

## 1 **Primary / Secondary Analysis**

### 4 **Analysis Plan**

6 The primary analysis was a hospital-level analysis. All hospitals had observations on the baseline  
7 period and on the intervention period. There are two types of outcome variables:

- 8 • those for which a patient can experience once, such as *Hospital Mortality* (binary)
- 9 • those for which a patient can experience more than once, such as *Clinical*  
10 *Deterioration Events* (count).

12 For each outcome a ‘numerator’ and a ‘denominator’ was identified. For a binary outcome, the  
13 numerator was the number of events in a hospital during a particular period (baseline or  
14 intervention), and the denominator was the number of discharges. For a count outcome the  
15 numerator was the number of events in a hospital during a particular period, and the denominator  
16 was the number of patient-days. See following table for variable and macro names.

18 Generalized estimating equations (GEE) methods were used to account for clustering by  
19 hospital, with an exchangeable correlation structure.

#### 21 **Binary outcomes:**

22 For a binary outcome, a GEE binomial model was used. There were two separate analyses, both  
23 using the number of events (x) and the number of discharges (n):

- 25 - a logit link was used, so that the log-odds of the outcome was modelled as a function of the  
26 predictors
- 27 - an identify link was used, so that the probability of the outcome was modelled as a function  
28 of the predictors

30 The predictor variables were:

- 32 (1) the treatment dummy indicator and
- 33 (2) the corresponding summary statistic (log odds or probability) for that hospital during  
34 the baseline period.

36 R code for GEE model of binary outcomes at the group level

```
37  
38 # load geepack library  
39 # n is the number of discharges at a hospital  
40 # x is the number of events at that hospital in the post-  
41 # randomization period  
42 # Hospital is the categorical variable indicating which hospital  
43 # the above numbers come from  
44 # logitBaseline logit of baseline probability for this hospital,
```

```

45 #   calculated with addition of 0.5 to numerator and 1 to
46 #   denominator if x = 0
47 # probBaseline baseline probability for this hospital,
48
49
50
51 #model for log-odds of outcome at the group level
52
53 GEEfit.OR <- geeglm(cbind(x, n-x)~Intervention + logitBaseline,
54                   id = Hospital,
55                   family = binomial,
56                   data=EPOCH,
57                   corstr = "exchangeable")
58
59
60 # model for probability of outcome at the group level
61
62 GEEfit.RD <- geeglm(cbind(x, n-x)~Intervention + probBaseline,
63                   id = Hospital,
64                   family =binomial(link=make.link("identity")),
65                   data=EPOCH,
66                   corstr = "exchangeable")
67
68
69 # model for probability of outcome at the individual level
70
71 # y = 1 for outcome, 0 for no outcome
72
73 GEEfit.RD <- geeglm(y~Intervention + probBaseline,
74                   id = Hospital,
75                   family =binomial(link=make.link("identity")),
76                   data=EPOCH,
77                   corstr = "exchangeable")
78
79

```

## 80 **Count outcomes:**

81

82 For a count outcome, a GEE Poisson model was used. There were two separate analyses, both  
83 using the number of events (x) and the number of patient-days (time):

84

- 85 - a log link was used, so that the log-rate was modelled as a function of the predictors
- 86 - an identify link was used, so that the rate was modelled as a function of the predictors

87

88 Both models included the number of patient days. With the log link, include log(patient days) as  
89 the offset. With the identity link, the code below shows how patient days were included

```

90
91 The predictor variables were
92     (1) the treatment dummy indicator and
93     (2) the corresponding summary statistic (log rate or rate) for that hospital during the
94     baseline period.
95 See following example R code for details.
96
97 # Modelling the log-rate
98 # N is the number of patient days in the post-randomization
99 #   period
100 # x is the number of events in the post-randomization period
101 # Hospital is the categorical variable indicating which hospital
102 #   the above numbers come from
103 # logBaseline is log of baseline rate for this hospital,
104 #   calculated with addition of 0.5 to numerator if x = 0
105 # Baseline is baseline rate for this hospital
106
107
108 geefit.RR <- geeglm(x ~offset(log(N)+Intervention + logBaseline,
109                       id = Hospital,
110                       family = poisson,
111                       data=EPOCH,
112                       corstr = "exchangeable"))
113
114 # The linear model needs this rearrangement of the data to
115 # incorporate the time at risk
116 # Nlin - its coefficient is the usual care intercept
117 # NlinG - its coefficient is the rate difference
118 # NlinB - its coefficient is the increase in the rate per unit
119 #   increase of the baseline rate
120
121 EPOCH$Nlin <- EPOCH$N/1000
122 EPOCH$GNlin <- EPOCH$N*(d$Group=="BedsidePEWS")
123 EPOCH$$BNlin <- EPOCH$N*(EPOCH$Baseline)
124
125 # modelling the rate
126
127 geefit.RD <- geeglm(x~Nlin+GNlin+BNlin-1,
128                   id = Hospital,
129                   family = poisson("identity"),
130                   data=EPOCH,
131                   corstr = "exchangeable"))
132
133 Continuous outcomes at the individual level:
134

```

135 The patient level continuous outcomes in Tables 2 and S4 were also modelled with a GEE, using  
136 a Gaussian model. Although the data are not normal at the individual level, the large sample size  
137 and the robustness of GEE implies that comparisons of means are largely unaffected by this non-  
138 normality.

139

140 For an individual-level outcome, these models all had the same structure

141

```
142 # y is a continuous outcome for a patient  
143 # Hospital is the hospital the patient is in  
144 # x0 is the mean value at baseline for the hospital a  
145 # patient is in
```

146

```
147 geefit.RR <- geeglm(x ~ Intervention + x0,  
148                     id = Hospital,  
149                     data=EPOCH,  
150                     corstr = "exchangeable")
```

151

152

### 153 **Sensitivity to model choice**

154

155 As the results of the analysis of cluster RCTs can vary somewhat with the method of analysis,  
156 models for odds ratios, probabilities, and rate ratios were also run using several other approaches  
157

158 Logit and log-rate models

159

160

161

162

163

164

165

166

167

168

169

170

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

- GEE on only post-intervention values
- Generalized linear mixed effects regression model (GLMER) on only post-intervention values
- GEE with both pre and post values as outcomes, estimating interaction between time and intervention
- GLMER with both pre and post values as outcomes, estimating interaction between time and intervention
- GEE on post-intervention values with baseline value as a covariate
- Generalized linear mixed effects regression model (GLMER) on post-intervention values with baseline value as a covariate
- Weighted linear model (weight = 1/(variance of logit) or weight = 1/variance (log-rate))) for logits (or log-rates), with baseline logit (or log-rate) as covariate.
- Quasibinomial logistic or Poisson regression (which allows for more variance than the binomial or Poisson) on post-data, with baseline logit (or log rate) as covariate

174 Models for probability or rate

- GEE on only post-intervention values (binomial or Poisson variance, identity link)
- GEE with both pre and post values as outcomes, estimating interaction between time and intervention (binomial or Poisson variance, identity link)

- GEE on post-intervention values with baseline value as a covariate (binomial or Poisson variance, identity link)
- Weighted linear model for post-probabilities (weight=1/(variance probability) or 1/(variance weight)), with baseline probability or rate as covariate
- Quasibinomial regression (which allows for more variance than the binomial or Poisson) on post-data, with baseline probability as covariate (binomial or Poisson variance, identity link)

**Shell Tables**

Continuous outcomes

|                                |   |   |         |
|--------------------------------|---|---|---------|
| Resuscitation Team Calls       | $B_{rt}/B_{PatientDays}$                  | $P_{rt}/P_{PatientDays}$                  | Poisson |
| Stat Calls                     | $B_{sc}/B_{PatientDays}$                  | $P_{sc}/P_{PatientDays}$                  | Poisson |
| Urgent ICU Consultations       | $B_{rr}/B_{PatientDays}$                  | $P_{rr}/P_{PatientDays}$                  | Poisson |
| Urgent ICU Admissions          | $B_{uicu}/B_{PatientDays}$                | $P_{uicu}/P_{PatientDays}$                | Poisson |
| Unplanned ICU Readmissions     | $B_{icur}/$<br>$B_{PatientDischargesICU}$ | $P_{icur}/$<br>$P_{PatientDischargesICU}$ | Poisson |
| Unplanned Hospital Readmission | $B_{hr}/$<br>$B_{PatientDischarges}$      | $P_{hr}/$<br>$P_{PatientDischarges}$      | Poisson |

189

190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202

**Subgroup Analysis Plan**

Two subgroup analyses are planned using the same methodology described in the previous section. In the first, ECMO, the hospitals will be divided into two groups: those that have ECMO service and those who do not. In the second, MET, the hospitals will be divided into two groups: those that have MET service and those who do not.

For each subgroup analysis, the treatment effect (BedsidePEWS vs. usual care) will be estimated in each group of hospitals and the presence of a subgroup effect will be assessed in a single GEE model with a one-term treatment by subgroup interaction term.

203 **ICU Analysis**

204

205

206 **Analysis Plan**

207

208 This was a patient-level analysis that followed the same general procedures as outlined above.  
209 However, the data has a record for each admission to the ICU, and a patient may have more than  
210 one admission; the table below shows how these were handled. Furthermore, a few patients had  
211 admissions to the same ICU in both study periods; these patients were eliminated from this  
212 analysis. The analysis was done with one record per patient as described in the table below.  
213

| <b>Outcome</b>   | <b>Description of the per patient outcome variable</b>   |
|--|--|
| Total length of stay   | The sum over admissions of the lengths of stay   |
| Average length of stay   | The average over admissions of the lengths of stay   |
| PIM at admission   | The average over admissions of the PIM at admission  |
| PIM II Prediction Mortality (/1000 urgent ICU discharges) (inverse-logit of <i>PIM</i> ) | The average probability over admissions of the PIM II predicted mortality  |
| Ventilation Free Days  | The days free of ventilation for the first admission   |
| Days of technology use   | Sum of all days over all admissions of mechanical ventilation days, nitric oxide days, ECMO days and dialysis days |
| Use of a technology (HFOV, ECMO, NO, Dialysis, MV)                                       | Binary indicator of whether the technology was used on any of the days in the ICU.                                 |
| 24-hour PELOD  | The average over admissions of the PELOD score for the first 24 hours  |
| PELOD ICU Stay   | The average over admissions of the PELOD score for the entire admission  |

214