

1 **Abstract**

2

3 Background: National Early Warning Score (NEWS) is increasingly used in UK  
4 hospitals. However, there is only limited evidence to support the use of pre-hospital  
5 early warning scores. We hypothesised that pre-hospital NEWS was associated with  
6 death or critical care escalation within the first 48 hours of hospital stay.

7

8 Methods: Planned secondary analysis of a prospective cohort study at a single UK  
9 teaching hospital. Consecutive medical ward admissions over a 20-day period were  
10 included in the study. Data were collected from ambulance report forms, medical  
11 notes and electronic patient records. Pre-hospital NEWS was calculated  
12 retrospectively. The primary outcome was a composite of death or critical care unit  
13 escalation within 48 hours of hospital admission. The secondary outcome was length  
14 of hospital stay.

15

16 Results: 189 patients were included in the analysis. The median pre-hospital NEWS  
17 was 3 (IQR 1-5). 13 patients (6.9%) died or were escalated to the critical care unit  
18 within 48 hours of hospital admission. Pre-hospital NEWS was associated with death  
19 or critical care unit escalation (OR, 1.25; 95% CI, 1.04-1.51; p=0.02), but NEWS on  
20 admission to hospital was more strongly associated with this outcome (OR, 1.52; 95%  
21 CI, 1.18-1.97, p<0.01). Neither was associated with hospital length of stay.

22

23 Conclusion: Pre-hospital NEWS was associated with death or critical care unit  
24 escalation within 48 hours of hospital admission. NEWS could be used by ambulance  
25 crews to assist in the early triage of patients requiring hospital treatment or rapid

26 transport. Further cohort studies or trials in large samples are required before  
 27 implementation.

28

29 **INTRODUCTION**

30 Early warning scores or rapid response systems are commonplace in UK hospitals.[1]  
 31 They assign weighting to routine clinical measurements and are used to detect  
 32 patients in need of clinical review or resuscitation.[2] The National Early Warning  
 33 Score (NEWS), developed by the Royal College of Physicians, is designed to  
 34 standardise and replace the multiple existing early warning previously used in UK  
 35 hospitals (table 1).[3] NEWS is associated with clinical outcome, including hospital  
 36 mortality and intensive care unit admission.[4-8] However, early warning scores are  
 37 not widely used in the pre-hospital setting, reflecting the limited current evidence  
 38 available to support their use.

*Table 1.*

| National Early Warning Score (NEWS) |       |        |           |           |           |         |         |
|-------------------------------------|-------|--------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|
|                                     | 3     | 2      | 1         | 0         | 1         | 2       | 3       |
| Temperature (°C)                    | <35.0 |        | 35.1-36.0 | 36.1-38.0 | 38.1-39.0 | >39.0   |         |
| Heart rate (beats/min)              | <41   |        | 41-50     | 51-90     | 91-110    | 111-130 | >130    |
| Systolic BP (mmHg)                  | <91   | 91-100 | 101-110   | 111-219   |           |         | >219    |
| Respiratory Rate (breaths/min)      | <9    |        | 9-11      | 12-20     |           | 21-24   | >25     |
| Oxygen Saturation (%)               | <92   | 92-93  | 94-95     | >96       |           |         |         |
| Supplemental oxygen                 |       | Yes    |           | No        |           |         |         |
| CNS response (AVPU)                 |       |        |           | A         |           |         | V, P, U |

Each category is graded 0-3. Scores for each category are added together to give a total. Composite scores of greater than 5 (or 3 in any one parameter) trigger an urgent medical review. A score of over 7 triggers a review by a critical care outreach team or medical response team. [3, 4, 11]

39

40 Only two studies have evaluated pre-hospital early warning scores. A retrospective  
 41 review of patients admitted to a single emergency department by ambulance found  
 42 that modified early warning score (MEWS) – a similar scoring system that pre-dates  
 43 NEWS - was more sensitive than clinician judgement for identifying critical illness in  
 44 the community. [9] A prospective cohort study of patients with medical and trauma

45 presentations admitted to a single hospital by ambulance found that NEWS was  
46 associated with intensive care unit admission and mortality.[10] However, it is  
47 unclear whether these results are generalisable to other populations with different  
48 demographics and case mixes. In addition, it is unclear whether a pre-hospital early  
49 warning score could be used by hospital staff for inpatient risk stratification.  
50 Therefore the importance of ambulance early warning scores to both ambulance crews  
51 and hospital physicians remains uncertain.

52

53 We hypothesise that NEWS derived from pre-hospital observations is associated with  
54 critical care unit escalation or death within 48 hours of hospital admission. We further  
55 hypothesise that NEWS derived from pre-hospital observations is more strongly  
56 associated with the outcome measure than NEWS on admission to hospital.

57

58

59 **METHOD**

60 **Study design**

61 This was a planned secondary analysis of data from an observational cohort study of  
62 adult patients admitted to a single hospital with acute medical presentations.[4 11]  
63 The methods and results of the main study have been published previously.[4 11] All  
64 new adult medical admissions to the Acute Assessment Unit (AAU) at the Royal  
65 London Hospital between 25<sup>th</sup> March and 13<sup>th</sup> April 2013 that were brought to  
66 hospital by ambulance were included in this analysis. Patients admitted directly to the  
67 critical care unit from the emergency department were not included. The National  
68 Research Ethics Service prospectively reviewed and approved this study  
69 (12/LO/1985). The study was registered retrospectively with Research Registry (UIN:  
70 researchregistry3194). We report the results of this analysis in accordance with the  
71 SRTOBE/STROCCS reporting statements.[12, 13]

72

73 **Data collection**

74 The exposures of interest were NEWS calculated from physiological observations  
75 obtained by ambulance staff before hospital admission, and NEWS derived from  
76 similar observations on admission to hospital. Researchers prospectively collected  
77 physiological measurements that were recorded by nurses or healthcare assistants at  
78 the point of admission to the Acute Assessment Unit. Researchers retrospectively  
79 reviewed ambulance service patient report forms for these patients and recorded the  
80 first set of observations measured by the ambulance crew. Data were considered  
81 missing if there were no observations recorded on the ambulance patient report form  
82 or if there were no observations recorded on the bedside observation chart within 24  
83 hours of admission to hospital. Researchers recorded data on paper data collection

84 forms and transferred this to an electronic database. The database was independently  
85 checked for accuracy. The outcome measures were determined by checking patient  
86 notes, electronic patient records and discharge summaries. We calculated NEWS  
87 retrospectively using Microsoft Excel (Microsoft Inc., Redmond WA).[4 11]

88

### 89 **Outcome measures**

90 The primary outcome measure was a composite of critical care unit escalation and  
91 death within 48 hours of admission to hospital.[4 11] At this centre, critical care  
92 consists of level three care (renal replacement therapy, advanced respiratory support  
93 or multi-organ support,) and level two care ('step down' from a higher level of care,  
94 single organ support, high frequency nursing care or invasive monitoring). This  
95 primary outcome definition has been used in previous studies and will identify all  
96 instances of in-hospital cardiac arrest at our institution.[4-6 11 14] The secondary  
97 outcome measure was length of hospital stay.[4 11]

98

### 99 **Statistical analysis**

100 Data were analysed using SPSS version 21 (IBM, Armonk, NY). Data were stratified  
101 according to the presence or absence of ambulance data. Missing data were handled  
102 by list-wise deletion. In order to test for association between NEWS and the primary  
103 outcome measure, multivariable logistic regression models were constructed and  
104 adjusted for age and gender - a strategy consistent with previous similar research.[5 6]  
105 NEWS was firstly considered as a continuous variable. Odds ratios derived from pre-  
106 hospital observations (pre-hospital NEWS) and for admission observations  
107 (admission NEWS) were calculated and compared. Secondly, NEWS was considered  
108 as a categorical variable, with the sample divided according to the recommended risk

109 groups (NEWS 1-4, 5-6, >7) and the analysis repeated. [15] Thirdly, the correlation  
110 between pre-hospital NEWS and admission NEWS was assessed using the Pearson  
111 product-moment correlation coefficient. Finally, to test for association between  
112 NEWS and the secondary outcome measure (length of hospital stay), a linear  
113 regression model was constructed, where length of stay was considered a continuous  
114 variable. The  $r^2$  values for pre-hospital NEWS with admission NEWS were compared.

115

## 116 **RESULTS**

117 453 adult medical patients were admitted during the study period, of which 258 were  
118 brought to hospital by ambulance. After excluding cases with missing data, 189 cases  
119 were included in the primary analysis and 180 were included in the secondary  
120 analysis (figure 1). The mean age of the entire cohort was 61 (sd. 22) years, compared  
121 to 67 (sd. 21) years for patients admitted by ambulance. There was no difference in  
122 the gender distribution for patients admitted by ambulance, compared to entire cohort.  
123 13 patients (6.9%) admitted by ambulance died or were escalated to the critical care  
124 unit within 48 hours. The median length of stay for patients admitted by ambulance  
125 was 4 (IQR 2-8) days. Baseline characteristics are provided in table 2.

126

127 Multivariable logistic regression analysis was used to test for the association between  
128 NEWS and the primary outcome measure. When considered as a continuous variable,  
129 pre-hospital NEWS and admission NEWS were both associated with the primary  
130 outcome measure (OR, 1.25; 95% CI, 1.04-1.51;  $p=0.02$  and OR, 1.52; 95% CI, 1.18-  
131 1.97,  $p<0.01$  respectively) (table 3). When considered as a categorical variable, pre-  
132 hospital NEWS and admission NEWS were both associated with the primary outcome  
133 measure (table 4).

134 We identified a moderate correlation between pre-hospital NEWS and admission  
 135 NEWS ( $r=0.44$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). Pre-hospital NEWS differed from admission NEWS in 33  
 136 cases (17.4%), of which 7 cases (21.2%) had a greater admission NEWS and 26 cases  
 137 (78.8%) had a greater pre-hospital NEWS. Neither pre-hospital nor admission NEWS  
 138 were associated with hospital length of stay ( $r^2=5.1\%$ ,  $p=0.48$  and  $r^2=5.2\%$ ,  $p=0.92$   
 139 respectively).

140 *Table 2. Baseline characteristics and diagnosis groups*

|                                     | Whole cohort | Admitted by ambulance |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|-----------------------|
| Sample size (n)                     | 453          | 258                   |
| Age in years (sd)                   | 60.9 (22.4)  | 67.4 (20.5)           |
| Female (%)                          | 242 (53.5)   | 138 (53.5)            |
| Admission NEWS (IQR)                | 2 (1-3)      | 2 (1-3)               |
| Ambulance NEWS (IQR)                | -            | 3 (1-5)               |
| <u>Post-take Diagnosis Category</u> |              |                       |
| <i>General Medical</i>              | 114 (25.2)   | 70 (27.1)             |
| <i>Respiratory</i>                  | 71 (15.7)    | 47 (18.2)             |
| <i>Health Care of the Elderly</i>   | 54 (11.9)    | 52 (20.1)             |
| <i>Cardiology</i>                   | 54 (11.9)    | 25 (9.7)              |
| <i>Gastroenterology</i>             | 35 (7.7)     | 14 (5.4)              |
| <i>Neurological</i>                 | 30 (6.6)     | 14 (5.4)              |
| <i>Haematology</i>                  | 30 (6.6)     | 11 (4.3)              |
| <i>Endocrinology</i>                | 16 (3.5)     | 8 (3.1)               |
| <i>Psychiatry</i>                   | 13 (2.9)     | 6 (2.3)               |
| <i>Oncology</i>                     | 12 (2.7)     | 6 (2.3)               |
| <i>Surgery</i>                      | 10 (2.2)     | 1 (0.4)               |
| <i>Rheumatology</i>                 | 5 (1.1)      | 1 (0.4)               |
| <i>Nephrology</i>                   | 4 (0.9)      | 1 (0.4)               |
| <i>Infection &amp; Immunology</i>   | 3 (0.7)      | 1 (0.4)               |
| <i>Other</i>                        | 2 (0.4)      | 1 (0.4)               |

Values are presented as n (%) unless otherwise stated. Age is presented as mean (sd) and NEWS is presented as median (IQR)

141

*Table 3.*

Association of pre-hospital NEWS and admission NEWS with critical care unit escalation or death within 48 hours of hospital admission.

|                   | Odds Ratio        | p-value |
|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| Pre-hospital NEWS | 1.25 (1.04-1.51)  | 0.02    |
| Age               | 1.01 (0.97-1.05)  | 0.60    |
| Gender            | 3.98 (1.02-15.55) | 0.05    |
| Admission NEWS    | 1.52 (1.18-1.97)  | <0.01   |
| Age               | 1.00 (0.96-1.04)  | 0.97    |
| Gender            | 5.37 (1.07-26.88) | 0.04    |

Multivariable logistic regression analysis with adjustment for age and gender. Presented as odds ratios with 95% confidence intervals.

143

144

145

146

147

*Table 4.*

Association of pre-hospital NEWS and admission NEWS (categorical variables) with critical care unit escalation or death within 48 hours of hospital admission.

|                          | Odds Ratio | p-value |
|--------------------------|------------|---------|
| <b>Pre-hospital NEWS</b> |            |         |
| NEWS 0-4 (reference)     | -          | -       |
| NEWS 5-6                 | 2.95       | 0.23    |
| NEWS $\geq 7$            | 4.45       | 0.03    |
| Age                      | 1.01       | 0.64    |
| Gender                   | 4.27       | 0.04    |
| <b>Admission NEWS</b>    |            |         |
| NEWS 0-4 (reference)     | -          | -       |
| NEWS 5-6                 | 4.02       | 0.08    |
| NEWS $\geq 7$            | 8.70       | 0.01    |
| Age                      | 1.01       | 0.70    |
| Gender                   | 3.61       | 0.07    |

Multivariable logistic regression analysis with adjustment for age and gender. Reference = reference category.

148

149

150

151

152 **DISCUSSION**

153

154 The main finding of this analysis is that NEWS derived from pre-hospital  
155 observations is associated with critical care unit escalation or death within 48 hours of  
156 hospital admission. But, NEWS derived from observations taken on admission to the  
157 medical ward were more strongly associated with critical care unit escalation or death  
158 within 48 hours of hospital admission, compared to NEWS derived from pre-hospital  
159 observations. This study identified a moderate correlation between ambulance NEWS  
160 and admission NEWS – in 83% of cases NEWS at both time points was the same.  
161 Where the scores were different, ambulance NEWS was greater in the majority of  
162 cases suggesting an improvement in clinical condition between pre-hospital  
163 assessment and medical ward admission. However, the variability in measurement  
164 techniques, equipment or clinical practice must be considered when interpreting these  
165 results. Patients with a pre-hospital NEWS of 7 or more had a four-fold increase in  
166 the odds of death or critical care unit admission compared to patients with a pre-  
167 hospital NEWS of 4 or less. Pre-hospital NEWS was not associated with hospital  
168 length of stay; this is consistent with our previous findings.[4]

169

170 Our results are similar to other published work in this area. A recent single-centre  
171 observational study identified association between NEWS calculated using ambulance  
172 data and both intensive care unit admission and mortality within 48 hours of hospital  
173 admission.[10] Other authors found that another early warning score (MEWS), when  
174 calculated using ambulance data, was associated with in-hospital adverse  
175 outcomes.[9] Our results suggest that pre-hospital NEWS may be a useful tool in  
176 guiding patient management by ambulance crews. This supports a small but growing  
177 body of evidence advocating the use of pre-hospital early warning scores. However,

178 their uptake by emergency medical services is reportedly slow.[10] Some authors  
179 have suggested using early warning scores to help trigger a blue-light transfer to  
180 hospital, much like the urgent clinical review triggered by an in-hospital NEWS of  
181 five or more.[9] Our results suggest that pre-hospital NEWS  $\geq 7$  would be an  
182 appropriate threshold for this. NEWS could be incorporated into the patient report  
183 forms used by emergency medical services, which would be akin to the bedside  
184 observation charts used in many hospitals. In addition, further consideration should be  
185 given to whether NEWS can be used all patient groups, since some studies suggest  
186 that population specific early warning scores should be used in hospital, for example  
187 PEWS in paediatric patients, MEOWS in obstetric patients and CREWS in patients  
188 with COPD.[16 17 18] From the point of view of the hospital physician, our results  
189 suggest that pre-hospital NEWS is not a better marker of clinical status compared to  
190 NEWS calculated on admission to hospital. Thus, whilst our results demonstrate the  
191 efficacy of pre-hospital NEWS, we are cautious in drawing conclusions regarding its  
192 effectiveness in the real clinical environment. We acknowledge that this is a single-  
193 centre study, so our results may not be generalisable to other clinical settings.

194

195 A strength of our analysis is that our sample represents a broad spectrum of medical  
196 specialities (table 2), but unlike other research in this field, it excluded patients  
197 suffering traumatic injury.[10] Inpatient data, including admission NEWS, were  
198 collected prospectively. However, for logistical reasons we were only able to collect  
199 the ambulance data in retrospect. At the time the study was conducted NEWS was not  
200 routinely used at our institution, which necessitated retrospective calculation of  
201 NEWS. This approach avoids observer error associated with early warning score

202 calculation, which has been previously reported with a frequency of 18-27%. [4 17  
203 20]

204

205 This analysis has a number of limitations. Our sample size was 258, but we were only  
206 able to include 189 cases in the primary analysis due to a higher than expected rate of  
207 missing data from the ambulance patient report forms. While our sample is a similar  
208 size to other studies of early warning scores, the missing data could represent a source  
209 of selection bias.[9 10 17 21] In order to minimise this potential source of bias, future  
210 studies should implement strategies to minimise missing data from ambulance report  
211 forms. We used a composite outcome measure of critical care admission or death  
212 within two days of hospital admission, which has been used in similar studies.[5 6 14]  
213 Our definition of critical care was based on the Intensive Care Society description,  
214 including level two and three care.[22] This reflects the organisation at our institution  
215 and may be different to other hospitals. We excluded patients who were admitted to  
216 the critical care unit directly from the emergency department, since this was a study of  
217 adult medical patients who, due to the limits of our ethics approval, were included in  
218 the study after admission to a medical ward. This could affect the event rate.  
219 However, in our sample 6.9% of patients reached the primary outcome, which is  
220 similar to other studies of this type.[9 23] Our statistical methods are appropriate to  
221 the sample size. The sample includes a small number of patients receiving palliative  
222 care. We ran a sensitivity analysis that excluded these cases and the results were very  
223 similar.

224

225

226

227 **CONCLUSION**

228 Pre-hospital NEWS is associated with death or critical care unit escalation within 48  
229 hours of hospital admission. However, admission NEWS is more strongly associated  
230 with outcome, which may represent patients who fail to improve despite treatment by  
231 the ambulance crew. Pre-hospital care may represent an important and useful  
232 extension of NEWS. However, evidence from large multi-centre studies is needed  
233 before implementing a pre-hospital version of NEWS.

234

235

236

237 **REFERENCES**

238

- 239 1. Patterson C, Maclean F, Bell C, et al. Early warning systems in the UK: variation in  
240 content and implementation strategy has implications for a NHS early warning  
241 system. *Clinical medicine* 2011;**11**(5):424-7
- 242 2. McGinley A, Pearse RM. A national early warning score for acutely ill patients.  
243 *Bmj* 2012;**345**:e5310 doi: 10.1136/bmj.e5310[published Online First: Epub  
244 Date]].
- 245 3. Jones M. NEWSDIG: The National Early Warning Score Development and  
246 Implementation Group. *Clinical medicine* 2012;**12**(6):501-3
- 247 4. Abbott TE, Vaid N, Ip D, et al. A single-centre observational cohort study of  
248 admission National Early Warning Score (NEWS). *Resuscitation* 2015;**92**:89-  
249 93 doi: 10.1016/j.resuscitation.2015.04.020[published Online First: Epub  
250 Date]].
- 251 5. Cooksley T, Kitlowski E, Haji-Michael P. Effectiveness of Modified Early  
252 Warning Score in predicting outcomes in oncology patients. *QJM : monthly  
253 journal of the Association of Physicians* 2012;**105**(11):1083-8 doi:  
254 10.1093/qjmed/hcs138[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 255 6. Corfield AR, Lees F, Zealley I, et al. Utility of a single early warning score in  
256 patients with sepsis in the emergency department. *Emergency medicine  
257 journal : EMJ* 2014;**31**(6):482-7 doi: 10.1136/emered-2012-  
258 202186[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 259 7. Romero-Brufau S, Huddleston JM, Naessens JM, et al. Widely used track and  
260 trigger scores: are they ready for automation in practice? *Resuscitation*  
261 2014;**85**(4):549-52 doi: 10.1016/j.resuscitation.2013.12.017[published Online  
262 First: Epub Date]].
- 263 8. Smith GB, Prytherch DR, Meredith P, et al. The ability of the National Early  
264 Warning Score (NEWS) to discriminate patients at risk of early cardiac arrest,  
265 unanticipated intensive care unit admission, and death. *Resuscitation*  
266 2013;**84**(4):465-70 doi: 10.1016/j.resuscitation.2012.12.016[published Online  
267 First: Epub Date]].
- 268 9. Fullerton JN, Price CL, Silvey NE, et al. Is the Modified Early Warning Score  
269 (MEWS) superior to clinician judgement in detecting critical illness in the pre-  
270 hospital environment? *Resuscitation* 2012;**83**(5):557-62 doi:  
271 10.1016/j.resuscitation.2012.01.004[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 272 10. Silcock DJ, Corfield AR, Gowens PA, et al. Validation of the National Early  
273 Warning Score in the prehospital setting. *Resuscitation* 2015;**89**:31-5 doi:  
274 10.1016/j.resuscitation.2014.12.029[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 275 11. Abbott TE, Torrance HD, Cron N, et al. A single-centre cohort study of National  
276 Early Warning Score (NEWS) and near patient testing in acute medical  
277 admissions. *European journal of internal medicine* 2016; **35**: 78-82. doi:  
278 10.1016/j.ejim.2016.06.014.
- 279 12. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, et al. The Strengthening the Reporting of  
280 Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for  
281 reporting observational studies. *Lancet* 2007; 370 (9596): 1453-7.
- 282 13. Agha RA, Borrelli MR, Vella-Baldacchino M, Thavayogan R and Orgill DP, for  
283 the STROCSS Group. The STROCSS Statement: Strengthening the  
284 Reporting of Cohort Studies in Surgery. *International Journal of Surgery*  
285 2017;**46**:198-202.

- 286 14. Peris A, Zagli G, Maccarrone N, et al. The use of Modified Early Warning Score  
287 may help anesthetists in postoperative level of care selection in emergency  
288 abdominal surgery. *Minerva anesthesiologica* 2012;**78**(9):1034-8
- 289 15. The Royal College of Physicians. National Early Warning Score (NEWS):  
290 Standardising the assessment of acute- illness severity in the NHS. Report of a  
291 working party. London, 2012.
- 292 16. Miranda JOF, Carmargo CL, Nascimento CLS, et al. Accuracy of a pediatric early  
293 warning score in the recognition of clinical deterioration. *Rev Lat Am*  
294 *Enfermagem* 2017; **10**;25:e2912.
- 295 17. Eccles SR, Subbe C, Hancock D, et al. CREWS: improving specificity whilst  
296 maintaining sensitivity of the National Early Warning Score in patients with  
297 chronic hypoxaemia. *Resuscitation* 2014;**85**(1):109-11 doi:  
298 10.1016/j.resuscitation.2013.08.277[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 299 18. Singh S, McGlennan A, England A, et al. A validation study of the CEMACH  
300 recommended modified early obstetric warning system (MEOWS).  
301 *Anaesthesia* 2012; **67**(1); 12-8.
- 302 19. Kolic I, Crane S, McCartney S, et al. Factors affecting response to National Early  
303 Warning Score (NEWS). *Resuscitation* 2015 doi:  
304 10.1016/j.resuscitation.2015.02.009[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 305 20. Subbe CP, Gao H, Harrison DA. Reproducibility of physiological track-and-  
306 trigger warning systems for identifying at-risk patients on the ward. *Intensive*  
307 *care medicine* 2007;**33**(4):619-24 doi: 10.1007/s00134-006-0516-8[published  
308 Online First: Epub Date]].
- 309 21. Jo S, Lee JB, Jin YH, et al. Modified early warning score with rapid lactate level  
310 in critically ill medical patients: the ViEWS-L score. *Emergency medicine*  
311 *journal : EMJ* 2013;**30**(2):123-9 doi: 10.1136/emered-2011-  
312 200760[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 313 22. Intensive Care Society. Levels of Critical Care for Adult Patients. 2009
- 314 23. Tirkkonen J, Olkkola KT, Huhtala H, et al. Medical emergency team activation:  
315 performance of conventional dichotomised criteria versus national early  
316 warning score. *Acta anaesthesiologica Scandinavica* 2014;**58**(4):411-9 doi:  
317 10.1111/aas.12277[published Online First: Epub Date]].

318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327

## COMPETING INTERESTS

None declared.