertiary-care hospital in Canada ⁴⁶
PEWS-IRISH	0-21	Respiratory rate, heart rate, systolic blood pressure, CRT, mental status, SpO ₂ , supplemental oxygen, work of breathing	Systolic blood pressure omitted; work of breathing and mental status dichotomised, reducing the maximum possible score to 15	Adaptation of the PEWS score by the Irish National Clinical Effectiveness Committee ⁵⁶
PEWS-RL	0-6	Respiratory rate, heart rate, temperature, mental status, supplemental oxygen, work of breathing		Score to predict clinical deterioration in children hospitalised on a general paediatric ward in a tertiary-care hospital in Rwanda ⁴⁷
qPELOD-2	0-3	Heart rate, systolic blood pressure, mental status	CRT used as a proxy for systolic blood pressure; mental status assessed using AVPU or GCS	Score to predict mortality in children with suspected infection on admission to nine European PICUs ³⁸

qSOFA	0-3	Respiratory rate, systolic blood pressure, mental status	CRT used as a proxy for systolic blood pressure; mental status assessed using AVPU or GCS	Adult sepsis score to predict mortality adapted for children with suspected infection on admission to PICUs in Australia and New Zealand ³⁸
SIRS	0-4	Respiratory rate, heart rate, temperature, white cell count		Expert consensus definition for the diagnosis of paediatric sepsis ⁵⁷

449

450

451 **Table 2. Baseline characteristics.** Baseline demographic, background, illness history, anthropometric, clinical, and laboratory characteristics of the cohort,
 452 stratified by primary outcome status. *Missing data: comorbidity = 23; preterm birth = 84; low birthweight = 238; illness duration = 2; number of previous
 453 care encounters = 391; axillary temperature = 33; heart rate = 17; respiratory rate = 107; oxygen saturation = 26; supplemental oxygen = 24; mental status =
 454 55; CRT = 17; pulse character = 42; cool extremities = 10; respiratory distress = 22; lung crackles = 10; white cell count = 117; neutrophil count = 117;
 455 lymphocyte count = 118; haemoglobin = 114; platelet count = 115; C-reactive protein = 411; glucose = 386; LqSOFA = 177; qSOFA = 170; qPELOD-2 = 83;
 456 SIRS = 235; PEWS = 175; PEWS-RL = 206; PEWS-IRISH = 220; PAWS = 209; FEAST-PET = 242. [§]Baseline SpO₂ amongst those not receiving supplemental
 457 oxygen at the time of PICU admission confirmed a similar relationship (96.5% vs. 98.0%; p < 0.001; n = 798). [†]Not alert = GCS < 15 or AVPU < A; prolonged
 458 CRT defined as > 2 seconds; respiratory distress = chest indrawing, tracheal tug, or nasal flaring; laboratory parameters included if measured within 24
 459 hours of PICU admission. AVPU = Alert Voice Pain Unresponsiveness scale; Bpm = beats/ breaths per minute; CRT = capillary refill time; GCS = Glasgow Coma
 460 Scale; PICU = paediatric intensive care unit.

Characteristic	Overall, N = 1,550 ¹	PICU survival		
		No, N = 97 ¹	Yes, N = 1,453 ¹	p-value ²
Demographics				
Age (months)	14.0 (4.0, 73.0)	18.0 (6.0, 60.0)	13.0 (4.0, 73.0)	0.30
Male sex	927 / 1,550 (60%)	54 / 97 (56%)	873 / 1,453 (60%)	0.40
Known comorbidity*	266 / 1,527 (17%)	27 / 94 (29%)	239 / 1,433 (17%)	0.003
Perinatal history				
Reported preterm birth*	111 / 1,466 (7.6%)	7 / 87 (8.0%)	104 / 1,379 (7.5%)	0.90
Reported low birthweight*	193 / 1,312 (15%)	13 / 75 (17%)	180 / 1,237 (15%)	0.50
Location of residence				
Travel time to hospital (minutes)	69.0 (27.0, 156.0)	88.0 (50.0, 197.0)	69.0 (27.0, 156.0)	0.008
Distance to hospital (kilometres)	60.8 (14.8, 147.0)	80.8 (31.4, 178.0)	60.8 (14.8, 139.0)	0.006
Illness history				
Duration of illness (days)*	3.0 (2.0, 5.0)	3.0 (2.0, 7.0)	3.0 (2.0, 5.0)	0.07
Care sought prior to admission at study site	1,160 / 1,550 (75%)	78 / 97 (80%)	1,082 / 1,453 (74%)	0.20
Traditional healer	30 / 1,160 (2.6%)	3 / 78 (3.8%)	27 / 1,082 (2.5%)	0.40

Characteristic	Overall, N = 1,550 ¹	PICU survival		
		No, N = 97 ¹	Yes, N = 1,453 ¹	p-value ²
Government primary health centre	296 / 1,160 (26%)	17 / 78 (22%)	279 / 1,082 (26%)	0.40
Private pharmacy	142 / 1,160 (12%)	11 / 78 (14%)	131 / 1,082 (12%)	0.60
Government hospital	114 / 1,160 (9.8%)	13 / 78 (17%)	101 / 1,082 (9.3%)	0.04
Non-governmental healthcare provider	133 / 1,160 (11%)	15 / 78 (19%)	118 / 1,082 (11%)	0.03
Private hospital/clinic	449 / 1,160 (39%)	34 / 78 (44%)	415 / 1,082 (38%)	0.40
Study site	171 / 1,160 (15%)	13 / 78 (17%)	158 / 1,082 (15%)	0.60
Satellite clinic of study site	195 / 1,160 (17%)	7 / 78 (9.0%)	188 / 1,082 (17%)	0.06
Other healthcare provider	49 / 1,160 (4.2%)	3 / 78 (3.8%)	46 / 1,082 (4.3%)	>0.90
Number of previous care encounters*	1.0 (1.0, 2.0)	1.0 (1.0, 2.0)	1.0 (1.0, 2.0)	0.30
Overnight admission prior to presentation	268 / 1,550 (17%)	29 / 97 (30%)	239 / 1,453 (16%)	<0.001
Inter-hospital transfer to study site	318 / 1,550 (21%)	26 / 97 (27%)	292 / 1,453 (20%)	0.11
Satellite clinic of study site	194 / 318 (61%)	8 / 26 (31%)	186 / 292 (64%)	<0.001
Other	108 / 318 (34%)	12 / 26 (46%)	96 / 292 (33%)	0.20
Self-transfer	16 / 318 (5.0%)	6 / 26 (23%)	10 / 292 (3.4%)	<0.001
Intra-hospital admission to PICU	294 / 1,550 (19%)	32 / 97 (33%)	262 / 1,453 (18%)	<0.001
Anthropometrics				
Weight-for-age z-score	-1.40 (-2.41, -0.53)	-1.81 (-3.37, -0.97)	-1.39 (-2.37, -0.51)	0.003
Vital signs				
Axillary temperature (°C)*	36.9 (36.4, 37.6)	37.0 (36.4, 37.7)	36.9 (36.4, 37.6)	0.90
Fever (≥ 37.5°C)	462 / 1,517 (30%)	30 / 94 (32%)	432 / 1,423 (30%)	0.80
Hypothermia (< 35.5°C)	46 / 1,517 (3.0%)	9 / 94 (9.6%)	37 / 1,423 (2.6%)	0.001
Heart rate (bpm)*				
< 12 months	165.0 (148.0, 176.0)	160.0 (145.0, 176.8)	165.0 (148.0, 176.0)	0.50
12 to 59 months	152.0 (132.0, 169.5)	142.0 (124.0, 161.0)	153.0 (134.0, 170.0)	0.03
60 months to 12 years	115.0 (98.0, 132.0)	150.0 (132.0, 164.0)	113.0 (98.0, 129.0)	<0.001
> 12 years	99.0 (83.0, 114.0)	128.0 (100.8, 151.5)	98.0 (81.0, 112.0)	0.05

Characteristic	Overall, N = 1,550 ¹	PICU survival		
		No, N = 97 ¹	Yes, N = 1,453 ¹	p-value ²
Respiratory rate (bpm)*				
< 12 months	56.0 (48.0, 62.0)	56.0 (48.5, 68.0)	56.0 (48.0, 62.0)	0.60
12 to 59 months	48.0 (38.0, 60.0)	46.0 (38.0, 56.5)	50.0 (38.0, 60.0)	0.50
60 months to 12 years	30.0 (26.0, 36.0)	42.0 (32.0, 52.0)	30.0 (26.0, 36.0)	<0.001
> 12 years	26.0 (24.0, 32.0)	39.0 (35.8, 40.0)	26.0 (24.0, 32.0)	0.002
Oxygen saturation (%)^{*§}	98.0 (96.0, 99.0)	98.0 (89.2, 99.0)	98.0 (97.0, 99.0)	<0.001
On supplemental oxygen*	767 / 1,526 (50%)	57 / 95 (60%)	710 / 1,431 (50%)	0.05
Clinical assessment[†]				
Not alert*	351 / 1,495 (23%)	56 / 89 (63%)	295 / 1,406 (21%)	<0.001
Prolonged central capillary refill time*	126 / 1,533 (8.2%)	31 / 97 (32%)	95 / 1,436 (6.6%)	<0.001
Weak pulse*	183 / 1,508 (12%)	28 / 92 (30%)	155 / 1,416 (11%)	<0.001
Cool extremities*	406 / 1,540 (26%)	43 / 97 (44%)	363 / 1,443 (25%)	<0.001
Respiratory distress*	900 / 1,528 (59%)	67 / 92 (73%)	833 / 1,436 (58%)	0.01
Lung crepitations*	561 / 1,540 (36%)	34 / 95 (36%)	527 / 1,445 (36%)	0.90
Laboratory parameters[†]				
White cell count (x10⁹ cells/μL)*	12.4 (8.2, 17.2)	12.1 (6.2, 17.8)	12.4 (8.4, 17.2)	0.20
Neutrophil count (x10 ⁹ cells/μL)*	6.0 (3.2, 10.1)	5.8 (2.5, 9.5)	6.0 (3.2, 10.1)	0.40
Lymphocyte count (x10 ⁹ cells/μL)*	3.7 (2.1, 6.2)	3.1 (1.5, 6.0)	3.7 (2.1, 6.3)	0.05
Haemoglobin (g/dL)*	108.0 (95.0, 122.0)	96.0 (79.0, 108.0)	109.0 (97.0, 123.0)	<0.001
Platelet count (x10⁹ cells/μL)*	376.0 (214.5, 506.5)	242.0 (76.0, 371.0)	384.0 (229.2, 509.5)	<0.001
C-reactive protein (mg/L)*	7.0 (2.0, 33.0)	13.5 (2.0, 74.5)	7.0 (2.0, 30.0)	0.03
Glucose (mmol/L)*	104.0 (86.0, 129.0)	111.5 (86.5, 159.8)	103.5 (86.0, 128.0)	0.20
Severity scores				
FEAST-PET*	2.0 (1.0, 3.0)	3.0 (2.0, 4.0)	2.0 (1.0, 3.0)	<0.001
LqSOFA*	0.0 (0.0, 1.0)	1.0 (1.0, 2.0)	0.0 (0.0, 1.0)	<0.001
PAWS*	3.0 (2.0, 5.0)	5.0 (3.0, 7.0)	3.0 (2.0, 5.0)	<0.001

Characteristic	Overall, N = 1,550 ¹	PICU survival		
		No, N = 97 ¹	Yes, N = 1,453 ¹	p-value ²
PEWS*	6.0 (3.0, 8.0)	7.5 (6.0, 11.0)	5.0 (3.0, 8.0)	<0.001
PEWS-IRISH*	4.0 (2.0, 7.0)	6.0 (4.2, 8.8)	4.0 (2.0, 6.0)	<0.001
PEWS-RL*	3.0 (2.0, 3.0)	3.0 (3.0, 4.0)	3.0 (1.0, 3.0)	<0.001
qPELOD-2*	0.0 (0.0, 1.0)	1.0 (0.0, 2.0)	0.0 (0.0, 1.0)	<0.001
qSOFA*	1.0 (1.0, 1.0)	2.0 (1.0, 2.0)	1.0 (1.0, 1.0)	<0.001
SIRS*	2.0 (1.0, 2.0)	2.0 (1.0, 3.0)	2.0 (1.0, 2.0)	<0.001

¹Median (IQR); n / N (%); ²Wilcoxon rank sum test; Pearson's Chi-squared test; Fisher's exact test

461

462 **Table 3. Final clinical prediction model to estimate the probability that a PICU admission will end**
 463 **in death.** Predictors spanning the five clinical domains are presented along with their regression
 464 coefficients and the formulae required to calculate the probability that a PICU admission will end in
 465 death. *Assessed by a Principal Investigator (CT) blinded to outcome status using the following
 466 adapted working definition: *any previous health condition known to be present at PICU admission*
 467 *severe enough to require specialty paediatric care and probably a period of hospitalisation over 12*
 468 *months.*⁵⁸ #Calculated (R package: *zscorer*)⁵⁹ using WHO (children < 10 years)^{60,61} and US CDC
 469 (children ≥ 10 years)⁶² reference ranges. [§]Travel by road estimated using GoogleMaps. [†]Admission
 470 from acute medical or surgical ward. [^]Central CRT > 2 seconds. ^{*}GCS < 15 and/or AVPU < A. AVPU =
 471 Alert Voice Pain Unresponsiveness scale; CRT = capillary refill time; GCS = Glasgow Coma Scale.

Clinical domain	Predictors	Ridge regression coefficient	p-value
	Intercept	-1.8525	
Background	Age (months)	-0.0013	0.02
	Presence of comorbidity *	0.2201	0.12
	Weight-for-age z-score (waz) #	-0.1108	< 0.001
Illness journey	Estimated travel time (minutes) §	0.0013	0.01
	Intra-hospital transfer †	0.4626	< 0.001
Cardiovascular	Heart rate (beats per minute)	-0.0002	0.89
	Heart rate (beats per minute) x Age (months)	8.6514 x10 ⁻⁶	0.14
	Prolonged capillary refill time ^	1.0244	< 0.001
Respiratory	Respiratory rate (beats per minute)	0.0090	0.01
	Respiratory rate (beats per minute) x Age (months)	4.8939 x10 ⁻⁵	0.03
	Oxygen saturation (%)	-0.0253	< 0.001
	Receipt of supplemental oxygen	0.1808	0.10
Neurological	Abnormal mental status †	1.0313	< 0.001

The model estimates the log odds of death during a PICU admission, using the sum of the intercept and the predictors multiplied by their coefficients, according to the following equation:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & -1.8525 - 0.0013 * age + \begin{cases} 0 \text{ if no comorbidity} \\ 0.2201 \text{ if comorbidity} \end{cases} - 0.1108 * waz + 0.0013 * travel\ time + \\
 & \begin{cases} 0 \text{ if no intra-hospital transfer} \\ 0.4626 \text{ if intra-hospital transfer} \end{cases} - 0.0002 * heart\ rate + 8.6514 \times 10^{-6} * age * heart\ rate + \begin{cases} 0 \text{ if no prolonged CRT} \\ 1.0244 \text{ if prolonged CRT} \end{cases} + 0.0090 * \\
 & respiratory\ rate + 4.8939 \times 10^{-5} * age * respiratory\ rate - 0.0253 * oxygen\ saturation + \begin{cases} 0 \text{ if no supplemental oxygen} \\ 0.1808 \text{ if supplemental oxygen} \end{cases} + \\
 & \begin{cases} 0 \text{ if normal mental status} \\ 1.0313 \text{ if abnormal mental status} \end{cases}
 \end{aligned}$$

To support clinical decision-making, the output of the model (log odds) is converted into the probability that a PICU admission will result in death using the following transformation:

$$\Pr(\text{death during PICU admission}) = \frac{e^{\text{log odds}}}{1 + e^{\text{log odds}}}$$


472 **Table 4. Ability of the model to triage PICU admissions.** Performance of the model at five cut-offs (decision thresholds or threshold probabilities). A cut-off
 473 of 10% reflects a triage strategy whereby all admissions with a predicted probability of death $\geq 10\%$ are directed to a high-acuity area and all other
 474 admissions managed on the main unit. A decrease in threshold probability (cut-off) is associated with an increase in the sensitivity of the triage strategy for
 475 identifying high-risk admissions, at the cost of a greater proportion of admissions being directed to the high-acuity area. FN = false negative (high-risk
 476 admission triaged to low-acuity area); FP = false positive (low-risk admission triaged to high-acuity area); NLR = negative likelihood ratio; PLR = positive
 477 likelihood ratio; TN = true negative (low-risk admission triaged to low-acuity area); TP = true positive (high-risk admission triaged to high-acuity area).

Predicted probability of death	Sensitivity (95% CI)	Specificity (95% CI)	PLR (95% CI)	NLR (95% CI)	Per 1,000 admissions (~63 of which would die)				Percentage of admissions triaged as high-acuity	Ratio of incorrect to correct high-acuity triages
					TP	FP	TN	FN		
2.5%	0.99 (0.97-1.00)	0.16 (0.14-0.18)	1.18 (1.14-1.21)	0.07 (0.01-0.46)	62	788	150	1	85.0%	13:1
5%	0.86 (0.79-0.93)	0.63 (0.61-0.66)	2.31 (2.08-2.57)	0.23 (0.14-0.37)	54	347	590	9	40.1%	6:1
7.5%	0.65 (0.56-0.74)	0.80 (0.78-0.82)	3.27 (2.73-3.91)	0.44 (0.33-0.57)	41	186	751	22	22.7%	5:1
10%	0.58 (0.48-0.68)	0.90 (0.88-0.92)	5.75 (4.57-7.23)	0.47 (0.37-0.59)	36	94	844	26	13.0%	3:1
15%	0.46 (0.37-0.56)	0.96 (0.95-0.97)	11.43 (8.22-15.88)	0.56 (0.46-0.67)	29	39	899	34	12.3%	1:1

478

479


480 **Figure 1. Performance of the nine existing severity scores.** Panel A: discrimination of the severity scores. Perfect discrimination is indicated by an AUC of
 481 1.0. Panel B: negative (red line) and positive (blue line) likelihood ratios of the severity scores at different cut-offs, illustrated on a \log_{10} scale. As a rule-of-
 482 thumb, a greater than 10-fold change (PLR > 10 or NLR < 0.1) is often deemed conclusive, a 5-to-10-fold change (PLR 5-10 or NLR 0.1-0.2) substantial, a 2-to-
 483 5-fold change (PLR 2-5 or NLR 0.2-0.5) small but important, and a less than two-fold change (PLR 1-2 or NLR 0.5-1) likely clinically insignificant.³² AUC = area




484 under the receiver operating characteristic curve; NLR = negative likelihood ratio; PLR = positive likelihood ratio.

485 **Figure 2. Discrimination and calibration of the new model.** Panel A: discrimination of the new model. Perfect discrimination is indicated by an AUC of 1.0.
486 Panel B: calibration of the new model. Dashed line indicates perfect calibration. Solid line indicates calibration of the model, with 95% confidence interval
487 (grey ribbon). Rug plots indicate distribution of predicted risks for participants who did (top) and did not (bottom) meet the primary outcome. AUC = area


488 under the receiver operating characteristic curve.



489



490 **Figure 3. Clinical utility of the new model across a range of plausible decision thresholds.** A cut-off (decision threshold or threshold probability) of 10%
491 reflects a triage strategy whereby all admissions with a predicted probability of death $\geq 10\%$ are directed to a high-acuity area and all other admissions
492 managed on the main unit. The net benefit of the new model is compared to the three existing scores that demonstrated potential for stratifying
493 admissions into low- and high-risk groups from the external validation. Above a cut-off of 7.5% using the new model to triage admissions appears to be the



494 optimal strategy.

495

496 **REFERENCES**

- 497 1. Turner EL, Nielsen KR, Jamal SM, von Saint Andre-von Arnim A, Musa NL. A Review of Pediatric
498 Critical Care in Resource-Limited Settings: A Look at Past, Present, and Future Directions. *Front*
499 *Pediatr* 2016; **4**: 5.
- 500 2. Losonczy LI, Papali A, Kivlehan S, et al. White Paper on Early Critical Care Services in Low
501 Resource Settings. *Ann Glob Health* 2021; **87**(1): 105.
- 502 3. Slusher TM, Kiragu AW, Day LT, et al. Pediatric Critical Care in Resource-Limited Settings-
503 Overview and Lessons Learned. *Front Pediatr* 2018; **6**: 49.
- 504 4. Firth P, Ttendo S. Intensive Care in Low-Income Countries - A Critical Need. *N Engl J Med* 2012;
505 **367**(21): 1974-6.
- 506 5. Duke T, Wandji F, Jonathan M, et al. Improved oxygen systems for childhood pneumonia: a
507 multihospital effectiveness study in Papua New Guinea. *Lancet* 2008; **372**(9646): 1328-33.
- 508 6. Tripathi S, Kaur H, Kashyap R, Dong Y, Gajic O, Murthy S. A survey on the resources and
509 practices in pediatric critical care of resource-rich and resource-limited countries. *J Intensive*
510 *Care* 2015; **3**: 40.
- 511 7. Argent AC, Chisti MJ, Ranjit S. What's new in PICU in resource limited settings? *Intensive Care*
512 *Med* 2018; **44**(4): 467-9.
- 513 8. Argent AC, Ahrens J, Morrow BM, et al. Pediatric intensive care in South Africa: an account of
514 making optimum use of limited resources at the Red Cross War Memorial Children's Hospital*.
515 *Pediatr Crit Care Med* 2014; **15**(1): 7-14.
- 516 9. Riviello ED, Letchford S, Achieng L, Newton MW. Critical care in resource-poor settings: lessons
517 learned and future directions. *Crit Care Med* 2011; **39**(4): 860-7.
- 518 10. Simkovich SM, Underhill LJ, Kirby MA, et al. Resources and Geographic Access to Care for Severe
519 Pediatric Pneumonia in Four Resource-limited Settings. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2022; **205**(2):
520 183-97.
- 521 11. Marshall JC, Bosco L, Adhikari NK, et al. What is an intensive care unit? A report of the task force
522 of the World Federation of Societies of Intensive and Critical Care Medicine. *J Crit Care* 2017;
523 **37**: 270-6.
- 524 12. Murthy S, Leligdowicz A, Adhikari NK. Intensive care unit capacity in low-income countries: a
525 systematic review. *PLoS One* 2015; **10**(1): e0116949.
- 526 13. Pollack MM, Holubkov R, Funai T, et al. The Pediatric Risk of Mortality Score: Update 2015.
527 *Pediatr Crit Care Med* 2016; **17**(1): 2-9.
- 528 14. Straney L, Clements A, Parslow RC, et al. Paediatric index of mortality 3: an updated model for
529 predicting mortality in pediatric intensive care*. *Pediatr Crit Care Med* 2013; **14**(7): 673-81.
- 530 15. Diaz JV, Riviello ED, Papali A, Adhikari NKJ, Ferreira JC. Global Critical Care: Moving Forward in
531 Resource-Limited Settings. *Ann Glob Health* 2019; **85**(1).
- 532 16. Wheeler I, Price C, Sitch A, et al. Early warning scores generated in developed healthcare
533 settings are not sufficient at predicting early mortality in Blantyre, Malawi: a prospective cohort
534 study. *PLoS One* 2013; **8**(3): e59830.
- 535 17. George EC. Good-quality research: a vital step in improving outcomes in paediatric intensive
536 care units in low- and middle-income countries. *Paediatr Int Child Health* 2017; **37**(2): 79-81.
- 537 18. Seifu A, Eshetu O, Tafesse D, Hailu S. Admission pattern, treatment outcomes, and associated
538 factors for children admitted to pediatric intensive care unit of Tikur Anbessa specialized
539 hospital, 2021: a retrospective cross-sectional study. *BMC Anesthesiol* 2022; **22**(1): 13.
- 540 19. Rusmawatiningtyas D, Rahmawati A, Makrufardi F, et al. Factors associated with mortality of
541 pediatric sepsis patients at the pediatric intensive care unit in a low-resource setting. *BMC*
542 *Pediatr* 2021; **21**(1): 471.
- 543 20. Nyirasafari R, Corden MH, Karambizi AC, et al. Predictors of mortality in a paediatric intensive
544 care unit in Kigali, Rwanda. *Paediatr Int Child Health* 2017; **37**(2): 109-15.

- 545 21. Teshager NW, Amare AT, Tamirat KS. Incidence and predictors of mortality among children
546 admitted to the pediatric intensive care unit at the University of Gondar comprehensive
547 specialised hospital, northwest Ethiopia: a prospective observational cohort study. *BMJ Open*
548 2020; **10**(10): e036746.
- 549 22. Collins GS, Reitsma JB, Altman DG, Moons KG. Transparent Reporting of a multivariable
550 prediction model for Individual Prognosis or Diagnosis (TRIPOD): the TRIPOD statement. *Ann*
551 *Intern Med* 2015; **162**(1): 55-63.
- 552 23. Frankel LR, Hsu BS, Yeh TS, et al. Criteria for Critical Care Infants and Children: PICU Admission,
553 Discharge, and Triage Practice Statement and Levels of Care Guidance. *Pediatr Crit Care Med*
554 2019; **20**(9): 847-87.
- 555 24. Chandna A, Tan R, Carter M, et al. Predictors of disease severity in children presenting from the
556 community with febrile illnesses: a systematic review of prognostic studies. *BMJ Glob Health*
557 2021; **6**(1).
- 558 25. Ogero M, Sarguta RJ, Malla L, et al. Prognostic models for predicting in-hospital paediatric
559 mortality in resource-limited countries: a systematic review. *BMJ Open* 2020; **10**(10): e035045.
- 560 26. Pollack MM, Dean JM, Butler J, et al. The ideal time interval for critical care severity-of-illness
561 assessment. *Pediatr Crit Care Med* 2013; **14**(5): 448-53.
- 562 27. Vergouwe Y, Steyerberg EW, Eijkemans MJ, Habbema JD. Substantial effective sample sizes
563 were required for external validation studies of predictive logistic regression models. *J Clin*
564 *Epidemiol* 2005; **58**(5): 475-83.
- 565 28. Ensor J, Martin EC, Riley RD. pmsampsize: Calculates the Minimum Sample Size Required for
566 Developing a Multivariable Prediction Model. R package version 1.1.1. R; 2021.
- 567 29. Riley RD, Ensor J, Snell KIE, et al. Calculating the sample size required for developing a clinical
568 prediction model. *BMJ* 2020; **368**: m441.
- 569 30. Tierney N, Cook D. Expanding Tidy Data Principles to Facilitate Missing Data Exploration,
570 Visualization and Assessment of Imputations. *Journal of Statistical Software* 2023; **105**(7): 1-31.
- 571 31. Robin X, Turck N, Hainard A, et al. pROC: an open-source package for R and S+ to analyze and
572 compare ROC curves. *BMC Bioinformatics* 2011; **12**(77).
- 573 32. Jaeschke R, Guyatt GH, Sackett DL, Evidence-Based Medicine Working Group. Users' Guides to
574 the Medical Literature III. How to Use an Article About a Diagnostic Test B. What Are the Results
575 and Will They Help Me in Caring for My Patients? *JAMA* 1994; **271**(9): 703-7.
- 576 33. Cule E, Moritz S, Frankowski D. ridge: Ridge Regression with Automatic Selection of the Penalty
577 Parameter. 2022.
- 578 34. Du Z, Hao Y. reportROC: An Easy Way to Report ROC Analysis. 2022.
- 579 35. Sjoberg DD. dcurves: Decision Curve Analysis for Model Evaluation. R package version 0.3.0.
580 2022.
- 581 36. Vickers AJ, Elkin EB. Decision curve analysis: a novel method for evaluating prediction models.
582 *Med Decis Making* 2006; **26**(6): 565-74.
- 583 37. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria: R
584 Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2020.
- 585 38. Schlapbach LJ, Straney L, Bellomo R, MacLaren G, Pilcher D. Prognostic accuracy of age-adapted
586 SOFA, SIRS, PELOD-2, and qSOFA for in-hospital mortality among children with suspected
587 infection admitted to the intensive care unit. *Intensive Care Med* 2018; **44**(2): 179-88.
- 588 39. van Nassau SC, van Beek RH, Driessen GJ, Hazelzet JA, van Wering HM, Boeddha NP. Translating
589 Sepsis-3 Criteria in Children: Prognostic Accuracy of Age-Adjusted Quick SOFA Score in Children
590 Visiting the Emergency Department With Suspected Bacterial Infection. *Front Pediatr* 2018; **6**:
591 266.
- 592 40. de Hond AAH, Steyerberg EW, van Calster B. Interpreting area under the receiver operating
593 characteristic curve. *Lancet Digit Health* 2022; **0**(0).
- 594 41. George EC, Walker AS, Kiguli S, et al. Predicting mortality in sick African children: the FEAST
595 Paediatric Emergency Triage (PET) Score. *BMC Med* 2015; **13**: 174.

- 596 42. Leclerc F, Duhamel A, Deken V, Grandbastien B, Leteurtre S, Groupe Francophone de
597 Reanimation et Urgences P. Can the Pediatric Logistic Organ Dysfunction-2 Score on Day 1 Be
598 Used in Clinical Criteria for Sepsis in Children? *Pediatr Crit Care Med* 2017; **18**(8): 758-63.
- 599 43. Romaine S.T, Potter J, Khanijau A, et al. Accuracy of a Modified qSOFA Score for Predicting
600 Critical Care Admission in Febrile Children. *Pediatrics* 2020; **146**(4): e20200782.
- 601 44. Eun S, Kim H, Kim HY, et al. Age-adjusted quick Sequential Organ Failure Assessment score for
602 predicting mortality and disease severity in children with infection: a systematic review and
603 meta-analysis. *Sci Rep* 2021; **11**(1): 21699.
- 604 45. Egdell P, Finlay L, Pedley DK. The PAWS score: validation of an early warning scoring system for
605 the initial assessment of children in the emergency department. *Emerg Med J* 2008; **25**(11):
606 745-9.
- 607 46. Parshuram CS, Hutchison J, Middaugh K. Development and initial validation of the Bedside
608 Paediatric Early Warning System score. *Crit Care* 2009; **13**(4): R135.
- 609 47. Rosman SL, Karangwa V, Law M, Monuteaux MC, Briscoe CD, McCall N. Provisional Validation of
610 a Pediatric Early Warning Score for Resource-Limited Settings. *Pediatrics* 2019; **143**(5):
611 e20183657.
- 612 48. Celiker MY, Pagnarith Y, Akao K, Sophearin D, Sorn S. Pediatric Palliative Care Initiative in
613 Cambodia. *Front Public Health* 2017; **5**: 185.
- 614 49. Haniffa R, Isaam I, De Silva AP, Dondorp AM, De Keizer NF. Performance of critical care
615 prognostic scoring systems in low and middle-income countries: a systematic review. *Crit Care*
616 2018; **22**(1): 18.
- 617 50. Hodkinson P, Argent A, Wallis L, et al. Pathways to Care for Critically Ill or Injured Children: A
618 Cohort Study from First Presentation to Healthcare Services through to Admission to Intensive
619 Care or Death. *PLoS One* 2016; **11**(1): e0145473.
- 620 51. Wiens MO, Kumbakumba E, Larson CP, et al. Postdischarge mortality in children with acute
621 infectious diseases: derivation of postdischarge mortality prediction models. *BMJ Open* 2015;
622 **5**(11): e009449.
- 623 52. Chisti MJ, Graham SM, Duke T, et al. Post-discharge mortality in children with severe
624 malnutrition and pneumonia in Bangladesh. *PLoS One* 2014; **9**(9): e107663.
- 625 53. Muenchhoff M, Goulder PJ. Sex differences in pediatric infectious diseases. *J Infect Dis* 2014;
626 **209** Suppl 3(Suppl 3): S120-6.
- 627 54. Calu Costa J, Wehrmeister FC, Barros AJ, Victora CG. Gender bias in careseeking practices in 57
628 low- and middle-income countries. *J Glob Health* 2017; **7**(1): 010418.
- 629 55. World Health Organization. Haemoglobin concentrations for the diagnosis of anaemia and
630 assessment of severity. Vitamin and Mineral Nutrition Information System. Geneva, 2011.
- 631 56. National Clinical Effectiveness Committee and Department of Health. National Clinical Guideline
632 on the Irish Paediatric Early Warning System (PEWS), 2016.
- 633 57. Goldstein B, Giroir B, Randolph A, International Consensus Conference on Pediatric S.
634 International pediatric sepsis consensus conference: definitions for sepsis and organ
635 dysfunction in pediatrics. *Pediatr Crit Care Med* 2005; **6**(1): 2-8.
- 636 58. Feudtner C, Christakis DA, Connell FA. Pediatric Deaths Attributable to Complex Chronic
637 Conditions: A Population-Based Study of Washington State, 1980–1997. *Pediatrics* 2000; **106**:
638 205-9.
- 639 59. Myatt M, Guevarra E. zscorer: Child Anthropometry z-Score Calculator. R package version 0.3.1.
640 2019.
- 641 60. de Onis M, Onyango AW, Borghi E, Siyam A, Nishida C, Siekmann J. Development of a WHO
642 growth reference for school-aged children and adolescents. *Bull World Health Organ* 2007;
643 **85**(9): 660-7.
- 644 61. WHO Multicentre Growth Reference Study Group. WHO Child Growth Standards based on
645 length/height, weight and age. *Acta Paediatr* 2006: 76-85.

646 62. Kuczmarski RJ, Ogden CL, Guo SS, et al. 2000 CDC growth charts for the United States: Methods
647 and development. *Vital Health Stat* 2002; **11**.

648