Pediatric Prehospital Protocols Grant
Children presenting with Non-Trauma Shock (hypovolemic, septic)
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ASK THE QUESTION

Question 1: For the pediatric patient presenting with non-traumatic hypovolemic shock from dehydration in the prehospital setting, does rapid delivery of initial fluid bolus(es) improve quality of care (e.g., decreased intensive care unit [ICU] admission rate, decreased hospital LOS, improved mortality, decreased end-organ failure)?

Question 2: For the pediatric patient presenting with non-traumatic septic shock in the prehospital setting, does rapid delivery of initial fluid bolus(es) improve quality of care (e.g. decreased ICU admission rate, decreased hospital LOS, improved mortality, decreased end-organ failure)?

Question 3: For the pediatric patient presenting with profound non-traumatic septic or hypovolemic shock in the prehospital setting, does a fluid bolus via intraosseous (IO) needle (when peripheral access has failed) result in improved quality of care (e.g. decreased ICU admission rate, decreased hospital LOS, improved mortality, decreased end-organ failure) relative to deferring intravenous (IV) placement at the receiving hospital?

Search Strategy
A comprehensive literature search was conducted to find relevant evidence to support the Prehospital Protocols – Non Traumatic Shock. This search was conducted in January 2012 and included the following databases and websites: Cochrane Collaboration Database, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ), National Guideline Clearinghouse, Pubmed, Trip Database, American Academy of Pediatrics, Prehospital Emergency Care, Prehospital and Disaster Medicine, Annals of Emergency Medicine, The American Journal of Emergency Medicine, Academic Emergency Medicine, JEMS: A Journal of EMS, Pediatric Emergency Care, and the Canadian Journal of Emergency Medicine. Search terms included the following: hypovolemic shock, hypovolemia, non-traumatic shock, septic shock, sepsis shock, pediatric, children, prehospital, out of hospital, and emergency care. Limits placed on the search terms were for literature published within the last 10 years, pediatric and adult patients, All Child 0-18 years, All Adult 19+ years, human patients and within the English language.

This project has been funded by the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA), Emergency Medical Services for Children (EMSC) State Partnership Grant #H33MC11305.
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CRITICALLY ANALYZE THE EVIDENCE

Existing External Order Sets/Guidelines/Clinical Pathways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Guideline/Pathway/Order Set</th>
<th>Organization and Author</th>
<th>Last Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pediatric Advanced Life Support: 2010 Guidelines for Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation and Emergency Cardiovascular Care</td>
<td>American Heart Association</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pediatric Advanced Life Support Guidelines for Management of Pediatric and Neonatal Septic Shock</td>
<td>American College of Critical Care Medicine</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two published clinical guidelines have been evaluated for this review using the AGREE criteria. AGREE includes evaluation of: Guideline Scope and Purpose, Stakeholder Involvement, Rigor of Development, Clarity and Presentation, Applicability, and Editorial Independence. Four reviewers appraised the guideline, and scored each component independently. Domain scores were calculated by summing up all the scores of the individual items in a domain, and standardizing the total as a percentage of the maximum possible score for a particular domain. After appraising the guidelines above using the AGREE instrument, the reviewers recommend using the guidelines with modifications. The reviewers were: Elizabeth Crabtree, MPH; Quinn Franklin, MS, CCLS; Colleen Jones, MS, RN; and Janelle Smith, MSN, RN.

Question 1: For the pediatric patient presenting with non-traumatic hypovolemic shock from dehydration in the prehospital setting, does rapid delivery of initial fluid bolus(es) improve quality of care (e.g., decreased intensive care unit [ICU] admission rate, decreased hospital LOS, improved mortality, decreased end-organ failure)?

Recommendation: Pediatric patients with non-traumatic hypovolemic shock from dehydration should receive rapid delivery of intravenous (or intraosseous) isotonic fluid in aliquots of 20 ml/kg.

Strength of recommendation: Strong

Grade criteria: Very low quality evidence

There were no studies found directly addressing the PICO question.

The Pediatric Advanced Life Support: 2010 American Heart Association (AHA) Guidelines for Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation and Emergency Cardiovascular Care recommend administering a bolus of 20mL/kg of isotonic crystalloid, as the initial fluid treatment. In addition, AHA noted there to be no added benefit in using colloid during the early phase of resuscitation. Subsequently, the University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas/BioTel EMS System’s guideline for shock mirrors AHA’s guideline and notes that 20mL/kg bolus should be administered for children with hypovolemic shock and repeated once if systolic pressure not above 70 mmHg. Emergency Medical Services for Children Pediatric Protocols recommends administering 20mL/kg set to maximum flow rate, reassess after the 1st bolus and if signs of non-traumatic shock persist, the bolus may be repeated at the same does up to 2 times for a maximum total of 60 mL/kg.

References:
Pediatric Advanced Life Support: 2010 American Heart Association Guidelines for Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation and Emergency Cardiovascular Care 2010
University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas/BioTel EMS System
Emergency Medical Services for Children Partnership for Children/National Association of EMS Physicians Model Pediatric Protocols 2003 Revision 2004
Question 2: For the pediatric patient presenting with septic shock in the prehospital setting, does rapid delivery of initial fluid bolus(es) improve quality of care (e.g., decreased ICU admission rate, decreased hospital LOS, improved mortality, decreased end-organ failure)?

Recommendation: Pediatric patients with presumed septic shock should receive rapid delivery of intravenous (or intraosseous) isotonic fluid in aliquots of 20 ml/kg.

Strength of recommendation: Strong

Grade criteria: Very low quality evidence

There were no studies found directly addressing the PICO question. One cohort study found that less than half of adult patients with severe sepsis treated in the prehospital setting received out-of-hospital fluids and approached but did not attain a statistically significant increase in the likelihood of achieving the goal mean arterial pressure during early goal directed therapy. (Seymour 2010).

The American College of Critical Care Medicine – Pediatric Advanced Life Support Guidelines for Management of Pediatric and Neonatal Septic Shock (2010) and Clinical Practice Parameters for Hemodynamic Support of Pediatric and Neonatal Shock (2009) recommend pushing boluses of 20mL/kg isotonic saline or colloid up to and over 60 mL/kg until perfusion improves or unless rales or hepatomegaly develop. In adults, the Surviving Sepsis Campaign (2008) noted that as soon as hypoperfusion is recognized initial resuscitation should begin. Fluid challenges of 1000 ml of crystalloids or 300-500 ml of colloids over 30 minutes. Additionally, the University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas/BioTel EMS System’s guideline for shock states that 20mL/kg bolus should be administered for children in shock and repeated once if systolic pressure not above 70 mmHg. Similarly, the Houston Fire Department and the Emergency Medical Services for Children Pediatric Protocols recommends 20mL/kg normal saline bolus for non-traumatic shock.

Subsequently, four studies investigated the implementation of a pediatric septic shock protocol. Two of the three studies were conducted in large, freestanding pediatric Emergency Departments and noted that the protocol improved recognition and reductions in time to delivery of rapid, aggressive fluid administration (Cruz 2011, Larsen 2011). Shapiro et al. (2006) reported an association between implementation of a protocol with changes in therapies including intravenous fluid delivery. Han et al (2003) evaluated the use of early septic shock reversal by community physicians and found that aggressive resuscitation can save the lives of children. Shock reversal was found in 24/91 (26%) of patients which was associated with 96% survival and a > 9-fold increased odds of survival (9.49[1.07-83.89]).

Lastly, a retrospective chart review of 90 pediatric patients treated for septic shock in the pediatric intensive care unit found that early fluid resuscitation was associated with a 3-fold reduction in the odds of death (OR: 0.33; 95% CI: 0.13- 0.85) when you control for the risk of mortality (Oliveira 2008).

Additionally, the Pediatric Advanced Life Support: 2010 American Heart Association Guidelines for Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation and Emergency Cardiovascular Care note that it is reasonable to use isotonic crystalloid solution as the initial fluid for the treatment of septic shock since there appears to be no clinically important difference in survival of children who are treated using a colloid compared with a crystalloid.

References:
American College of Critical Care Medicine – Pediatric Advanced Life Support Guidelines for Management of Pediatric and Neonatal Septic Shock 2010
Clinical Practice Parameters for Hemodynamic Support of Pediatric and Neonatal Septic Shock: 2007 Update from the American College of Critical Care Medicine
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Seymour (2010): Retrospective, cohort study of 52 adult patients transported by advanced life support (ALS) and received early-goal directed therapy (EGDT). The study evaluated whether or not the delivery of out-of-hospital fluid in patients with severe sepsis is associated with reduced time to achievement of goal-oriented resuscitation in the emergency department (ED).

- CI/RR

Seymour (2010):

- Patients receiving out-of-hospital fluid had lower out of hospital mean (± SD) systolic blood pressure (95 ± 40 mmHg versus 117 ± 29 mmHg, P=0.03) and a higher median (interquartile range) Sequential Organ Failure Assessment scores in the ED (7 [5-8] versus 4 [4-6], P<0.01) than patients who do not receive out of hospital fluids.

Recommendation(s): Very Low Quality Evidence
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Design Limitations

- No inconsistencies

- Wide variation of treatment effect across studies

- Populations varied (e.g., sicker, older)

- Interventions varied (e.g., doses)

- Outcomes varied (e.g., diminishing effect over time)

- Head-to-head comparison in correct population

- Indirect comparisons (e.g., interventions to placebo but not each other)

- Different populations (Seymour 2010)

- Different interventions (Seymour 2010)

- Different outcomes measured (Seymour 2010)

- Comparisons not applicable to question/outcome (Seymour 2010)

Summary of Consistency

Indirectness of Comparison

Imprecision of Results

Dichotomous outcomes

- Sample size lower than calculated optimal information size (Seymour 2010)

- Total # of events is < 300 based on simulations & dependent on baseline risk & effect sizes

Continuous outcomes

- 95% CI includes negligible effect and appreciable benefit or harm

- 95% CI includes no effect and the upper or lower limit crosses the minimal important difference (MID), either for benefit or harm

- Upper or lower limit crosses an effect size of 0.5 in either direction (if MID is not known or differences in outcomes require the calculation of an effect size)
Patients receiving out of hospital fluids approached but did not attain a statistically significant increase in the likelihood of achieving mean arterial pressure (≥ 65 mmHg within 6 hours after ED triage (70% versus 44%; P= 0.09).

Reference:

Question 3: For the pediatric patient presenting with profound non-traumatic septic or hypovolemic shock in the prehospital setting, does a fluid bolus via intraosseous (IO) needle (when peripheral access has failed) result in improved quality of care (e.g., decreased ICU admission rate, decreased hospital LOS, improved mortality, decreased end-organ failure) relative to deferring intravenous (IV) placement at the receiving hospital?

Recommendation: Fluid boluses via the IO route are recommended if administration via the IV route cannot be initiated in a timely manner.

Strength of recommendation: Strong
Grade criteria: Very low quality evidence

There were no studies found directly addressing the PICO question. One observational study and one single-blinded randomized trial, evaluated the insertion times and success rates of various IO needles (Findlay 2006, Hartholt 2010). The studies concluded that IO devices provide a safe, simple, and fast method for gaining access to the circulation in emergency situations. An observational study of pediatric ED patients found that IO success rates were high despite infrequent use (Nijssen-Jordan 2000). Only one of the studies included pediatric patients in the pre-hospital setting (Hartholt 2010). Three observational studies looked specifically at the use of EZ-IO. They found that EZ-IO requires minimal training, is easy to use, is fast, and has a
high success rate even on initial insertion (Leviton 2009, Schalk 2011, Sunde 2010). Two of the studies included pediatric patients (Schalk 2011, Sunde 2010).

While no literature was found evaluating clinical outcomes for pediatric patients with an IO placed in the pre-hospital setting in the last 10 years, a retrospective chart review of prehospital IV placement in pediatric patients published in 1992 found a 57% success rate for IV placement in patients less than 6 years of age, and a 74% success rate in children greater or equal to 6 years (Lillis 1992). Both the American College of Critical Care Medicine – Pediatric Advanced Life Support Guidelines for Management of Pediatric and Neonatal Septic Shock (2010), and the EMSC Partnership for Children/National Association of EMS Physicians Model Pediatric Protocols (2003) recommend obtaining IO access, if IV access is not feasible. However, they caution against delaying transport to obtain vascular access. In addition, the University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center at Dallas/BioTel EMS System’s guideline for shock advocates using IO infusion early if the child is unconscious.

**Recommendation(s):** Fluid boluses via the IO route are recommended if administration via the IV route cannot be initiated in a timely manner.

**Strong Recommendation; Very Low Quality Evidence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Summary of Consistency</th>
<th>Indirectness of Comparison</th>
<th>Imprecision of Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>No inconsistencies</td>
<td>Head-to-head comparison in correct population</td>
<td>Dichotomous outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient sample size</td>
<td>Wide variation of treatment effect across studies</td>
<td>Indirect comparisons (e.g., interventions to placebo but not each other)</td>
<td>Sample size lower than calculated optimal information size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of blinding</td>
<td>Populations varied (e.g., sicker, older)</td>
<td>Different populations</td>
<td>Total # of events is &lt; 300 based on simulations &amp; dependent on baseline risk &amp; effect sizes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of allocation concealment</td>
<td>Interventions varied (e.g., doses)</td>
<td>Different interventions</td>
<td>95% CI includes negligible effect and appreciable benefit or harm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large losses to F/U</td>
<td>Outcomes varied (e.g., diminishing effect over time)</td>
<td>Different outcomes measured</td>
<td>Continuous outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect analysis of ITT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95% CI includes no effect and the upper or lower limit crosses the minimal important difference (MID), either for benefit or harm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stopped early for benefit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective reporting of measured outcomes (e.g., no effect outcome)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Design Limitations**


**Number of Studies:** Total # 5

- Systematic review
- RCT (1)
- Cohort
- Observational (4)
- Case Reports
- Publication Bias Evident
- Yes
- No

**Sample**

Findlay (2006): Observational study of 10 paramedics that participated in a training program on the use of the FAST1 System (Adult IO Intravenous Infusion System), and then used the system in 3 simulated prehospital scenarios. The study evaluated the ease and use and compatibility of the training method using a visual analog scale.

Hartholt (2010): Single-blinded randomized trial of 65 adults and 22 pediatric patients requiring acute administration of fluids or medication without successful insertion of IV catheter. Patients randomized to either Jamshidi 15G, BIG 18G or FAST1 IO needle.

Leviton (2009): Prospective study of EZ-IO with operators performing insertions on cadavers


Findlay (2006):
- Mean duration of the procedure from opening package to initiation of fluid flow was 92 ± 32 seconds
- Mean displacement of 2 mm (0.08 in) and 1 mm (0.04 in) in the vertical and horizontal planes, respectively
- Paramedics rated the system highly in all areas

Hartholt (2010):
- Median insertion times ranted from 38 seconds for the Jamshidi 15G to 49 seconds for the BIG 15G and 62 seconds for the FAST1 (p=0.004)
- Devices did not differ with respect to success rates (adults overall 80% and children overall 86%)

Leviton (2009):
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