

BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email info.bmjopen@bmj.com

BMJ Open

Characterising Variation in Composition and Activation Criteria of Rapid Response and Cardiac Arrest Teams: A Survey of Medicare Participating Hospitals in Five American States

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-024548
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	01-Jun-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Mitchell, Oscar; New York University School of Medicine, Motschwiller, Caroline; New York University School of Medicine Horowitz, James; New York University School of Medicine Evans, Laura; New York University School of Medicine Mukherjee, Vikramjit; New York University School of Medicine
Keywords:	Adult intensive & critical care < ANAESTHETICS, EPIDEMIOLOGY, Adult intensive & critical care < INTENSIVE & CRITICAL CARE

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Peer Review Only

1
2
3 **Characterising Variation in Composition and Activation Criteria of Rapid Response and**
4
5 **Cardiac Arrest Teams:**
6

7
8 **A Survey of Medicare Participating Hospitals in Five American States**
9

10 **Authors:**

11
12 Oscar J.L. Mitchell, New York School of Medicine, Department of Internal Medicine, 550 1st
13 Avenue, New York, New York, 10016, United States of America
14

15
16 Caroline W. Motschwiller, New York School of Medicine, Department of Internal Medicine, 550
17 1st Avenue, New York, New York, 10016, United States of America
18

19
20 James M. Horowitz, New York School of Medicine, Division of Pulmonary, Critical Care, and
21 Sleep Medicine, 550 1st Avenue, New York, New York, 10016, United States of America
22

23
24 Laura E. Evans, Associate Professor, New York School of Medicine, Medical Director of
25 Critical Care, Bellevue Hospital, 462 1st Avenue, New York, New York, 10016, United States of
26 America

27
28 Vikramjit Mukherjee, Assistant Professor, New York School of Medicine, Division of
29 Pulmonary, Critical Care, and Sleep Medicine, 462 1st Avenue, New York, New York, 10016,
30 United States of America
31

32 **Corresponding Author:**

33 Oscar J.L. Mitchell
34 New York School of Medicine
35 Department of Internal Medicine
36 550 1st Avenue
37 New York, New York, 10016
38 United States of America
39

40
41 Email: oscarmitchell@nyumc.org
42

43 **Conflicts of Interest:** None
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract

Objectives:

To characterise the variation in composition, leadership, and activation criteria of rapid response and cardiac arrest teams in five north-eastern states of the United States of America.

Design:

Voluntary 50 question survey of acute care hospitals in north-eastern USA.

Setting:

Acute care hospitals in New York, New Jersey, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Pennsylvania.

Participants:

Out of 378 hospitals, contacts were identified for 303, and 107 surveys were completed.

Results:

Out of 378 hospitals, contacts were identified for 303, and 107 surveys were completed. All but two hospitals had an RRT, 70% of which changed members daily. The most common activation criteria were clinical concern (95%), single vital sign abnormalities (77%), and Early Warning Score (59%). 81% of hospitals had a dedicated cardiac arrest team.

RRT composition varied widely, with respiratory therapists, critical care nurses, physicians and nurse managers being the most likely to attend (89%, 78%, 64%, and 51% respectively). Consistent presence of critical care physicians was uncommon and both cardiac arrest teams and teams were frequently led by trainee physicians, often without senior supervision.

Trial Registration:

The study was approved by the New York University School of Medicine's Institutional Review Board.

Conclusions:

As the largest study to date in the USA, we have demonstrated wide heterogeneity, rapid team turnover, and a lack of senior supervision of RRT and cardiac arrest teams. These factors likely contribute to the mixed results seen in studies of RRTs.

1
2
3 **Article Summary:**
4

5 ***Strengths and Limitations:***
6

- 7
- 8 - This is the largest study of its kind and the only study of RRT and cardiac arrest team
 - 9 composition in the USA
 - 10 - Gives an understanding of the characterisation of RRT and cardiac arrest team structure
 - 11 and function
 - 12 - Only represents Medicare participating hospitals in five states
 - 13 - The 35% response rate further limits study
 - 14

15
16 **Funding:**
17

18 This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or
19 not-for-profit sectors.
20

21 **Conflicts of Interest:**
22

23
24 None of the authors have any conflicts of interest to declare.
25

26 **Keywords:** Critical care; resuscitation; rapid response team
27

28 **Abbreviations:** RRT: rapid response team; USA: United States of America; IHI: Institute for
29 Healthcare Improvement; ICU: Intensive Care Unit; ACGME: Accreditation Council for
30 Graduate Medical Education; HIPAA: Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of
31 1996
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Introduction:

The use of Rapid Response Teams (RRTs) is now well established throughout the United States of America (USA), Europe, Australia and Canada, in part due to their inclusion in the Institute for Healthcare Improvement (IHI) 5 Million Lives Campaign. [1] Although no criteria have been formally defined, the IHI defines an RRT as “a team of clinicians who bring critical care expertise to the bedside.” In practice the composition of each RRT likely varies by hospital, based on local resources and requirements. Once activated, the goal of the RRT is to rescue sick or deteriorating patients to prevent further decompensation and to facilitate appropriate and timely treatment, as well as rapid and appropriate escalation of care. Each RRT may be a multidisciplinary team with representatives from internal medicine, critical care and nursing, as well as other allied healthcare professionals. [2 3]

Evidence behind RRTs is far from robust, with some studies showing reductions in rates of unexpected hospital deaths and out of intensive care unit (ICU) cardiac arrest after the establishment of an RRT [4-10] and others failing to demonstrate significant improvement. [2 11 12] The effectiveness of an RRT might be intrinsically linked to its composition, as provider expertise possibly influences the ability to promptly stabilise, resuscitate and triage a deteriorating patient. Most of the published literature, however, is focused on the impact on patient outcomes after implementation of an RRT in a single hospital or healthcare system, with little attention to RRT composition. To our knowledge, there have been no studies which have looked at variation in the composition, availability, or activation criteria for such teams in the USA.

1
2
3 We sought to survey acute care hospitals in five north-eastern states: New York; Pennsylvania;
4
5 Rhode Island; Vermont; and New Jersey in order to establish the current practice with regards to
6
7 RRT and cardiac arrest team members, availability and activation criteria.
8
9
10

11 **Methods:**

12
13
14
15
16
17 The study was reviewed and approved by the New York University School of Medicine's Office
18
19 of Science and Research Institutional Review Board (i17-01584).
20
21
22

23
24 Acute care hospitals in New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, and New Jersey were
25
26 identified from the publicly available Medicare database (data.medicare.gov). If contact details
27
28 were not already known to team members or available online, hospitals were contacted by
29
30 telephone by study team members in order to identify a contact person involved in RRTs and
31
32 cardiac arrests. Study team members contacted hospital personnel in a systematic fashion:
33
34 initially contacting the nursing administration department; then the hospitalist or Medicine
35
36 division; then Chief Residents of the Internal Medicine program (if available); and finally, the
37
38 Chief Nursing Officer of the hospital. Once an appropriate contact was identified, an anonymous
39
40 survey email was sent via the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996
41
42 (HIPAA) compliant REDCap web application. After two weeks, a reminder email was sent if the
43
44 survey had not been completed.
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 To minimise the risk of duplicate surveys being completed, each survey contained a unique link,
52
53 and only one valid link was sent to each hospital at a time. The survey consisted of fifty
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 questions, which were a mixture of multiple choice and free text answers, all of which had to be
4
5 completed to submit the survey. The survey collected baseline hospital information as well as
6
7 information on RRT and cardiac arrest team activation criteria, the method by which the
8
9 individual members were contacted, leadership and individual team makeup.
10
11
12
13

14 **Patient Involvement:**

15
16 Patients were not involved in this research project.
17
18
19
20

21 **Results:**

22 *Characteristics of the Study Hospitals:*

23
24
25
26 Three hundred and seventy-eight acute care hospitals were identified from the Medicare database
27
28 and RRT contacts were identified for 303 of these (80%) using the methods above. One hundred
29
30 and seven surveys were completed, the majority from New York and Pennsylvania, a response
31
32 rate of 35%.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 Out of the hospitals that responded, 59 (55%) reported a university affiliation. All but two
43
44 hospitals had an ICU (Table 1). Seventy-two hospitals (67%) had a training program approved
45
46 by the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education (ACGME) in either Internal
47
48 Medicine, Anaesthesia, or Critical Care.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Characteristics of Participating Hospitals

		n	Percentage
University Affiliation	Yes	59	55%
	No	48	45%
Financial Structure	Private	54	50%
	Public	53	50%
Inpatient Beds	0-100	14	13%
	100-500	58	54%
	>500	35	33%
ICU Beds	0	2	2%
	1-20	50	47%
	21-50	31	29%
	>50	24	22%
ACGME Training Program	Internal Medicine Residency	69	64%
	Anaesthesia Residency	39	36%
	Critical Care Fellowship	51	48%

Table 1: Characteristics of participating hospitals. ICU: Intensive Care Unit, ACGME: Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education.

RRT Activation Criteria and Availability:

Of the 107 hospitals, 105 had an RRT. One of the two hospitals without an ICU also did not have an RRT. One hundred and four of the 105 RRTs were available 24 hours a day. RRTs were dispatched by overhead call in 75 hospitals (71%), pager in 71 hospitals (68%) and by phone in 24 hospitals (23%). Over half of the RRTs were called out with more than one modality, the most common of which was a combination of pager and overhead call in 49 hospitals (47%).

RRT Characteristics

		n	Percentage
24h RRT		104	99%
RRT Calling Criteria	Clinical Concern	100	95%
	Vital sign	81	77%
	EWS	62	59%
RRT Called Over	Overhead	75	71%
	Pager	71	68%
	Phone	24	23%
	Pager and Overhead	49	47%
RRT Team Members Change	Daily	73	70%
	Weekly	15	14%
	Monthly	4	4%
	Rarely	13	12%

Table 2: RRT characteristics, including availability of RRT, activation criteria, mechanism of dispatch, and variation in individual team members. RRT: Rapid Response Team.

Membership Turnover:

Turnover of the RRT was high, with team members changing daily in 70%. The majority of hospitals had multiple activation criteria for RRTs, the most common of which were clinical concern (95%), vital sign abnormalities (77%), and Early Warning Scores (EWS) (59%) (Table 2). Less common activation criteria included family member concern (2%), alcohol withdrawal scores (1%), falls (1%), and lack of intravenous access (1%).

RRT Composition:

RRT composition varied widely with most hospitals having representatives from multiple disciplines including physicians, nursing management, respiratory therapy and pharmacy. Respiratory therapists, critical care nurses, physicians and nurse managers were the most common healthcare professionals to always attend RRTs (89%, 78%, 64%, and 51% respectively) (Figure 1). Sixty-seven hospitals (64%) always had a physician of some specialty present at the RRT. Attending physicians were always part of the RRT in 40 hospitals (38%), occasionally present in 56 (53%), and never present in 9 (9%). Critical care physicians, whether attending or fellow, always attended RRTs in 20% of hospitals and never attended in 25%.

RRT Leadership:

RRTs were led by an attending physician in 31%, a trainee physician in 41%, a nurse in 12%, and a nurse practitioner or physician assistant (PA) in 10%. The remaining 6% were led by any physician present at the RRT (5%), or an emergency department physician (1%), (Table 3). In 35 out of the 69 hospitals with an ACGME internal medicine residency (51%), RRTs were led by internal medicine residents, in six of these hospitals (17%) internal medicine attending physicians also always made up part of the RRT, presumably in a supervisory role.

Team Leader by Specialty

	Rapid Response		Cardiac Arrest		
	n	Percentage	n	Percentage	
Internal Medicine	NP/PA	11	10%	5	6%
	Resident	35	33%	33	38%
	Attending	22	21%	18	21%
Critical Care	Fellow	5	5%	6	7%
	Attending	10	10%	17	20%
	Nurse	13	12%	2	2%
Anaesthesia	Resident	0	0%	0	0%
	Attending	0	0%	0	0%
Other	Family Medicine				
	Resident	3	3%	1	1%
	ED Physician	1	1%	1	1%
	Variable Providers	5	5%	4	5%

Table 3: Individual who was reported to usually lead the RRT and cardiac arrest team by specialty and training level. NP: Nurse Practitioner, PA: Physician Assistant, ED: Emergency Department.

Cardiac Arrest Teams:

Eighty-seven hospitals (81%) had a dedicated cardiac arrest team. The most common method to call a cardiac arrest team was overhead (91%), followed by pager (68%) and phone (9%). Sixty percent of hospitals used both overhead call and pager. As with RRTs, membership of cardiac arrest teams varied widely (Figure 2). Senior physicians were slightly more likely to lead cardiac arrests (40% of cardiac arrest teams compared to 31% of RRTs) with critical care attendings leading 20% of cardiac arrest teams compared to 10% of RRTs and nurses leading only 2% of cardiac arrests (Table 3).

Discussion:

Rapid Response Teams aim to provide rapid deployment of skilled healthcare professionals to the bedside of a critically unwell patient in order to simultaneously assess, triage, and intervene to prevent further deterioration. For such an intervention to be effective, patients must be identified early in their clinical course, correctly diagnosed and expeditiously treated. While there has been broad adoption of the RRT model, there is no clear guideline-based “best practices” statement regarding team structure, dynamics or activation criteria, which may contribute to the variability in the effectiveness reported by single-centre studies of RRTs.

We here report the results of the first study in the USA, demonstrating significant inter-hospital variations in the activation, constitution and functioning of RRT and cardiac arrest teams.

The choice of activation criteria is paramount to the success of the team. Ideally, such criteria allow for accurate and early identification of patients while avoiding excessive false alarms. We found that the most commonly used activation criteria were clinical concern and single vital sign abnormalities. Early warning scores, which are calculated from routinely collected vital signs, are extensively studied and have been shown to outperform single vital sign abnormalities in predicting adverse clinical outcomes. [13] Introduction of EWS has been associated with reduction in cardiac arrest rates and inpatient mortality. [14-21] Despite the evidence supporting the use of EWS to reduce adverse clinical outcomes, we found that they were only used in 59%

1
2
3 of centres in this survey. Broader adoption of EWS as a trigger for activating RRTs might help in
4
5 standardizing the way deteriorating patients are identified early in their trajectory.
6
7

8
9
10 Almost all RRTs were available around the clock, however team membership varied
11
12 considerably and RRT members changed daily in the vast majority. The effect of frequent team
13
14 turnover in RRTs has not been studied, but one-off teams are known to perform particularly
15
16 poorly and the beneficial effects of increasing team familiarity is well described in fields outside
17
18 of medicine. [22 23] Given this, maintaining a consistent RRT with familiar members may
19
20 improve team dynamics. Individual hospital requirements and resources will certainly impact on
21
22 their ability to support such a team. An RRT huddle at the beginning of each shift, describing
23
24 individual roles and responsibilities, may help to preserve team dynamics and efficient
25
26 communication despite this turnover. [24]
27
28
29
30

31
32
33 One of the appealing features of RRTs is the rapid delivery of skilled healthcare practitioners and
34
35 critical care expertise to the bedside, in essence a projection of ICU level of care to the medical
36
37 floors. In practice, we found that lack of consistent attending physician presence was
38
39 commonplace, even in hospitals where RRTs were led by resident physicians with only one to
40
41 three years of postgraduate experience. Although some studies have suggested that the addition
42
43 of an senior critical care physician to the RRT does not improve mortality, [25 26] the inclusion
44
45 of an attending critical care physician ensures attending supervision of the RRT or cardiac arrest,
46
47 improves documentation, and is associated with high survival rates [27]. The impact of the lack
48
49 of senior support at these low frequency, high stakes scenarios may weaken its effectiveness and
50
51 is an area deserving of future research.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Our study has several significant weaknesses. Firstly, and most significantly, it is a survey that
6 was only completed by a single individual at each hospital. While we made every effort to ensure
7 that the survey was only completed by one person per hospital and that the person completing the
8 form would be able to do so correctly, we were unable to verify this due to anonymous nature of
9 the survey.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 Our response rate of 35% is a significant limitation to the generalisability of our findings. As the
20 survey was anonymous, we were unable to assess the variation in location, resources and
21 affiliation between responders and non-responders. It is unclear whether there was any
22 significant difference between hospitals who responded and those that did not, although a lower
23 proportion of small hospitals completed surveys, which limits our results further. Smaller
24 hospitals may have fewer resources, more limited physician availability, and a lower number of
25 RRT events when compared to larger hospitals and factors such as these may affect their
26 approach to the RRT structure and availability.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 The study included only Medicare-participating hospitals in New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode
41 Island, Vermont, and New Jersey and our findings cannot necessarily be extrapolated to the
42 practice of hospitals across the country or internationally. Variation in RRT and cardiac arrest
43 team composition, as well as activation criteria, has been demonstrated in small studies in a
44 number of other countries, suggesting that such variation is not a unique finding, an area of
45 future study for our group [28-30].
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 When assessing the evidence concerning the clinical impact of RRTs, it is important to
4 remember that the RRT is only part of the inpatient chain of rescue. For the best outcome and
5 ideal RRT, multiple factors must be met: the team must be called early, whether by EWS or
6 other track and trigger score; the patient must be diagnosed correctly and managed promptly by
7 experienced clinicians; and the team must work smoothly and communicate well.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 **Conclusion:**

18
19 RRTs have become almost ubiquitous across the USA, despite the uncertainty of their impact. As
20 the largest study to date, we have demonstrated considerable heterogeneity among RRTs and
21 cardiac arrest teams, a factor that likely contributes to the mixed results seen in studies. Increased
22 use of EWS, optimizing team dynamics and ensuring that trainee team leaders are adequately
23 supported may improve RRT function and patient safety. Individual factors that influence the
24 effectiveness of the RRT deserve further study.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Acknowledgements:** None
4
5
6
7

8 **Data Sharing Statement:** Data will not be published publically. Please contact Oscar Mitchell
9
10 at oscar.mitchell@nyumc.org if access to the original data is required.
11
12
13

14 **Author Contributions:** OM, LE, VM designed the study. OM, CM, JH and VM collected and
15 analysed the data. OM, CM, JH, LE and VM wrote the manuscript and agree to its submission
16 for publication.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60


References

1. Institute for Healthcare Improvement. 5 Million Lives campaign 2006 [Available from: <http://www.ihl.org/about/documents/5millionlivescampaigncasestatement.pdf> accessed March 10th 2018 2018.
2. Chan PS, Khalid A, Longmore LS, et al. Hospital-wide code rates and mortality before and after implementation of a rapid response team. *JAMA* 2008;300(21):2506-13. doi: 10.1001/jama.2008.715
3. ANZICS-Core Met dose Investigators, Jones D, Drennan K, et al. Rapid Response Team composition, resourcing and calling criteria in Australia. *Resuscitation* 2012;83(5):563-7. doi: 10.1016/j.resuscitation.2011.10.023
4. Bellomo R, Goldsmith D, Uchino S, et al. A prospective before-and-after trial of a medical emergency team. *Med J Aust* 2003;179(6):283-7.
5. DeVita MA, Braithwaite RS, Mahidhara R, et al. Use of medical emergency team responses to reduce hospital cardiopulmonary arrests. *Qual Saf Health Care* 2004;13(4):251-4. doi: 10.1136/qhc.13.4.251
6. Buist M, Harrison J, Abaloz E, et al. Six year audit of cardiac arrests and medical emergency team calls in an Australian outer metropolitan teaching hospital. *BMJ* 2007;335(7631):1210-2. doi: 10.1136/bmj.39385.534236.47
7. Dacey MJ, Mirza ER, Wilcox V, et al. The effect of a rapid response team on major clinical outcome measures in a community hospital. *Crit Care Med* 2007;35(9):2076-82.
8. Offner PJ, Heit J, Roberts R. Implementation of a rapid response team decreases cardiac arrest outside of the intensive care unit. *J Trauma* 2007;62(5):1223-7; discussion 27-8. doi: 10.1097/TA.0b013e31804d4968
9. Sharek PJ, Parast LM, Leong K, et al. Effect of a rapid response team on hospital-wide mortality and code rates outside the ICU in a Children's Hospital. *JAMA* 2007;298(19):2267-74. doi: 10.1001/jama.298.19.2267
10. Ludikhuizen J, Brunsveld-Reinders AH, Dijkgraaf MG, et al. Outcomes Associated With the Nationwide Introduction of Rapid Response Systems in The Netherlands. *Crit Care Med* 2015;43(12):2544-51. doi: 10.1097/CCM.0000000000001272
11. Hillman K, Chen J, Cretikos M, et al. Introduction of the medical emergency team (MET) system: a cluster-randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2005;365(9477):2091-7. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(05)66733-5
12. Chan PS, Jain R, Nallmothu BK, et al. Rapid Response Teams: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Arch Intern Med* 2010;170(1):18-26. doi: 10.1001/archinternmed.2009.424
13. Jarvis S, Kovacs C, Briggs J, et al. Aggregate National Early Warning Score (NEWS) values are more important than high scores for a single vital signs parameter for discriminating the risk of adverse outcomes. *Resuscitation* 2015;87:75-80. doi: 10.1016/j.resuscitation.2014.11.014
14. Subbe CP, Kruger M, Rutherford P, et al. Validation of a modified Early Warning Score in medical admissions. *QJM* 2001;94(10):521-6.
15. Gardner-Thorpe J, Love N, Wrightson J, et al. The value of Modified Early Warning Score (MEWS) in surgical in-patients: a prospective observational study. *Ann R Coll Surg Engl* 2006;88(6):571-5. doi: 10.1308/003588406X130615
16. Paterson R, MacLeod DC, Thetford D, et al. Prediction of in-hospital mortality and length of stay using an early warning scoring system: clinical audit. *Clin Med (Lond)* 2006;6(3):281-4.

17. Groarke JD, Gallagher J, Stack J, et al. Use of an admission early warning score to predict patient morbidity and mortality and treatment success. *Emerg Med J* 2008;25(12):803-6. doi: 10.1136/emj.2007.051425
18. Cei M, Bartolomei C, Mumoli N. In-hospital mortality and morbidity of elderly medical patients can be predicted at admission by the Modified Early Warning Score: a prospective study. *Int J Clin Pract* 2009;63(4):591-5. doi: 10.1111/j.1742-1241.2008.01986.x
19. Maupin JM, Roth DJ, Krapes JM. Use of the Modified Early Warning Score decreases code blue events. *Jt Comm J Qual Patient Saf* 2009;35(12):598-603.
20. Moon A, Cosgrove JF, Lea D, et al. An eight year audit before and after the introduction of modified early warning score (MEWS) charts, of patients admitted to a tertiary referral intensive care unit after CPR. *Resuscitation* 2011;82(2):150-4. doi: 10.1016/j.resuscitation.2010.09.480
21. Nishijima I, Oyadomari S, Maedomari S, et al. Use of a modified early warning score system to reduce the rate of in-hospital cardiac arrest. *J Intensive Care* 2016;4:12. doi: 10.1186/s40560-016-0134-7
22. Harrison DJ, Mohammed S, McGrath JE, et al. Time matters in team performance: Effects of member familiarity, entrainment, and task discontinuity on speed and quality. *Personnel Psychology* 2003;56(3):633-69.
23. Huckman RS, Staats BR, Upton DM. Team familiarity, role experience, and performance: Evidence from Indian software services. *Management Science* 2009;55(1):85-100.
24. Shapiro J, Venkata A, Ochieng P, et al. The Emergency Department to ICU Quality and Safety Project Formal Handoff/Huddle to Improve Care. 43rd Annual Critical Care Congress, 2013.
25. Karvellas CJ, de Souza IA, Gibney RT, et al. Association between implementation of an intensivist-led medical emergency team and mortality. *BMJ Qual Saf* 2012;21(2):152-9. doi: 10.1136/bmjqs-2011-000393
26. Morris DS, Schweickert W, Holena D, et al. Differences in outcomes between ICU attending and senior resident physician led medical emergency team responses. *Resuscitation* 2012;83(12):1434-7. doi: 10.1016/j.resuscitation.2012.07.017
27. Romig M, Duval-Arnould J, Winters BD, et al. Intensivist Presence at Code Events Is Associated with High Survival and Increased Documentation Rates. *Crit Care Clin* 2018;34(2):259-66. doi: 10.1016/j.ccc.2017.12.009
28. Psirides A, Hill J, Hurford S. A review of rapid response team activation parameters in New Zealand hospitals. *Resuscitation* 2013;84(8):1040-4. doi: 10.1016/j.resuscitation.2013.01.022
29. Tirkkonen J, Nurmi J, Olkkola KT, et al. Cardiac arrest teams and medical emergency teams in Finland: a nationwide cross-sectional postal survey. *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand* 2014;58(4):420-7. doi: 10.1111/aas.12280
30. Lauridsen KG, Schmidt AS, Adelborg K, et al. Organisation of in-hospital cardiac arrest teams - a nationwide study. *Resuscitation* 2015;89:123-8. doi: 10.1016/j.resuscitation.2015.01.014

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only



33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 1: Composition of RRTs by specialty.




Figure 2: Composition of cardiac arrest teams by speciality.

BMJ Open

Characterising Variation in Composition and Activation Criteria of Rapid Response and Cardiac Arrest Teams: A Survey of Medicare Participating Hospitals in Five American States

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-024548.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	11-Sep-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Mitchell, Oscar; New York University School of Medicine, Motschwiller, Caroline; New York University School of Medicine Horowitz, James; New York University School of Medicine Evans, Laura; New York University School of Medicine Mukherjee, Vikramjit; New York University School of Medicine
Primary Subject Heading:	Intensive care
Secondary Subject Heading:	Anaesthesia
Keywords:	Adult intensive & critical care < ANAESTHETICS, EPIDEMIOLOGY, Adult intensive & critical care < INTENSIVE & CRITICAL CARE

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Characterising Variation in Composition and Activation Criteria of Rapid Response and**
4
5 **Cardiac Arrest Teams:**
6

7
8 **A Survey of Medicare Participating Hospitals in Five American States**
9

10 **Authors:**
11

12 Oscar J.L. Mitchell, New York School of Medicine, Department of Internal Medicine, 550 1st
13 Avenue, New York, New York, 10016, United States of America
14

15
16 Caroline W. Motschwiller, New York School of Medicine, Department of Internal Medicine, 550
17 1st Avenue, New York, New York, 10016, United States of America
18

19 James M. Horowitz, New York School of Medicine, Division of Cardiology, 550 1st Avenue,
20 New York, New York, 10016, United States of America
21

22
23 Laura E. Evans, Associate Professor, New York School of Medicine, Medical Director of
24 Critical Care, Bellevue Hospital, 462 1st Avenue, New York, New York, 10016, United States of
25 America
26

27 Vikramjit Mukherjee, Assistant Professor, New York School of Medicine, Division of
28 Pulmonary, Critical Care, and Sleep Medicine, 462 1st Avenue, New York, New York, 10016,
29 United States of America
30

31
32 **Corresponding Author:**

33 Oscar J.L. Mitchell
34 New York School of Medicine
35 Department of Internal Medicine
36 550 1st Avenue
37 New York, New York, 10016
38 United States of America
39

40
41 Email: oscarmitchell@nyumc.org
42

43 **Conflicts of Interest:** None
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract

Objectives:

To characterise the variation in composition, leadership, and activation criteria of rapid response and cardiac arrest teams in five northeastern states of the United States of America.

Design:

Cross-sectional study consisting of a voluntary 46-question survey of acute care hospitals in northeastern USA.

Setting:

Acute care hospitals in New York, New Jersey, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Pennsylvania.

Participants:

Surveys were completed by any member of the RRT with a working knowledge of the team structure. Participants were all Medicare-participating acute care hospitals, including teaching and community hospitals as well as hospitals from rural, urban and suburban areas.

Results:

Out of 378 hospitals, contacts were identified for 303, and 107 surveys were completed. All but two hospitals had an RRT, 70% of which changed members daily. The most common activation criteria were clinical concern (95%), single vital sign abnormalities (77%), and Early Warning Score (59%). 81% of hospitals had a dedicated cardiac arrest team.

RRT composition varied widely, with respiratory therapists, critical care nurses, physicians and nurse managers being the most likely to attend (89%, 78%, 64%, and 51% respectively). Consistent presence of critical care physicians was uncommon and both cardiac arrest teams and teams were frequently led by trainee physicians, often without senior supervision.

Conclusions:

As the largest study to date in the USA, we have demonstrated wide heterogeneity, rapid team turnover, and a lack of senior supervision of RRT and cardiac arrest teams. These factors likely contribute to the mixed results seen in studies of RRTs.

Strengths and Limitations of the Study:

- This is the largest study of its kind and the only study of RRT and cardiac arrest team composition in the USA
- Gives an understanding of the characterisation of RRT and cardiac arrest team structure and function
- Only represents Medicare participating hospitals in five states
- The 35% response rate further limits study

Funding Statement:

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Conflicts of Interest:

None of the authors have any conflicts of interest to declare.

Keywords: Critical care; resuscitation; rapid response team

Abbreviations: RRT: rapid response team; USA: United States of America; IHI: Institute for Healthcare Improvement; ICU: Intensive Care Unit; ACGME: Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education; HIPAA: Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996

Introduction:

The use of Rapid Response Teams (RRTs) is now well established throughout the United States of America (USA), Europe, Australia and Canada, in part due to their inclusion in the Institute for Healthcare Improvement (IHI) 5 Million Lives Campaign. [1] Although no criteria have been formally defined, the IHI defines an RRT as “a team of clinicians who bring critical care expertise to the bedside.” In practice the composition of each RRT likely varies by hospital, based on local resources and requirements. Once activated, the goal of the RRT is to rescue sick or deteriorating patients to prevent further decompensation and to facilitate appropriate and timely treatment, as well as rapid and appropriate escalation of care. Each RRT may be a multidisciplinary team with representatives from internal medicine, critical care and nursing, as well as other allied healthcare professionals. [2-4]

Evidence behind RRTs is far from robust, with some studies showing reductions in rates of unexpected hospital deaths and out of intensive care unit (ICU) cardiac arrest after the establishment of an RRT [5-11] and others failing to demonstrate significant improvement. [2 12 13] The effectiveness of an RRT might be intrinsically linked to its composition, as provider expertise possibly influences the ability to promptly stabilise, resuscitate and triage a deteriorating patient. Most of the published literature, however, is focused on the impact on patient outcomes after implementation of an RRT in a single hospital or healthcare system, with little attention to RRT and cardiac arrest team composition. To our knowledge, there has been only one such study in the USA, which described substantial heterogeneity between 33 hospitals in a south-eastern state. [4]

1
2
3 We hypothesised that there would be wide variation in team structure, leadership and activation
4 criteria of RRT and cardiac arrest teams. We sought to survey acute care hospitals in five
5
6 northeastern states: New York; Pennsylvania; Rhode Island; Vermont; and New Jersey in order
7
8 to establish the current practice with regards to RRT and cardiac arrest team members,
9
10 availability and activation criteria.
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 **Methods:**

21 *Survey Design:*

22 The study was reviewed and approved by the New York University School of Medicine's Office
23 of Science and Research Institutional Review Board (i17-01584). A 46-question survey was
24 created by the investigators (Appendix 1). The survey collected baseline hospital characteristics,
25 which were limited to hospital size, ICU beds and presence of an Accreditation Council for
26 Graduate Medical Education (ACGME) training program to avoid loss of anonymity.
27
28

29 Characteristics of the RRT included methods of RRT activation, including the use of Early
30 Warning Scores (EWS), single vital sign abnormalities and clinical concern. Additionally,
31 information on RRT and cardiac arrest team leadership and individual team makeup was also
32 collected, with the RRT leader being defined as the member of the team who usually leads the
33 RRT.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

49 *Survey Distribution:*

50 The study was conducted over a 3-month period from January to March 2018. Acute care
51 hospitals in New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, and New Jersey were identified
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 from the publicly available Medicare database (data.medicare.gov). If contact details were not
4 already known to team members or available online, hospitals were contacted by telephone by
5 study team members in order to identify a contact person involved in RRTs and cardiac arrests.
6
7
8 Study team members contacted hospital personnel in a systematic fashion: initially contacting the
9
10 nursing administration department; then the hospitalist or Medicine division; then Chief
11
12 Residents of the Internal Medicine program (if available); and finally the Chief Nursing Officer
13
14 of the hospital. Once an appropriate contact was identified, an anonymous survey email was sent
15
16 via the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA) compliant
17
18 REDCap web application. After two weeks, a reminder email was sent if the survey had not been
19
20 completed.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 To minimise the risk of duplicate surveys being completed, each survey contained a unique link,
29
30 and only one valid link was sent to each hospital at a time. All survey questions had to be
31
32 completed in order to submit the survey.
33
34
35
36
37

38 Statistical comparisons of categorical variables were performed using the Chi squared test. Data
39
40 analysis was completed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 23.
41
42
43

44 **Patient Involvement:**

45
46 Patients were not involved in this research project.
47
48
49
50

51 **Results:**

52 53 54 55 *Characteristics of the Study Hospitals:* 56 57 58 59 60

1
2
3
4
5 Three hundred and seventy-eight acute care hospitals were identified from the Medicare database
6 and RRT contacts were identified for 303 of these (80%) using the methods above. One hundred
7
8 and seven surveys were completed, the majority from New York and Pennsylvania, a response
9
10 rate of 35%. As all questions were mandatory, there were no missing data.
11
12
13
14
15

16
17 Out of the hospitals that responded, 59 (55%) reported a university affiliation. All but two
18
19 hospitals had an ICU (Table 1). Seventy-two hospitals (67%) had a training program approved
20
21 by the ACGME in Internal Medicine, Anaesthesia, or Critical Care.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Characteristics of Participating Hospitals

		n	Percentage
University Affiliation	Yes	59	55%
	No	48	45%
Financial Structure	Private	54	50%
	Public	53	50%
Inpatient Beds	0-500	72	67%
	>500	35	33%
ICU Beds	0	2	2%
	1-20	50	47%
	21-50	31	29%
	>50	24	22%
ACGME Training Program Present	Internal Medicine Residency	69	64%
	Anaesthesia Residency	39	36%
	Critical Care Fellowship	51	48%

Table 1: Characteristics of participating hospitals. ICU: Intensive Care Unit, ACGME: Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education.

RRT Activation Criteria and Availability:

Of the 107 hospitals, 105 had an RRT. One of the two hospitals without an ICU also did not have an RRT. One hundred and four of the 105 RRTs were available 24 hours a day. RRTs were dispatched by overhead call in 75 hospitals (71%), pager in 71 hospitals (68%) and by phone in 24 hospitals (23%). Over half of the RRTs were called out with more than one modality, the most common of which was a combination of pager and overhead call in 49 hospitals (47%).

RRT Characteristics

		n	Percentage
24h RRT		104	99%
RRT Calling Criteria	Clinical Concern	100	95%
	Vital sign	81	77%
	EWS	62	59%
RRT Called Over	Overhead	75	71%
	Pager	71	68%
	Phone	24	23%
	Pager and Overhead	49	47%
RRT Team Members Change	Daily	73	70%
	Weekly	15	14%
	Monthly	4	4%
	Rarely	13	12%

Table 2: RRT characteristics, including availability of RRT, activation criteria, mechanism of dispatch, and variation in individual team members. RRT: Rapid Response Team.

Membership Turnover:

Turnover of the RRT was high, with team members changing daily in 70%. The majority of hospitals had multiple activation criteria for RRTs, the most common of which were clinical concern (95%), vital sign abnormalities (77%), and EWS (59%) (Table 2). Less common activation criteria included family member concern (2%), alcohol withdrawal scores (1%), falls (1%), and lack of intravenous access (1%). Neither the size of the hospital nor the size of the ICU was significantly associated with the use of EWS as activation criteria.

RRT Composition:

1
2
3 RRT composition varied widely with most hospitals having representatives from multiple
4 disciplines including physicians, nursing management, respiratory therapy and pharmacy.
5
6 Respiratory therapists, critical care nurses, physicians and nurse managers were the most
7
8 common healthcare professionals to always attend RRTs (89%, 78%, 64%, and 51%
9
10 respectively) (Figure 1). Sixty-seven hospitals (64%) always had a physician present in the RRT.
11
12 Attending physicians were always part of the RRT in 40 hospitals (38%), occasionally present in
13
14 56 (53%), and never present in 9 (9%). Critical care physicians, whether attending or fellow,
15
16 always attended RRT activations in 20% of hospitals and never attended in 25%. The size of the
17
18 hospital was not associated with having consistent presence of attending physicians or critical
19
20 care physicians as part of their RRT ($p=0.89$ and $p=0.30$ respectively). The presence of an
21
22 ACGME training program was not significantly associated with consistent attending presence at
23
24 RRTs ($p=0.49$).
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 ***RRT Leadership:***

36
37
38
39
40 RRTs were led by an attending physician in 31%, a trainee physician in 41%, a nurse in 12%,
41
42 and a nurse practitioner or physician assistant (PA) in 10%. The remaining 6% were led by any
43
44 physician present at the RRT (5%), or an emergency department physician (1%), (Table 3). In 35
45
46 out of the 69 hospitals with an ACGME internal medicine residency (51%), RRTs were led by
47
48 internal medicine residents, in six of these hospitals (17%) internal medicine attending
49
50 physicians also always made up part of the RRT, presumably in a supervisory role.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Team Leader by Specialty

		Rapid Response		Cardiac Arrest	
		n	Percentage	n	Percentage
	NP/PA	11	10%	5	6%
Internal Medicine	Resident	35	33%	33	38%
	Attending	22	21%	18	21%
Critical Care	Fellow	5	5%	6	7%
	Attending	10	10%	17	20%
	Nurse	13	12%	2	2%
Anaesthesia	Resident	0	0%	0	0%
	Attending	0	0%	0	0%
Other	Family Medicine				
	Resident	3	3%	1	1%
	ED Physician	1	1%	1	1%
	Variable Providers	5	5%	4	5%

Table 3: Individual who was reported to usually lead the RRT and cardiac arrest team by specialty and training level. NP: Nurse Practitioner, PA: Physician Assistant, ED: Emergency Department.

Cardiac Arrest Teams:

Eighty seven hospitals (81%) had a dedicated cardiac arrest team. The most common method to call a cardiac arrest team was overhead (91%), followed by pager (68%) and phone (9%). Sixty percent of hospitals used both overhead call and pager. As with RRTs, membership of cardiac arrest teams varied widely (Figure 2). Senior physicians were slightly more likely to lead cardiac arrests (40% of cardiac arrest teams compared to 31% of RRTs) with critical care attendings leading 20% of cardiac arrest teams compared to 10% of RRTs and nurses leading only 2% of cardiac arrests (Table 3).

Discussion:

Rapid Response Teams aim to provide rapid deployment of skilled healthcare professionals to the bedside of a critically unwell patient in order to simultaneously assess, triage, and intervene to prevent further deterioration. For such an intervention to be effective, patients must be identified early in their clinical course, correctly diagnosed and expeditiously treated. While there has been broad adoption of the RRT model, there is no clear guideline-based “best practices” statement regarding team structure, dynamics or activation criteria, which may contribute to the variability in the effectiveness reported by single-centre studies of RRTs. Factors that have been associated with top performing cardiac arrest teams include team design, team composition, communication and leadership during cardiac arrest and training of the cardiac arrest team. [14]

We here report the results of the largest study in the USA, demonstrating substantial inter-hospital variations in the activation, constitution and functioning of RRT and cardiac arrest teams. To our knowledge it is also the first study to have described the structure of cardiac arrest teams.

The choice of activation criteria is paramount to the success of the team. Ideally, such criteria allow for accurate and early identification of patients while avoiding excessive false alarms. We found that the most commonly used activation criteria were clinical concern and single vital sign abnormalities. Early warning scores, which are calculated from routinely collected vital signs, are extensively studied and have been shown to outperform single vital sign abnormalities in

1
2
3 predicting adverse clinical outcomes. [15] Introduction of EWS has been associated with
4
5 reduction in cardiac arrest rates and inpatient mortality. [16-22] Despite the evidence supporting
6
7 the use of EWS to reduce adverse clinical outcomes, we found that they were only used in 59%
8
9 of centres in this survey. Broader adoption of EWS as a trigger for activating RRTs might help in
10
11 standardising the way deteriorating patients are identified early in their trajectory.
12
13
14

15
16
17 Almost all RRTs were available around the clock, however team membership varied
18
19 considerably and RRT members changed daily in the vast majority. The effect of frequent team
20
21 turnover in RRTs has not been studied, but one-off teams are known to perform particularly
22
23 poorly and the beneficial effects of increasing team familiarity are well described in fields
24
25 outside of medicine and improved cardiac arrest team communication has been associated with
26
27 top-performing cardiac arrest teams. [14 23 24] Given this, maintaining a consistent RRT with
28
29 familiar members may improve team dynamics. Individual hospital requirements and resources
30
31 will certainly impact on their ability to support such a team. An RRT huddle at the beginning of
32
33 each shift, describing individual roles and responsibilities, may help to preserve team dynamics
34
35 and efficient communication despite this turnover. [25]
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 One of the appealing features of RRTs is the rapid delivery of skilled healthcare practitioners and
43
44 critical care expertise to the bedside, in essence a projection of ICU level of care to the medical
45
46 floors. In practice, we found that lack of consistent attending physician presence was
47
48 commonplace, even in hospitals where RRTs were led by resident physicians with only one to
49
50 three years of postgraduate experience. Although some studies have suggested that the addition
51
52 of an senior critical care physician to the RRT does not improve mortality, [26 27] the inclusion
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 of an attending critical care physician ensures attending supervision of the RRT or cardiac arrest,
4 improves documentation, and is associated with high survival rates [28]. We expected that
5 smaller hospitals would be more stretched for resources and as such less likely have senior
6 physicians at RRTs, but we did not find any association between the size of hospital, number of
7 ICU beds, or presence of an ACGME training program and the consistent presence of senior
8 physicians. The impact of the lack of senior support at these low frequency, high stakes scenarios
9 may weaken RRT effectiveness and is an area deserving of future research.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 Our study has several weaknesses. Firstly and most importantly, it is a survey that was only
22 completed by a single individual at each hospital. While we made every effort to ensure that the
23 survey was only completed by one person per hospital and that the person completing the form
24 would be able to do so correctly, we were unable to verify this due to anonymous nature of the
25 survey.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 Our response rate of 35% is a substantial limitation to the generalisability of our findings. As the
36 survey was anonymous, we were unable to assess the variation in location, resources and
37 affiliation between responders and non-responders. It is unclear whether there was any difference
38 between hospitals who responded and those that did not, although a lower proportion of small
39 hospitals completed surveys, which limits our results further. Smaller hospitals may have fewer
40 resources, more limited physician availability, and a lower number of RRT events when
41 compared to larger hospitals and factors such as these may affect their approach to the RRT
42 structure and availability.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The study included only Medicare-participating hospitals in New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode
4
5 Island, Vermont, and New Jersey and our findings cannot necessarily be extrapolated to the
6
7 practice of hospitals across the country or internationally. Variation in RRT and cardiac arrest
8
9 team composition, as well as activation criteria, has been demonstrated in small studies in a
10
11 number of other countries, suggesting that such variation is not a unique finding, an area of
12
13 future study for our group [29-31].
14
15
16
17
18

19 When assessing the evidence concerning the clinical impact of RRTs, it is important to
20
21 remember that the RRT is only part of the inpatient chain of rescue. For the best outcome and
22
23 ideal RRT, multiple factors must be met: the team must be called early, whether by EWS or
24
25 other track and trigger score; the patient must be diagnosed correctly and managed promptly by
26
27 experienced clinicians; and the team must work smoothly and communicate well.
28
29
30
31
32

33 **Conclusion:**

34
35 RRTs have become almost ubiquitous across the USA, despite the uncertainty of their impact. As
36
37 the largest study to date, we have demonstrated considerable heterogeneity among RRTs and
38
39 cardiac arrest teams, a factor that likely contributes to the mixed results seen in studies. Increased
40
41 use of EWS, optimising team dynamics and ensuring that trainee team leaders are adequately
42
43 supported may improve RRT function and patient safety. Individual factors that influence the
44
45 effectiveness of the RRT, including the importance of leadership, member turnover, and team
46
47 structure on RRT and cardiac arrest team outcome. The creation of consensus guidelines
48
49 regarding RRT and cardiac arrest team membership could serve to standardise RRT and cardiac
50
51 arrest team structure and function across the country.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Acknowledgements:** None
4
5
6

7
8 **Data Sharing Statement:** Data will not be published publicly. Please contact Oscar Mitchell at
9
10 oscar.mitchell@nyumc.org if access to the original data is required.
11
12

13
14
15 **Author Contributions:**

16
17 OM, LE, VM designed the study. OM, CM, JH and VM collected and analysed the data. OM, CM, JH,
18
19 LE and VM wrote the manuscript and agree to its submission for publication.
20
21

22
23 All authors were involved in the writing of the manuscript and have drafted, reviewed and approved the
24
25 current version. All authors agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions
26
27 related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

1. Institute for Healthcare Improvement. 5 Million Lives campaign 2006 [Available from: <http://www.ihl.org/about/documents/5millionlivescampaigncasestatement.pdf> accessed March 10th 2018 2018.
2. Chan PS, Khalid A, Longmore LS, et al. Hospital-wide code rates and mortality before and after implementation of a rapid response team. *JAMA* 2008;300(21):2506-13. doi: 10.1001/jama.2008.715
3. ANZICS-Core Met dose Investigators, Jones D, Drennan K, et al. Rapid Response Team composition, resourcing and calling criteria in Australia. *Resuscitation* 2012;83(5):563-7. doi: 10.1016/j.resuscitation.2011.10.023
4. Stollendorf DP, Jones CB. Deployment of rapid response teams by 31 hospitals in a statewide collaborative. *Jt Comm J Qual Patient Saf* 2015;41(4):186-91.
5. Bellomo R, Goldsmith D, Uchino S, et al. A prospective before-and-after trial of a medical emergency team. *Med J Aust* 2003;179(6):283-7.
6. DeVita MA, Braithwaite RS, Mahidhara R, et al. Use of medical emergency team responses to reduce hospital cardiopulmonary arrests. *Qual Saf Health Care* 2004;13(4):251-4. doi: 10.1136/qhc.13.4.251
7. Buist M, Harrison J, Abaloz E, et al. Six year audit of cardiac arrests and medical emergency team calls in an Australian outer metropolitan teaching hospital. *BMJ* 2007;335(7631):1210-2. doi: 10.1136/bmj.39385.534236.47
8. Dacey MJ, Mirza ER, Wilcox V, et al. The effect of a rapid response team on major clinical outcome measures in a community hospital. *Crit Care Med* 2007;35(9):2076-82.
9. Offner PJ, Heit J, Roberts R. Implementation of a rapid response team decreases cardiac arrest outside of the intensive care unit. *J Trauma* 2007;62(5):1223-7; discussion 27-8. doi: 10.1097/TA.0b013e31804d4968
10. Sharek PJ, Parast LM, Leong K, et al. Effect of a rapid response team on hospital-wide mortality and code rates outside the ICU in a Children's Hospital. *JAMA* 2007;298(19):2267-74. doi: 10.1001/jama.298.19.2267
11. Ludikhuizen J, Brunsveld-Reinders AH, Dijkgraaf MG, et al. Outcomes Associated With the Nationwide Introduction of Rapid Response Systems in The Netherlands. *Crit Care Med* 2015;43(12):2544-51. doi: 10.1097/CCM.0000000000001272
12. Hillman K, Chen J, Cretikos M, et al. Introduction of the medical emergency team (MET) system: a cluster-randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2005;365(9477):2091-7. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(05)66733-5
13. Chan PS, Jain R, Nallmothu BK, et al. Rapid Response Teams: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Arch Intern Med* 2010;170(1):18-26. doi: 10.1001/archinternmed.2009.424
14. Nallmothu BK, Guetterman TC, Harrod M, et al. How Do Resuscitation Teams at Top-Performing Hospitals for In-Hospital Cardiac Arrest Succeed? A Qualitative Study. *Circulation* 2018;138(2):154-63. doi: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.118.033674
15. Jarvis S, Kovacs C, Briggs J, et al. Aggregate National Early Warning Score (NEWS) values are more important than high scores for a single vital signs parameter for discriminating the risk of adverse outcomes. *Resuscitation* 2015;87:75-80. doi: 10.1016/j.resuscitation.2014.11.014

16. Gardner-Thorpe J, Love N, Wrightson J, et al. The value of Modified Early Warning Score (MEWS) in surgical in-patients: a prospective observational study. *Ann R Coll Surg Engl* 2006;88(6):571-5. doi: 10.1308/003588406X130615
17. Paterson R, MacLeod DC, Thetford D, et al. Prediction of in-hospital mortality and length of stay using an early warning scoring system: clinical audit. *Clin Med (Lond)* 2006;6(3):281-4.
18. Groarke JD, Gallagher J, Stack J, et al. Use of an admission early warning score to predict patient morbidity and mortality and treatment success. *Emerg Med J* 2008;25(12):803-6. doi: 10.1136/emj.2007.051425
19. Cei M, Bartolomei C, Mumoli N. In-hospital mortality and morbidity of elderly medical patients can be predicted at admission by the Modified Early Warning Score: a prospective study. *Int J Clin Pract* 2009;63(4):591-5. doi: 10.1111/j.1742-1241.2008.01986.x
20. Maupin JM, Roth DJ, Krapes JM. Use of the Modified Early Warning Score decreases code blue events. *Jt Comm J Qual Patient Saf* 2009;35(12):598-603.
21. Moon A, Cosgrove JF, Lea D, et al. An eight year audit before and after the introduction of modified early warning score (MEWS) charts, of patients admitted to a tertiary referral intensive care unit after CPR. *Resuscitation* 2011;82(2):150-4. doi: 10.1016/j.resuscitation.2010.09.480
22. Nishijima I, Oyadomari S, Maedomari S, et al. Use of a modified early warning score system to reduce the rate of in-hospital cardiac arrest. *J Intensive Care* 2016;4:12. doi: 10.1186/s40560-016-0134-7
23. Harrison DJ, Mohammed S, McGrath JE, et al. Time matters in team performance: Effects of member familiarity, entrainment, and task discontinuity on speed and quality. *Personnel Psychology* 2003;56(3):633-69.
24. Huckman RS, Staats BR, Upton DM. Team familiarity, role experience, and performance: Evidence from Indian software services. *Management Science* 2009;55(1):85-100.
25. Shapiro J, Venkata A, Ochieng P, et al. The Emergency Department to ICU Quality and Safety Project Formal Handoff/Huddle to Improve Care. 43rd Annual Critical Care Congress, 2013.
26. Karvellas CJ, de Souza IA, Gibney RT, et al. Association between implementation of an intensivist-led medical emergency team and mortality. *BMJ Qual Saf* 2012;21(2):152-9. doi: 10.1136/bmjqs-2011-000393
27. Morris DS, Schweickert W, Holena D, et al. Differences in outcomes between ICU attending and senior resident physician led medical emergency team responses. *Resuscitation* 2012;83(12):1434-7. doi: 10.1016/j.resuscitation.2012.07.017
28. Romig M, Duval-Arnould J, Winters BD, et al. Intensivist Presence at Code Events Is Associated with High Survival and Increased Documentation Rates. *Crit Care Clin* 2018;34(2):259-66. doi: 10.1016/j.ccc.2017.12.009
29. Psirides A, Hill J, Hurford S. A review of rapid response team activation parameters in New Zealand hospitals. *Resuscitation* 2013;84(8):1040-4. doi: 10.1016/j.resuscitation.2013.01.022
30. Tirkkonen J, Nurmi J, Olkkola KT, et al. Cardiac arrest teams and medical emergency teams in Finland: a nationwide cross-sectional postal survey. *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand* 2014;58(4):420-7. doi: 10.1111/aas.12280
31. Lauridsen KG, Schmidt AS, Adelborg K, et al. Organisation of in-hospital cardiac arrest teams - a nationwide study. *Resuscitation* 2015;89:123-8. doi: 10.1016/j.resuscitation.2015.01.014

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60


Legends to Figures:

Figure 1: Composition of RRTs by specialty.


Figure 2: Composition of cardiac arrest teams by speciality.

For peer review only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



- 1
2
3 1. Hospital affiliation (select one): University affiliated
4 Non-university affiliated
5
6
7
8 2. State:
9
10
11 3. Financial structure (select one) Private
12 Public
13 Veteran's Affairs
14
15
16
17 4. Number of inpatient beds 0-100
18 100-500
19 >500
20
21
22
23
24 5. Number of ICU beds in your hospital 0
25 1-20
26 21-50
27 >50
28
29
30
31
32 6. ACGME Internal Medicine Residency Program Yes/No
33 7. ACGME Critical Care Fellowship Program Yes/No
34 8. ACGME Anaesthesiology Residency Program Yes/No
35
36
37
38
39
40
41 9. Does your hospital have a rapid response team (RRT)? Yes/No
42
43 10. Is your RRT available 24 hours a day? Yes/No
44
45
46 11. How are RRTs called at your hospital? Pager
47 Overhead call
48 Phone
49 Other
50
51
52
53
54 12. If other, how are RRTs called at your hospital?
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 13. Who is usually responsible for leading RRTs?
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

NP/PA

Internal medicine resident

Internal medicine attending

Critical care fellow

Critical care attending

Critical care nursing

Anaesthesia resident

Anaesthesia attending

Other

19 14. If other, who is usually responsible for leading RRTs at your hospital?
20
21

22 15. What parameters can result in a RRT being called?
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

Early warning score (NEWS, MEWS
etc)

Single vital sign abnormality (eg HR,
RR etc)

Clinical concern

Other

34 16. If other, what parameters can results in an RRT being called at your hospital?
35
36

37 17. Members of the RRT usually change:
38
39
40
41
42
43

Daily

Weekly

Monthly

Rarely

44 18-29. Who is present at RRT's?
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Always, Sometimes, Never

Nurse Practitioner

Physician Assistant

Internal Medicine Resident

Internal Medicine Attending

Anaesthesia Resident

Anaesthesia Attending

1
2
3 Critical Care Fellow

4 Critical Care Attending

5 Critical Care Nurse

6 Nurse Manager

7 Respiratory Therapist

8 Pharmacist
9
10
11
12
13

14 30. Does your hospital have a cardiac arrest team?
15
16

17 31. How are cardiac arrests called at your hospital?

Pager

Overhead call

Phone

Other
24
25

26 32. If other, how are cardiac arrests called at your hospital?
27
28

29 33. Who is usually responsible for leading cardiac arrests? NP/PA

Internal medicine resident

Internal medicine attending

Critical care fellow

Critical care attending

Critical care nursing

Anaesthesia resident

Anaesthesia attending

Other
43
44

45 34. If other, who is responsible for leading cardiac arrests at your hospital?
46
47

48 35-46. Who is present at cardiac arrests?
49
50

Always, Sometimes, Never

51 Nurse Practitioner

52 Physician Assistant

53 Internal Medicine Resident

54 Internal Medicine Attending
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4 Anaesthesia Resident
- 5 Anaesthesia Attending
- 6 Critical Care Fellow
- 7 Critical Care Attending
- 8
- 9 Critical Care Nurse
- 10
- 11 Nurse Manager
- 12
- 13 Respiratory Therapist
- 14
- 15 Pharmacist
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28
- 29
- 30
- 31
- 32
- 33
- 34
- 35
- 36
- 37
- 38
- 39
- 40
- 41
- 42
- 43
- 44
- 45
- 46
- 47
- 48
- 49
- 50
- 51
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60

STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies*

	Item No	Recommendation
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract X p.1
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found X p.2-3
Introduction		
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported X p. 4-5
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses X p.5
Methods		
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper X p.5-6
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection X p.5-6
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants X p.5-6
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable X p.5
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group X All data was derived from the surveys
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias X p.6
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at X p.7
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why NA
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding p.6
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions NA
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed p.7
		(d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy NA
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses NA

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Results		
Participants	13*	Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed X p.7 (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage NA (c) Consider use of a flow diagram NA
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders X Table 1 on page 8 (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest NA
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures X Tables 2 and 3 and pages 7-13
Main results	16	Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included NA (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized NA (c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period NA
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses NA
Discussion		
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives p.14-16
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias p.15-16
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence p.15-16
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results p.16
Other information		
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based NA

*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

1
2 **Note:** An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and
3 published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely
4 available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at
5 <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is
6 available at www.strobe-statement.org.
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

BMJ Open

Characterising Variation in Composition and Activation Criteria of Rapid Response and Cardiac Arrest Teams: A Survey of Medicare Participating Hospitals in Five American States

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-024548.R2
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	11-Jan-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Mitchell, Oscar; New York University School of Medicine, Motschwiller, Caroline; New York University School of Medicine Horowitz, James; New York University School of Medicine Evans, Laura; New York University School of Medicine Mukherjee, Vikramjit; New York University School of Medicine
Primary Subject Heading:	Intensive care
Secondary Subject Heading:	Anaesthesia
Keywords:	Adult intensive & critical care < ANAESTHETICS, EPIDEMIOLOGY, Adult intensive & critical care < INTENSIVE & CRITICAL CARE

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4 **Characterising Variation in Composition and Activation Criteria of Rapid Response and**

5
6
7 **Cardiac Arrest Teams:**

8
9
10 **A Survey of Medicare Participating Hospitals in Five American States**

11
12
13
14 **Authors:**

15
16
17 Oscar J.L. Mitchell, New York School of Medicine, Department of Internal Medicine, 550
18 1st Avenue, New York, New York, 10016, United States of America

19
20
21
22
23 Caroline W. Motschwiller, New York School of Medicine, Department of Internal Medicine,
24 550 1st Avenue, New York, New York, 10016, United States of America

25
26
27
28 James M. Horowitz, New York School of Medicine, Division of Cardiology, 550 1st
29 Avenue, New York, New York, 10016, United States of America

30
31
32
33 Laura E. Evans, Associate Professor, New York School of Medicine, Medical Director of
34 Critical Care, Bellevue Hospital, 462 1st Avenue, New York, New York, 10016, United
35 States of America

36
37
38
39
40 Vikramjit Mukherjee, Assistant Professor, New York School of Medicine, Division of
41 Pulmonary, Critical Care, and Sleep Medicine, 462 1st Avenue, New York, New York,
42 10016, United States of America

43
44
45
46
47 **Corresponding Author:**

48 Oscar J.L. Mitchell
49 New York School of Medicine
50 Department of Internal Medicine
51 550 1st Avenue
52 New York, New York, 10016

1
2
3
4 United States of America
5

6
7 Email: oscarmitchell@nyumc.org
8

9
10 **Conflicts of Interest:** None
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract

Objectives:

To characterise the variation in composition, leadership, and activation criteria of rapid response and cardiac arrest teams in five northeastern states of the United States of America.

Design:

Cross-sectional study consisting of a voluntary 46-question survey of acute care hospitals in northeastern USA.

Setting:

Acute care hospitals in New York, New Jersey, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Pennsylvania.

Participants:

Surveys were completed by any member of the RRT with a working knowledge of team composition and function. Participants were all Medicare-participating acute care hospitals, including teaching and community hospitals as well as hospitals from rural, urban and suburban areas.

Results:

Out of 378 hospitals, contacts were identified for 303, and 107 surveys were completed. All but two hospitals had an RRT, 70% of which changed members daily. The most common activation criteria were clinical concern (95%), single vital sign abnormalities (77%), and Early Warning Score (59%). 81% of hospitals had a dedicated cardiac arrest team.

1
2
3
4 RRT composition varied widely, with respiratory therapists, critical care nurses,
5 physicians and nurse managers being the most likely to attend (89%, 78%, 64%, and
6 51% respectively). Consistent presence of critical care physicians was uncommon and
7 both cardiac arrest teams and teams were frequently led by trainee physicians, often
8 without senior supervision.
9
10
11
12

13 **Conclusions:**

14
15
16
17 As the largest study to date in the USA, we have demonstrated wide heterogeneity, rapid
18 team turnover, and a lack of senior supervision of RRT and cardiac arrest teams. These
19 factors likely contribute to the mixed results seen in studies of RRTs.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Strengths and Limitations of the Study:

- Survey based design of the study and 35% response rate limits the generalisability of our findings.
- Design of survey allowed for detailed description of CAT and RRT composition and function in participating hospitals.
- Only represents Medicare participating hospitals in five states.

Funding Statement:

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Conflicts of Interest:

None of the authors have any conflicts of interest to declare.

Keywords: Critical care; resuscitation; rapid response team

Abbreviations: RRT: rapid response team; USA: United States of America; IHI: Institute for Healthcare Improvement; ICU: Intensive Care Unit; ACGME: Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education; HIPAA: Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996

Introduction:

The use of Rapid Response Teams (RRTs) is now well established throughout the United States of America (USA), Europe, Australia and Canada, in part due to their inclusion in the Institute for Healthcare Improvement (IHI) 5 Million Lives Campaign.¹

Although no criteria have been formally defined, the IHI defines an RRT as “a team of clinicians who bring critical care expertise to the bedside.” In practice the composition of each RRT likely varies by hospital, based on local resources and requirements. Once activated, the goal of the RRT is to rescue sick or deteriorating patients to prevent further decompensation and to facilitate appropriate and timely treatment, as well as rapid and appropriate escalation of care. Each RRT may be a multidisciplinary team with representatives from internal medicine, critical care and nursing, as well as other allied healthcare professionals.²⁻⁴

Evidence behind RRTs is far from robust, with some studies showing reductions in rates of unexpected hospital deaths and out of intensive care unit (ICU) cardiac arrest after

1
2
3 the establishment of an RRT ⁵⁻¹¹ and others failing to demonstrate significant
4
5
6
7 improvement. ^{2 12 13} The effectiveness of an RRT might be intrinsically linked to its
8
9
10 composition, as provider expertise possibly influences the ability to promptly stabilise,
11
12
13 resuscitate and triage a deteriorating patient. Most of the published literature, however,
14
15
16 is focused on the impact on patient outcomes after implementation of an RRT in a
17
18
19 single hospital or healthcare system, with little attention to RRT and cardiac arrest team
20
21
22 composition. To our knowledge, there have been only two such studies in the USA, one
23
24
25 which described substantial heterogeneity between 33 hospitals in a south-eastern
26
27
28 state, and another that showed variation in CAT composition. ^{4 14}
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 We hypothesised that there would be wide variation in the leadership, activation criteria,
39
40
41 and the composition of RRT and cardiac arrest teams. We sought to survey acute care
42
43
44 hospitals in five northeastern states: New York; Pennsylvania; Rhode Island; Vermont;
45
46
47 and New Jersey in order to establish the current practice with regards to RRT and
48
49
50 cardiac arrest team members, availability and activation criteria.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Methods:**
4
5
6
7
8
9

10 ***Survey Design:***
11
12

13
14 The study was reviewed and approved by the New York University School of Medicine's
15
16 Office of Science and Research Institutional Review Board (i17-01584). A 46-question
17
18 survey was created by the investigators (Appendix 1). The survey collected baseline
19
20 hospital characteristics, which were limited to hospital size, ICU beds and presence of
21
22 an Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education (ACGME) training program to
23
24 avoid loss of anonymity. Characteristics of the RRT included methods of RRT
25
26 activation, including the use of Early Warning Scores (EWS), single vital sign
27
28 abnormalities and clinical concern. Additionally, information on RRT and cardiac arrest
29
30 team leadership and individual team composition was also collected, with the RRT
31
32 leader being defined as the member of the team who usually leads the RRT.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 ***Survey Distribution:***
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 The study was conducted over a 3-month period from January to March 2018. Acute
5
6
7 care hospitals in New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, and New Jersey
8
9
10 were identified from the publicly available Medicare database (data.medicare.gov). If
11
12
13 contact details were not already known to team members or available online, hospitals
14
15
16 were contacted by telephone by study team members in order to identify a contact
17
18
19 person involved in RRTs and cardiac arrests. Study team members contacted hospital
20
21
22 personnel in a systematic fashion: initially contacting the nursing administration
23
24
25 department; then the hospitalist or Medicine division; then Chief Residents of the
26
27
28 Internal Medicine program (if available); and finally the Chief Nursing Officer of the
29
30
31 hospital. Once an appropriate contact was identified, an anonymous survey email was
32
33
34 sent via the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA)
35
36
37 compliant REDCap web application. After two weeks, a reminder email was sent if the
38
39
40 survey had not been completed.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 To minimise the risk of duplicate surveys being completed, each survey contained a
5
6
7 unique link, and only one valid link was sent to each hospital at a time. All survey
8
9
10 questions had to be completed in order to submit the survey.
11
12
13

14
15
16
17 Statistical comparisons of categorical variables were performed using the Chi squared
18
19
20 test. Data analysis was completed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences
21
22
23
24 (SPSS) version 25.
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 **Patient Involvement:**

32
33
34
35 Neither patients, nor the general public were involved in this research project.
36
37
38
39
40

41 **Results:**

42 43 44 45 46 47 48 *Characteristics of the Study Hospitals:* 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

1
2
3
4 Three hundred and seventy-eight acute care hospitals were identified from the Medicare
5
6
7 database and RRT contacts were identified for 303 of these (80%) using the methods
8
9
10 above. One hundred and seven surveys were completed, the majority from New York
11
12
13 and Pennsylvania, a response rate of 35%. As all questions were mandatory, there
14
15
16
17 were no missing data.
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Out of the hospitals that responded, 59 (55%) reported a university affiliation. All but two
25
26
27 hospitals had an ICU (Table 1). Seventy-two hospitals (67%) had a training program
28
29
30 approved by the ACGME in Internal Medicine, Anaesthesia, or Critical Care.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Characteristics of Participating Hospitals

		n	Percentage
University Affiliation	Yes	59	55%
	No	48	45%
Financial Structure	Private	54	50%
	Public	53	50%
Inpatient Beds	0-500	72	67%
	>500	35	33%
ICU Beds	0	2	2%
	1-20	50	47%
	21-50	31	29%
	>50	24	22%
ACGME Training Program Present	Internal Medicine Residency	69	64%
	Anaesthesia Residency	39	36%
	Critical Care Fellowship	51	48%

Table 1: Characteristics of participating hospitals. ICU: Intensive Care Unit, ACGME: Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education.

RRT Activation Criteria and Availability:

Of the 107 hospitals, 105 had an RRT. One of the two hospitals without an ICU also did not have an RRT. One hundred and four of the 105 RRTs were available 24 hours a

1
2
3 day. RRTs were dispatched by overhead call in 75 hospitals (71%), pager in 71
4
5
6 hospitals (68%) and by phone in 24 hospitals (23%). Over half of the RRTs were called
7
8
9
10 out with more than one modality, the most common of which was a combination of
11
12
13
14 pager and overhead call in 49 hospitals (47%).
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

RRT Characteristics

	Percentage	
	n	e
24h RRT	104	99%
RRT Calling Criteria		
Clinical Concern	100	95%
Vital sign	81	77%
EWS	62	59%
RRT Called Over		
Overhead	75	71%
Pager	71	68%
Phone	24	23%
Pager and Overhead	49	47%
RRT Team Members Change		
Daily	73	70%
Weekly	15	14%
Monthly	4	4%
Rarely	13	12%

1
2
3 Table 2: RRT characteristics, including availability of RRT, activation criteria,
4
5
6
7 mechanism of dispatch, and variation in individual team members. RRT: Rapid
8
9
10 Response Team.
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 ***Membership Turnover:***
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Turnover of the RRT was high, with team members changing daily in 70%. The majority
25
26
27 of hospitals had multiple activation criteria for RRTs, the most common of which were
28
29
30 clinical concern (95%), vital sign abnormalities (77%), and EWS (59%) (Table 2). Less
31
32
33 common activation criteria included family member concern (2%), alcohol withdrawal
34
35
36 scores (1%), falls (1%), and lack of intravenous access (1%). Neither the size of the
37
38
39 hospital nor the size of the ICU was significantly associated with the use of EWS as
40
41
42
43
44
45 activation criteria (p=0.48 and p=0.33 respectively).
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 ***RRT Composition:***
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 RRT composition varied widely with most hospitals having representatives from multiple
5
6
7 disciplines including physicians, nursing management, respiratory therapy and
8
9
10 pharmacy. Respiratory therapists, critical care nurses, physicians and nurse managers
11
12
13 were the most common healthcare professionals to always attend RRTs (89%, 78%,
14
15
16 64%, and 51% respectively) (Figure 1). Sixty-seven hospitals (64%) always had a
17
18
19 physician present in the RRT. Attending physicians were always part of the RRT in 40
20
21
22 hospitals (38%), occasionally present in 56 (53%), and never present in 9 (9%). Critical
23
24
25 care physicians, whether attending or fellow, always attended RRT activations in 20% of
26
27
28 hospitals and never attended in 25%. The size of the hospital was not associated with having
29
30
31 consistent presence of attending physicians or critical care physicians as part of their RRT
32
33
34 (p=0.89 and p=0.30 respectively). The presence of an ACGME training program was not
35
36
37 significantly associated with consistent attending presence at RRTs (p=0.50).
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 ***RRT Leadership:***

46
47
48
49
50
51

52 RRTs were led by an attending physician in 30%, a trainee physician in 41%, a nurse in
53
54
55 12%, and a nurse practitioner or physician assistant (PA) in 10%. The remaining 6%
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 were led by any physician present at the RRT (5%), or an emergency department
4
5
6
7 physician (1%), (Table 3). In 35 out of the 69 hospitals with an ACGME internal
8
9
10 medicine residency (51%), RRTs were led by internal medicine residents, in six of these
11
12
13 hospitals (17%) internal medicine attending physicians also always made up part of the
14
15
16
17 RRT, presumably in a supervisory role.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Team Leader by Specialty

		Rapid Response		Cardiac Arrest	
		n	Percentage	n	Percentage
Internal Medicine	NP/PA	1		5	6%
	Resident	3		33	38%
	Attending	2	21%	18	21%
	Fellow	5	5%	6	7%
Critical Care	Attending	1		17	20%
	Nurse	3	12%	2	2%
Anaesthesia	Resident	0	0%	0	0%
	Attending	0	0%	0	0%

	Family Medicine				
Other	Resident	3	3%	1	1%
	ED Physician	1	1%	1	1%
	Variable				
	Providers	5	5%	4	5%

Table 3: Individual who was reported to usually lead the RRT and cardiac arrest team by specialty and training level. NP: Nurse Practitioner, PA: Physician Assistant, ED: Emergency Department.

Cardiac Arrest Teams:

Eighty seven hospitals (81%) had a dedicated cardiac arrest team. The most common method to call a cardiac arrest team was overhead (91%), followed by pager (68%) and phone (9%). Sixty percent of hospitals used both overhead call and pager.

As with RRTs, membership of cardiac arrest teams varied widely (Figure 2). Senior physicians were slightly more likely to lead cardiac arrests (40% of cardiac arrest teams compared to 31% of RRTs) with critical care attendings leading 20% of cardiac arrest

1
2
3
4 teams compared to 10% of RRTs and nurses leading only 2% of cardiac arrests (Table
5
6
7 3).
8
9

14 Discussion:

20
21 Rapid Response Teams aim to provide rapid deployment of skilled healthcare
22
23
24 professionals to the bedside of a critically unwell patient in order to simultaneously
25
26
27 assess, triage, and intervene to prevent further deterioration. For such an intervention to
28
29
30 be effective, patients must be identified early in their clinical course, correctly diagnosed
31
32
33 and expeditiously treated. While there has been broad adoption of the RRT model,
34
35
36 there is no clear guideline-based “best practices” statement regarding team
37
38
39 composition, dynamics or activation criteria, which may contribute to the variability in the
40
41
42 effectiveness reported by single-centre studies of RRTs. Factors that have been
43
44
45 associated with top performing cardiac arrest teams include team design, team
46
47
48 composition, communication and leadership during cardiac arrest and training of the
49
50
51 cardiac arrest team. ¹⁵
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 We here report the results of the largest study in the USA, demonstrating substantial
8
9
10 inter-hospital variations in the activation, constitution and functioning of RRT and
11
12
13
14 cardiac arrest teams.
15

16
17
18
19
20
21 The choice of activation criteria is paramount to the success of the team. Ideally, such
22
23
24 criteria allow for accurate and early identification of patients while avoiding excessive
25
26
27
28 false alarms. We found that the most commonly used activation criteria were clinical
29
30
31 concern and single vital sign abnormalities. EWS, which are calculated from routinely
32
33
34
35 collected vital signs, are extensively studied and have been shown to outperform single
36
37
38 vital sign abnormalities in predicting adverse clinical outcomes.¹⁶ Introduction of EWS
39
40
41
42 has been associated with reduction in cardiac arrest rates and inpatient mortality.¹⁷⁻²³
43

44
45 Despite the evidence supporting the use of EWS to reduce adverse clinical outcomes,
46
47
48
49 we found that they were only used in 59% of centres in this survey. Broader adoption of
50
51
52 EWS as a trigger for activating RRTs might help in standardising the way deteriorating
53
54
55
56 patients are identified early in their trajectory.
57
58
59

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 Almost all RRTs were available around the clock, however team membership varied
8
9
10 considerably and RRT members changed daily in the vast majority. The effect of
11
12
13 frequent team turnover in RRTs has not been studied, but one-off teams are known to
14
15
16 perform particularly poorly and the beneficial effects of increasing team familiarity are
17
18
19 well described in fields outside of medicine and improved cardiac arrest team
20
21
22 communication has been associated with top-performing cardiac arrest teams.^{15 24 25}
23
24
25
26
27
28 Given this, maintaining a consistent RRT with familiar members may improve team
29
30
31 dynamics. Individual hospital requirements and resources will certainly impact on their
32
33
34 ability to support such a team. An RRT huddle at the beginning of each shift, describing
35
36
37 individual roles and responsibilities, may help to preserve team dynamics and efficient
38
39
40 communication despite this turnover.²⁶
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 One of the appealing features of RRTs is the rapid delivery of skilled healthcare
50
51
52 practitioners and critical care expertise to the bedside, in essence a projection of ICU
53
54
55 level of care to the medical floors. In practice, we found that lack of consistent attending
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 physician presence was commonplace, even in hospitals where RRTs were led by
4
5
6
7 resident physicians with only one to three years of postgraduate experience. Although
8
9
10 some studies have suggested that the addition of an senior critical care physician to the
11
12
13 RRT does not improve mortality,^{27 28} the inclusion of an attending critical care physician
14
15
16 ensures attending supervision of the RRT or cardiac arrest, improves documentation,
17
18
19 and is associated with high survival rates²⁹. We expected that smaller hospitals would
20
21
22 be more stretched for resources and as such less likely have senior physicians at
23
24
25 RRTs, but we did not find any association between the size of hospital, number of ICU
26
27
28 beds, or presence of an ACGME training program and the consistent presence of senior
29
30
31 physicians. The impact of the lack of senior support at these low frequency, high stakes
32
33
34 scenarios may weaken RRT effectiveness and is an area deserving of future research.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Our study has several weaknesses. Firstly and most importantly, it is a survey that was
46
47
48 only completed by a single individual at each hospital. While we made every effort to
49
50
51 ensure that the survey was only completed by one person per hospital and that the
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 person completing the form would be able to do so correctly, we were unable to verify
4
5
6
7 this due to anonymous nature of the survey.
8
9

10
11
12
13
14 Our response rate of 35% is a substantial limitation to the generalisability of our
15
16
17 findings. As the survey was anonymous, we were unable to assess the variation in
18
19
20 location, resources and affiliation between responders and non-responders. It is unclear
21
22
23 whether there was any difference between hospitals who responded and those that did
24
25
26 not, although a lower proportion of small hospitals completed surveys, which limits our
27
28
29 results further. Smaller hospitals may have fewer resources, more limited physician
30
31
32 availability, and a lower number of RRT events when compared to larger hospitals and
33
34
35 factors such as these may affect their approach to the RRT composition and availability.
36
37
38
39
40

41
42
43
44
45 The study included only Medicare-participating hospitals in New York, Pennsylvania,
46
47
48 Rhode Island, Vermont, and New Jersey and our findings cannot necessarily be
49
50
51 extrapolated to the practice of hospitals across the country or internationally. Variation
52
53
54 in RRT and cardiac arrest team composition, as well as activation criteria, has been
55
56
57
58
59

1
2
3 demonstrated in small studies in a number of other countries, suggesting that such
4
5
6
7 variation is not a unique finding, an area of future study for our group³⁰⁻³².
8
9

10
11
12
13
14 When assessing the evidence concerning the clinical impact of RRTs, it is important to
15
16
17 remember that the RRT is only part of the inpatient chain of rescue. For the best
18
19
20
21 outcome and ideal RRT, multiple factors must be met: the team must be called early,
22
23
24 whether by EWS or other track and trigger score; the patient must be diagnosed
25
26
27
28 correctly and managed promptly by experienced clinicians; and the team must work
29
30
31 smoothly and communicate well.
32
33

34 35 36 37 38 **Conclusion:**

39
40
41 RRTs have become almost ubiquitous across the USA, despite the uncertainty of their
42
43
44 impact. As the largest study to date, we have demonstrated considerable heterogeneity
45
46
47 among RRTs and cardiac arrest teams, a factor that likely contributes to the mixed
48
49
50 results seen in studies. Increased use of EWS, optimising team dynamics and ensuring
51
52
53 that trainee team leaders are adequately supported may improve RRT function and
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 patient safety. Individual factors that influence the effectiveness of the RRT, including
4
5
6
7 the importance of leadership, member turnover, and team composition on RRT and
8
9
10 cardiac arrest team outcome. The creation of consensus guidelines regarding RRT and
11
12
13 cardiac arrest team membership could serve to standardise RRT and cardiac arrest
14
15
16
17 team composition and function across the country.
18
19

20
21 **Acknowledgements:** None
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 **Data Sharing Statement:** Data will not be published publicly. Please contact Oscar
29
30
31 Mitchell at oscar.mitchell@nyumc.org if access to the original data is required.
32
33
34
35
36

37 **Author Contributions:**
38
39

40 OM, LE, VM designed the study. OM, CM, JH and VM collected and analysed the data. OM,
41
42
43 CM, JH, LE and VM wrote the manuscript and agree to its submission for publication.
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 All authors were involved in the writing of the manuscript and have drafted, reviewed and
51
52
53 approved the current version. All authors agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work in
54
55
56
57
58
59

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are

appropriately investigated and resolved.

References

1. Institute for Healthcare Improvement. 5 Million Lives campaign 2006 [Available from: <http://www.ihl.org/about/documents/5millionlivescampaigncasestatement.pdf> accessed March 10th 2018 2018.
2. Chan PS, Khalid A, Longmore LS, et al. Hospital-wide code rates and mortality before and after implementation of a rapid response team. *JAMA* 2008;300(21):2506-13. doi: 10.1001/jama.2008.715
3. ANZICS-Core Met dose Investigators, Jones D, Drennan K, et al. Rapid Response Team composition, resourcing and calling criteria in Australia. *Resuscitation* 2012;83(5):563-7. doi: 10.1016/j.resuscitation.2011.10.023
4. Stollendorf DP, Jones CB. Deployment of rapid response teams by 31 hospitals in a statewide collaborative. *Jt Comm J Qual Patient Saf* 2015;41(4):186-91. [published Online First: 2015/05/16]
5. Bellomo R, Goldsmith D, Uchino S, et al. A prospective before-and-after trial of a medical emergency team. *Med J Aust* 2003;179(6):283-7.
6. DeVita MA, Braithwaite RS, Mahidhara R, et al. Use of medical emergency team responses to reduce hospital cardiopulmonary arrests. *Qual Saf Health Care* 2004;13(4):251-4. doi: 10.1136/qhc.13.4.251
7. Buist M, Harrison J, Abaloz E, et al. Six year audit of cardiac arrests and medical emergency team calls in an Australian outer metropolitan teaching hospital. *BMJ* 2007;335(7631):1210-2. doi: 10.1136/bmj.39385.534236.47
8. Dacey MJ, Mirza ER, Wilcox V, et al. The effect of a rapid response team on major clinical outcome measures in a community hospital. *Crit Care Med* 2007;35(9):2076-82.
9. Offner PJ, Heit J, Roberts R. Implementation of a rapid response team decreases cardiac arrest outside of the intensive care unit. *J Trauma* 2007;62(5):1223-7; discussion 27-8. doi: 10.1097/TA.0b013e31804d4968
10. Sharek PJ, Parast LM, Leong K, et al. Effect of a rapid response team on hospital-wide mortality and code rates outside the ICU in a Children's Hospital. *JAMA* 2007;298(19):2267-74. doi: 10.1001/jama.298.19.2267
11. Ludikhuizen J, Brunsveld-Reinders AH, Dijkgraaf MG, et al. Outcomes Associated With the Nationwide Introduction of Rapid Response Systems in The Netherlands. *Crit Care Med* 2015;43(12):2544-51. doi: 10.1097/CCM.0000000000001272
12. Hillman K, Chen J, Cretikos M, et al. Introduction of the medical emergency team (MET) system: a cluster-randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2005;365(9477):2091-7. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(05)66733-5
13. Chan PS, Jain R, Nallmothu BK, et al. Rapid Response Teams: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Arch Intern Med* 2010;170(1):18-26. doi: 10.1001/archinternmed.2009.424
14. Edelson DP, Yuen TC, Mancini ME, et al. Hospital cardiac arrest resuscitation practice in the United States: a nationally representative survey. *J Hosp Med* 2014;9(6):353-7. doi: 10.1002/jhm.2174 [published Online First: 2014/02/20]
15. Nallmothu BK, Guetterman TC, Harrod M, et al. How Do Resuscitation Teams at Top-Performing Hospitals for In-Hospital Cardiac Arrest Succeed? A Qualitative Study. *Circulation* 2018;138(2):154-63. doi: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.118.033674

16. Jarvis S, Kovacs C, Briggs J, et al. Aggregate National Early Warning Score (NEWS) values are more important than high scores for a single vital signs parameter for discriminating the risk of adverse outcomes. *Resuscitation* 2015;87:75-80. doi: 10.1016/j.resuscitation.2014.11.014 [published Online First: 2014/11/30]
17. Gardner-Thorpe J, Love N, Wrightson J, et al. The value of Modified Early Warning Score (MEWS) in surgical in-patients: a prospective observational study. *Ann R Coll Surg Engl* 2006;88(6):571-5. doi: 10.1308/003588406X130615
18. Paterson R, MacLeod DC, Thetford D, et al. Prediction of in-hospital mortality and length of stay using an early warning scoring system: clinical audit. *Clin Med (Lond)* 2006;6(3):281-4.
19. Groarke JD, Gallagher J, Stack J, et al. Use of an admission early warning score to predict patient morbidity and mortality and treatment success. *Emerg Med J* 2008;25(12):803-6. doi: 10.1136/emj.2007.051425
20. Cei M, Bartolomei C, Mumoli N. In-hospital mortality and morbidity of elderly medical patients can be predicted at admission by the Modified Early Warning Score: a prospective study. *Int J Clin Pract* 2009;63(4):591-5. doi: 10.1111/j.1742-1241.2008.01986.x
21. Maupin JM, Roth DJ, Krapes JM. Use of the Modified Early Warning Score decreases code blue events. *Jt Comm J Qual Patient Saf* 2009;35(12):598-603.
22. Moon A, Cosgrove JF, Lea D, et al. An eight year audit before and after the introduction of modified early warning score (MEWS) charts, of patients admitted to a tertiary referral intensive care unit after CPR. *Resuscitation* 2011;82(2):150-4. doi: 10.1016/j.resuscitation.2010.09.480
23. Nishijima I, Oyadomari S, Maedomari S, et al. Use of a modified early warning score system to reduce the rate of in-hospital cardiac arrest. *J Intensive Care* 2016;4:12. doi: 10.1186/s40560-016-0134-7
24. Harrison DJ, Mohammed S, McGrath JE, et al. Time matters in team performance: Effects of member familiarity, entrainment, and task discontinuity on speed and quality. *Personnel Psychology* 2003;56(3):633-69.
25. Huckman RS, Staats BR, Upton DM. Team familiarity, role experience, and performance: Evidence from Indian software services. *Management Science* 2009;55(1):85-100.
26. Shapiro J, Venkata A, Ochieng P, et al. The Emergency Department to ICU Quality and Safety Project Formal Handoff/Huddle to Improve Care. 43rd Annual Critical Care Congress, 2013.
27. Karvellas CJ, de Souza IA, Gibney RT, et al. Association between implementation of an intensivist-led medical emergency team and mortality. *BMJ Qual Saf* 2012;21(2):152-9. doi: 10.1136/bmjqs-2011-000393
28. Morris DS, Schweickert W, Holena D, et al. Differences in outcomes between ICU attending and senior resident physician led medical emergency team responses. *Resuscitation* 2012;83(12):1434-7. doi: 10.1016/j.resuscitation.2012.07.017
29. Romig M, Duval-Arnould J, Winters BD, et al. Intensivist Presence at Code Events Is Associated with High Survival and Increased Documentation Rates. *Crit Care Clin* 2018;34(2):259-66. doi: 10.1016/j.ccc.2017.12.009
30. Psirides A, Hill J, Hurford S. A review of rapid response team activation parameters in New Zealand hospitals. *Resuscitation* 2013;84(8):1040-4. doi: 10.1016/j.resuscitation.2013.01.022 [published Online First: 2013/02/05]

- 1
2
3 31. Tirkkonen J, Nurmi J, Olkkola KT, et al. Cardiac arrest teams and medical emergency teams
4 in Finland: a nationwide cross-sectional postal survey. *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand*
5 2014;58(4):420-7. doi: 10.1111/aas.12280 [published Online First: 2014/02/28]
6
7 32. Lauridsen KG, Schmidt AS, Adelborg K, et al. Organisation of in-hospital cardiac arrest
8 teams - a nationwide study. *Resuscitation* 2015;89:123-8. doi:
9 10.1016/j.resuscitation.2015.01.014 [published Online First: 2015/01/27]
10
11
12
13
14

15 **Legends to Figures:**
16
17
18
19

20 **Figure 1: Composition of RRTs by specialty.**
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 **Figure 2: Composition of cardiac arrest teams by specialty.**
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 1: Composition of RRTs by specialty.




Figure 2: Composition of cardiac arrest teams by speciality.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1. Hospital affiliation (select one):
University affiliated
Non-university affiliated
2. State:
3. Financial structure (select one)
Private
Public
Veteran's Affairs
4. Number of inpatient beds
0-100
100-500
>500
5. Number of ICU beds in your hospital
0
1-20
21-50
>50
6. ACGME Internal Medicine Residency Program Yes/No
7. ACGME Critical Care Fellowship Program Yes/No
8. ACGME Anaesthesiology Residency Program Yes/No
9. Does your hospital have a rapid response team (RRT)? Yes/No
10. Is your RRT available 24 hours a day? Yes/No
11. How are RRTs called at your hospital?
Pager
Overhead call
Phone
Other
12. If other, how are RRTs called at your hospital?

- 1
2
3
4 13. Who is usually responsible for leading RRTs? NP/PA
5 Internal medicine resident
6 Internal medicine attending
7
8 Critical care fellow
9
10 Critical care attending
11
12 Critical care nursing
13
14 Anaesthesia resident
15
16 Anaesthesia attending
17
18 Other
19
20 14. If other, who is usually responsible for leading RRTs at your hospital?
21
22
23 15. What parameters can result in a RRT being called? Early warning score (NEWS, MEWS
24 etc)
25
26 Single vital sign abnormality (eg HR,
27 RR etc)
28
29 Clinical concern
30
31 Other
32
33
34 16. If other, what parameters can results in an RRT being called at your hospital?
35
36
37 17. Members of the RRT usually change: Daily
38 Weekly
39 Monthly
40 Rarely
41
42
43
44 18-29. Who is present at RRT's? Always, Sometimes, Never
45
46
47 Nurse Practitioner
48
49 Physician Assistant
50
51 Internal Medicine Resident
52
53 Internal Medicine Attending
54
55 Anaesthesia Resident
56
57 Anaesthesia Attending
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Critical Care Fellow
Critical Care Attending
Critical Care Nurse
Nurse Manager
Respiratory Therapist
Pharmacist

30. Does your hospital have a cardiac arrest team?

31. How are cardiac arrests called at your hospital?

Pager
Overhead call
Phone
Other

32. If other, how are cardiac arrests called at your hospital?

33. Who is usually responsible for leading cardiac arrests? NP/PA

Internal medicine resident
Internal medicine attending
Critical care fellow
Critical care attending
Critical care nursing
Anaesthesia resident
Anaesthesia attending
Other

34. If other, who is responsible for leading cardiac arrests at your hospital?

35-46. Who is present at cardiac arrests? Always, Sometimes, Never

Nurse Practitioner
Physician Assistant
Internal Medicine Resident
Internal Medicine Attending

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Anaesthesia Resident
Anaesthesia Attending
Critical Care Fellow
Critical Care Attending
Critical Care Nurse
Nurse Manager
Respiratory Therapist
Pharmacist

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies*

	Item No	Recommendation
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract X p.1
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found X p.2-3
Introduction		
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported X p. 4-5
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses X p.5
Methods		
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper X p.5-6
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection X p.5-6
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants X p.5-6
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable X p.5
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group X All data was derived from the surveys
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias X p.6
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at X p.7
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why NA
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding p.6
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions NA
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed p.7
		(d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy NA
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses NA

Results		
Participants	13*	Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed X p.7 (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage NA (c) Consider use of a flow diagram NA
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders X Table 1 on page 8 (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest NA
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures X Tables 2 and 3 and pages 7-13
Main results	16	Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included NA (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized NA (c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period NA
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses NA
Discussion		
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives p.14-16
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias p.15-16
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence p.15-16
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results p.16
Other information		
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based NA

*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

1
2 **Note:** An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and
3 published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely
4 available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at
5 <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is
6 available at www.strobe-statement.org.
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60