DIAGNOSTIC ACCURACY OF DELIRIUM DIAGNOSIS IN PEDIATRIC

INTENSIVE CARE: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW

ESM_2_Joffe:

The data collection tool used to abstract study data in the systematic review.

Authors: Alia Daoud BSc1, Jonathan P Duff MD1,2, Ari R Joffe MD1,2

Affiliations: 1. University of Alberta, Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry; 2. University of Alberta, Department of Pediatrics and Stollery Children's Hospital.

Corresponding Author: Ari R Joffe MD; 4-546 Edmonton Clinic Health Academy; 11405 87 Avenue; Edmonton, Alberta, Canada; T6G 1C9. Phone: 780 2485435. Email: ari.joffe@albertahealthservices.ca Fax: 780 4073214.

DATA COLLECTION TOOL

Title	
Authors	
Reference [Journal, Year, Volume: page numbers]	
<u>METHODOLOGY</u>	
Study Research Question	
Study setting	University hospital Community hospital
Index Test Used	Name: Description in enough detail to replicate: Y/N Categories (delirium/not delirium thresholds) defined: apriori/post-hoc What was the threshold for delirium: Training of raters: Y/N/not stated Number of raters: Qualifications of raters: Research physician Staff intensivist Fellow Resident Bedside nurse Research nurse Parent Others: Cost per single index test: \$ Not mentioned
Study population: Inclusion (Indications for the Index Test)	Age: Diagnoses: Co-morbidities:
Study population: Exclusions (Indications for the Index Test)	Age: Diagnoses: Co-morbidities:
Date of Study	Start date: End date:
Name/Type of Reference Test Used:	Name (eg. DSM criteria): Training of raters: Y/N/not stated Qualifications of raters: Psychiatrist Fellow Resident Nurse Other:
Recruitment process	All PICU patients Referral for assessment Other:
Patient Sampling Method	Consecutive Non-consecutive (sub-selection): random/non-random Please describe if non-random:
Data Collection Process	Prospective/Retrospective

RESULTS		
Patient Flow:	Flow diagram in paper	Y/N
	Number eligible	n=
	Number meeting pre- specified exclusion criteria	n=
	Number enrolled	n=
	(intention to diagnose)	
	Number of participants	n=
	excluded from the study after enrollment:	
	Number of participants	n=
	in final numbers for	
	outcome (sensitivity/	
D	specificity)	li CX l m
Reason for exclusion	Invalid Inconclusive Resu	
from the study after enrollment (and n)	a) Uninterpretable d	nagnostic feature: ampers interpretation of test Y/N
emoninent (and ii)	n=	ampers interpretation of test 1/10
	Describe:	
	-Obstructed test (interrupted) Y/N
	n= Describe:	
		idity (an inadequate test procedure was
	10.70	nducted to an acceptable standard) Y/N
	n=	1 ,
	Describe:	
	b) Missing (not done	
	n=	Took (a sith on also also as siting a sec
	negative; intermediate):	Test (neither clearly positive nor
	, , ,	clusive test results (overlap): Y/N
	n=	17.
		clusive test results: Y/N
	n= Describe:	
		ence Test (neither clearly positive nor
	negative):	chee rese (herener elearly positive nor
		clusive test results (overlap): Y/N
	n=	
	Describe:	
	n=	clusive test results: Y/N
	2 55 51 15 51	
Enrolled Participant		
Descriptions		

Ages				71 (* 1
Illness(s)/condition(s) of participants enrolled	Admission diagnoses (top Co-morbidities (top 4):	0 4):		
	Factor	Delirium	No Delirium	Risk
Risk Factors for delirium:	Age Male Severity of illness Diagnostic Category Sepsis/fever/infection Cardiac surgical Neurosurgical General Surgical Trauma TBI Neurologic Medical Respiratory Other Medications Inotropes/Pressors Benzodiazepines Opiates Dexmedetomidine Other Other conditions Ventilated Shock	Delirium	No Delirium	Risk
	ARDS HBP Electrolyte abn Other:			
Predisposing (pre- existing) co-morbidities of participants enrolled	Factor Cognitive impairment Seizure disorder Stroke Vision impaired Hearing impaired Other	Delirium	No Delirium	Risk
The Outcomes of delirium:	Outcome Mortality PICU Hospital Other LOS Ventilation d PICU d	Delirium	No Delirium	Risk

	-	Outcome De	lirium	No Delirium Risk	
		Hospital d			
		Neurocognitive			
		PTSD			
		Other			
Treatment of delir	ium	Benzodiazepines:	-		
described		Dexmedetomidine:			
		Haloperidol:			
		Atypical Antipsychotic:			
The Incidence of a	nv	Other: (#pts with delirium by reference	re test)/(#nt	ts enrolled in the	
delirium (%)	•••	study)=	ce test)/ ("pt	is em oned in the	
(#patients with de	lirium	(#pts with delirium by reference	ce test)/(#pt	ts included in the	
diagnosis by refere	ence	study)=			
test)/ (#patients)					
The Incidence of	(0/)	(#pts with delirium by reference	ce test)/(#pt	ts enrolled in the	
hyperactive delirit	ım (%)	study)= (#pts with delirium by reference test)/(#pts included in the			
		study)=	ce test]/(#pt	is included in the	
The Incidence of		(#pts with delirium by reference test)/(#pts enrolled in the			
hypoactive deliriu	m (%)	study)=			
		(#pts with delirium by reference test)/(#pts included in the			
		study)=			
The Incidence of m	nixed	(#pts with delirium by reference test)/(#pts enrolled in the			
delirium (%)		study)=			
		(#pts with delirium by reference study)=	ce test)/(#pt	ts included in the	
		Of Index Test (Hours):	Intra-rate	~•	
Time Interval betv	veen		Inter-rater		
repeated measure	ments	Of Reference Test (Hours):	Intra-rate	·	
		Inter-rater:_			
Time Interval betv		< 12hr 12 to 24 hours >24 hours			
the Index and Refe	erence	Was there any treatment for delirium in between: Y/N			
Test					
The presence	e of Ty	pes of BIAS			
Spectrum Bias		ed patients do not represent the	YES NO		
		um of severity for the target condition or		Describe:	
		ative conditions (eg more advanced stages).			
Selection Bias	7746700	e patients are not enrolled consecutively or		YES NO	
	rando	mly		Describe:	
Index Test	The ir	dex test results are interpreted v	with	YES NO	
Information Bias				Describe:	
		clinical information than in pract			
Misclassification	The re	ference standard does not corre	ctly	YES NO	
Bias	classi	y patients with the target condit	ion.	Describe:	

Context Bias	The prevalence of delirium is much different than expected in the PICU population	YES NO Describe:
Partial	A non random set of patients does not undergo	YES NO
Verification Bias	the reference standard.	Describe:
Differential	A set of patients is verified with a different	YES NO
Verification Bias	reference standard than another set, especially when this selection depends on the index test result (eg. index test influences decision to order reference test)	Describe:
Incorporation	The index test is incorporated in a composite	YES NO
Bias	reference standard	Describe:
	The patients' condition changes between	YES NO
Disease	administering the index test and the reference	Describe:
Progression Bias	standard (i.e. when the period of time between	
	the index and reference tests is too long; defined as >24hr apart, not on same day)	
Reference Test	The reference standard is interpreted knowing	YES NO
Information Bias	the index test results.	Describe:
Excluded Data	Occurs when uninterpretable or intermediate	YES NO
	test results and withdrawals are not included in the analysis.	Describe:
Limited Challenge	Patients with a specific condition known to	YES NO
Bias	adversely affect the way the index test works are	Describe:
	excluded (eg. difficult to diagnose patients excluded).	
C	1	Ji

Statistics: count each patient only once i.e. if 1 patient examined more than once, use first exam(iner) only, or report separate for each exam(iner) if available. If only median (IQR) (range) reported among examiners, then cannot create the cross-tabulation table, but can report the reported statistics by median (IQR) (range).

Fill the next page out for

- a) each index test used (if more than one was used in the study), and
- b) each subgroup reported separately (eg. Individual raters; type of delirium [hyperactive, hypoactive, mixed]; type of participant (eg. Sepsis, Trauma, etc); center (if multicenter study)
- c) any sensitivity analysis reported (eg. Including valid inconclusive results considered with positive or negative index test)

This table and results are for: overall study / subgroup [describe:]/						
sensitivity and	alysis [describe:					
	REFERENCE TEST			Totals		
			-12			
		+ for Delir	ium	- for Delirium		
	. C. D. II I			,		
	+ for Delirium	a=		b=		
INDEX TECT						
INDEX TEST	- for Delirium	c=		d=		
(Name:	- 101 Deni iuni	C-		u-		
	To a serial serial					
	Inconclusive					
	(Uninterpretable) Totals					
	Totals				е	
Was this cross-	tabulation reported in	the paper?	Yes	No		
Sensitivity (The	e proportion of patient	ts with	Men	tioned in paper:		
	s on the reference test			CI in paper:		
also positive or	the index test)= $a/(a-$	+c)	Calc	ulated from cross t	abulation:	
Specificity (The	e proportion of patient	s with	Mentioned in paper:			
	s on the reference test			CI in paper:		
1	n the index test) = $d/(1$			ulated from cross t		
	, , ,	,				
Positive Predictive Value = a/(a+b)				tioned in paper:		
				CI in paper:		
	The second secon		+	ulated from cross t		
Negative Predi	ctive Value = d/(c+d)			tioned in paper:		
				CI in paper:		
D ''' 11 11	1 11 11 11 11 11	1.64	V2000 VVV	ulated from cross t		
Positive Likelihood ratio = sensitivity / (1 - specificity). If a cell is 0, use 0.5 added to each				tioned in paper:		
cell in table to		a to each	1	CI in paper:		
	hood ratio = (1 – sensi	tivrity) /		ulated from cross t		
	cell is 0, use 0.5 added		Mentioned in paper: or no			
cell in table to		to each	1	ulated from cross t		
	id inconclusive results	what was	Gaic	%	abulation	
				70		
the index test yield = % of patients included in the sensitivity and specificity calculations.						
	id inconclusive results:			%		100
the index test e	effectiveness = correct					
classification/t	otal tests done = (a+d)	/e.				
	id inconclusive results		Sens	itivity:		
the sensitivity	and specificity if the re	sults are		cificity:		
	ositive index test resu					
If there are valid inconclusive results: what was		1	itivity:			
the sensitivity and specificity if the results are		Spec	cificity:			
grouped with negative index test results.						

QUADAS-2 Quality Criteria			
Patient Selection [3 signaling question, 1 risk o	f bias qu	uestion	1 applicability
question]			
Was a consecutive or random sample of patients enrolled?	YES	NO	UNCLEAR
Was a case-control design avoided?	YES	NO	UNCLEAR
Did the study avoid inappropriate exclusions?	YES	NO	UNCLEAR
Could the selection of patients have introduced bias?	High	Low	UNCLEAR
Are there concerns that the included patients do not match the review question?	High	Low	UNCLEAR
Index Test [2 signaling question, 1 risk of bias of	question	1, 1 app	licability question]
Were the index test results interpreted without	YES	NO	UNCLEAR
knowledge of the results of the reference standard?			
If a threshold was used, was it pre-specified?	YES	NO	UNCLEAR
Could the conduct or interpretation of the index test have introduced bias?	High	Low	UNCLEAR
Are there concerns that the index test, its conduct, or interpretation differ from the review question?	High	Low	UNCLEAR
Reference Standard [2 signaling question, 1 ris	k of bias	s, 1 app	licability]
	Typa		
Is the reference standard likely to correctly classify the target condition?	YES	NO	UNCLEAR
Were the reference standard results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the index test?	YES	NO	UNCLEAR
Could the reference standard, its conduct, or its interpretation have introduced bias?	High	Low	UNCLEAR
Are there concerns that the target condition as defined by the reference standard does not match the review question?	High	Low	UNCLEAR
Flow and Timing [4 signaling questions, 1 risk of	of bias]		
Was there an appropriate interval between index test(s) and reference standard?	YES	NO	UNCLEAR
Did all patients receive a reference standard?	YES	NO	UNCLEAR
Did all patients receive the same reference standard?	YES	NO	UNCLEAR
Were all patients included in the analysis?	YES	NO	UNCLEAR
Could the patient have introduced bias?	High	Low	UNCLEAR

Note:

- 1. Applicability ratings "do not include signaling questions. Review authors record the information on which the judgment of applicability is made and then rate their concern that the study does not match the review question. Concerns about applicability are rated as "low", "high", or "unclear."" " The "unclear" category should be used only when insufficient data are reported."
- 2. Applicability in patient selection category can refer to concerns about: severity of illness, demographic characteristics, differential diagnoses, co-morbidities, setting of study, or previous testing.

3. If applicability concerns rated high o Patient selection:	r unclear, please describe reasons here:
Index Test:	
Reference Standard:	
Reliability (of index test to differentiate patients with from those without delirium) = observer variability.	Inter-rater: Number of raters: Number of replicate observations: Method: intraclass correlation / Kappa statistic / other () Result:95% CI Intra-rater: Number of replicate observations: Method: intraclass correlation / Kappa statistic/ other () Result:95% CI
Agreement (proportion of index test scores that are identical within or between raters)	Neither Inter-rater: Proportion of Agreement: 95% CI: Other statistic: Intra-rater: Proportion of agreement: 95% CI: Other statistic: Neither

Name:	 	
Comments:		