

National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence

CG50: Acutely ill patients in hospital  
Guideline Review Consultation Comments Table  
8-21 November 2010

Stakeholder	Agree?	Comments	Comments on areas excluded from original scope	Comments on equality issues
British Thoracic Society	Yes			
Mid Yorkshire Hospitals NHS Trust	Yes			
City Hospitals Sunderland	No	With regard to clinical areas 1 & 2 (re Track and Trigger systems), there is no mention of the proposed NEWS (Royal College of Physicians). Although I don't believe this has "gone live" as yet, I thought it would be worthy of mention as I believe it is coming out soon(?). I would like to see what NICE will be recommending in term of it's use included in this review document.		
GDG member	No	<p>Clinical area 1: Are there any parameters in addition to those considered in the guideline (heart rate, respiratory rate, systolic BP, levels of consciousness, oxygen saturation and temperature)?</p> <p>Clinical area 2 suggests that "...currently there is still no direct comparative study on the accuracy of different systems..."</p> <p>Ref: Prytherch D, Smith GB, Schmidt PE,</p>	<p>It would be helpful if the guidelines included recommendations regarding the use of a standardised method of communicating patient deterioration (e.g., RSVP or SBAR) between staff.</p> <p>References:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Featherstone P, Chalmers T, Smith GB. RSVP: a system for communication of deterioration in hospital patients. Br J Nurs.</li> </ol>	

**PLEASE NOTE:** Comments received in the course of consultations carried out by the Institute are published in the interests of openness and transparency, and to promote understanding of how recommendations are developed. The comments are published as a record of the submissions that the Institute has received, and are not endorsed by the Institute, its officers or advisory committees.

Stakeholder	Agree?	Comments	Comments on areas excluded from original scope	Comments on equality issues
		<p>Featherstone PI. ViEWS - towards a national Early Warning Score for detecting adult inpatient deterioration. Resuscitation 2010; 81: 932–937.</p> <p>A new paper-based, Early Warning Score (ViEWS) was compared with 33 published others using the same database of vital signs [n = 198,755 observation sets collected from 35,585 consecutive, completed acute medical admissions] and mortality at a specified periods after vital signs measurement (ranging from 12 to 120 hours after EWS measurement). EWS performance was measured using the area under the receiver-operating characteristics (AUROC) curve. ViEWS performed better than the 33 other EWSs for all outcomes tested.</p> <p>The AUROC (95% CI) for ViEWS using in-hospital mortality with 24 h of the observation set was 0.888 (0.880–0.895). The AUROCs (95% CI) for the 33 other EWSs tested using the same outcome ranged from 0.803 (0.792–0.815) to 0.850 (0.841–0.859).</p> <p>ViEWS was designed by including all six of the essential vital signs recommended by NICE (HR, RR, sBP, conscious level, SpO2, Temperature) but also includes fractional inspired oxygen concentration (FiO2).</p>	<p>2008;17:860-864. Thomas CM, Bertram E, Johnson D. The SBAR communication technique: teaching nursing students professional communication skills. Nurse Educ. 2009;34:176-180.</p>	
South Wales Critical Care Network	Yes			

**PLEASE NOTE:** Comments received in the course of consultations carried out by the Institute are published in the interests of openness and transparency, and to promote understanding of how recommendations are developed. The comments are published as a record of the submissions that the Institute has received, and are not endorsed by the Institute, its officers or advisory committees.

Stakeholder	Agree?	Comments	Comments on areas excluded from original scope	Comments on equality issues
Royal College of Physicians	Yes	The Royal College of Physicians is grateful for the opportunity to comment on the review proposal. We agree that presently there is insufficient evidence to warrant an update and believe that more studies are required. The RCP is particularly interested in the delivery of acute care in hospitals and has started several work-streams relevant to the guidance. We are collecting data likely to be helpful in the next reconfiguration of the guidelines and would be pleased to contribute more directly at a relevant juncture. Please feel free to make contact about this.		
Obstetric Anaesthetists' Association	No		<p>Pregnant women have different physiology to non-pregnant, and also have particular diseases e.g. pre-eclampsia. This is of importance when using EWS charts as the thresholds for physiological values triggering an alert may need to be altered.</p> <p>This has been discussed by Swanton et al. A national survey of obstetric early warning systems in the UK. <i>Int J Obstet Anesth</i> 2009;18:253-7.</p> <p>Several abstracts have also been published investigating the performance of EWS charts in obstetrics: Kodikara &amp; McGlennan <i>Int J Obstet</i></p>	

**PLEASE NOTE:** Comments received in the course of consultations carried out by the Institute are published in the interests of openness and transparency, and to promote understanding of how recommendations are developed. The comments are published as a record of the submissions that the Institute has received, and are not endorsed by the Institute, its officers or advisory committees.

Stakeholder	Agree?	Comments	Comments on areas excluded from original scope	Comments on equality issues
			<p>Anesth 2009;18:S9  Tufail et al Int J Obstet Anesth 2009;18:S20  Singh &amp; McGlennan Int J Obstet Anesth 2010;19:S7  Treadgold &amp; Collis Int J Obstet Anesth 2010;19:S9  Allman et al Int J Obstet Anesth 2010;19:S11  O'Connor &amp; Reid Int J Obstet Anesth 2010;19:S12</p>	
Intensive Care Society's Patient Liaison Committee (CritPal)	No	<p>CritPal welcomes the review but is concerned that there is not any proposal to review the effectiveness of the Guideline and its implementation. We know from patients' and relatives' reports that patients continue to receive less than optimal treatment on the acute wards following transfer from intensive care. Possibly, because this is a complex area requiring fundamental changes and rethinking of clinical practice, the Guideline should be reviewed in again in two years' time.</p> <p>We also think that a review in two years would be appropriate because the work being done by the RCP on NEWS will have been trialled and views formed about NEWS.</p>		
British Association of Dermatologists	Yes			

**PLEASE NOTE:** Comments received in the course of consultations carried out by the Institute are published in the interests of openness and transparency, and to promote understanding of how recommendations are developed. The comments are published as a record of the submissions that the Institute has received, and are not endorsed by the Institute, its officers or advisory committees.

Stakeholder	Agree?	Comments	Comments on areas excluded from original scope	Comments on equality issues
University College London Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust	Yes	<p>YES, although dissemination and implementation would be aided by some additional points as below.</p> <p>1) The Royal College of Physicians is about to publish a recommended national/NHS early warning scoring system, probably based on the Prytherch DR 2010 'ViEWS' paper in Resuscitation 2010; 81(8):932-7. The suggested system area under the receiver-operating characteristics curve (95% CI) using mortality with 24h of the observation set was 0.888 in this analysis. It is our view that this is a level of sensitivity and specificity which is worthy of endorsement.</p> <p>2) The Jones D, Bellomo R, DeVita MA review paper 'Effectiveness of the Medical Emergency Team: the importance of dose' in Crit Care 2009; 13(5):313; highlights that there needs to be a sufficient level of activity of critical care outreach to make a significant difference; e.g., there is an inverse correlation between the number of calls to outreach and number of cardiac arrests.</p> <p>3) The NIHR Service Delivery and Organisation funded 'Evaluation of outreach services in critical care' (<a href="http://www.sdo.nihr.ac.uk/files/project/74-final-report.pdf">http://www.sdo.nihr.ac.uk/files/project/74-final-report.pdf</a>) found that "Patients with CCOS visit(s) post-discharge from the critical care unit, when matched by patient characteristics or propensity score, were most associated with decreased hospital mortality and decreased post-critical care unit, hospital length of stay. The</p>		

**PLEASE NOTE:** Comments received in the course of consultations carried out by the Institute are published in the interests of openness and transparency, and to promote understanding of how recommendations are developed. The comments are published as a record of the submissions that the Institute has received, and are not endorsed by the Institute, its officers or advisory committees.

Stakeholder	Agree?	Comments	Comments on areas excluded from original scope	Comments on equality issues
		<p>difference in mean total cost per patient between patients receiving CCOS visit(s)) post-discharge and matched controls ranged from - £ 289 to- £ 34. Though not statistically significant, the differences indicated a high probability that CCOS visits following discharge from critical care were cost effective, regardless of willingness to pay.</p> <p>4) We note that the nature of the response to acute illness remains very variable. The DoH 2009 framework of competencies for recognising and responding to acutely ill patients in hospital was largely developed to support NICE CG50, and again is worthy of endorsement and reinforcement.</p>		
Resuscitation Council (UK)	Yes			
British Association of Critical Care Nurses	Yes			
NIHR Kings' Patient Safety & Service Quality Research Centre, Kings' College London	Yes		<p>Our ethnographic study using standard methods (observations, semi-structured interviews, documentary review and analysis of routine data) explored how safety tools and technologies were used in practice in two inner city NHS Trusts. This research highlights a number of issues relevant to the implementation of CG50:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research to date has focused on the effectiveness</li> </ul>	

**PLEASE NOTE:** Comments received in the course of consultations carried out by the Institute are published in the interests of openness and transparency, and to promote understanding of how recommendations are developed. The comments are published as a record of the submissions that the Institute has received, and are not endorsed by the Institute, its officers or advisory committees.

Stakeholder	Agree?	Comments	Comments on areas excluded from original scope	Comments on equality issues
			<p>of <i>individual</i> safety tools and systems such as track and trigger, intelligent assessment technologies and outreach services. Our findings illustrate the hidden mediation work that goes on to ensure these tools and technologies 'perform' in practice and their <i>collective</i> usefulness in shaping understandings of deterioration and triggering behaviour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whilst the tools and technologies enhanced safety, there were additional <i>unintended</i> consequences (e.g. inattention to markers outside EWS.) Intra- and interprofessional tension also resulted from different understandings and applications of the tools and technologies.</li> </ul> <p>We therefore recommend that the guideline needs to add in the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tools and technologies, designed to work at different stages of the acutely ill pathway, work synergistically</li> </ul>	

**PLEASE NOTE:** Comments received in the course of consultations carried out by the Institute are published in the interests of openness and transparency, and to promote understanding of how recommendations are developed. The comments are published as a record of the submissions that the Institute has received, and are not endorsed by the Institute, its officers or advisory committees.

Stakeholder	Agree?	Comments	Comments on areas excluded from original scope	Comments on equality issues
			<p>to improve recognition and response behaviour. Trusts need to ensure they offer a comprehensive response system which addresses all of the following: crisis detection and calling for help, crisis response, and a quality improvement and governance structure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The tools and technologies need to be embedded within a flexible, adaptive approach to improving safety for the acutely ill patient. This needs to move away from a model of dependence on technologies and preoccupation with finding the 'perfect tool' to an approach which focuses on understanding <i>how</i> to gain the most out of each tool or system and to value staff's role in risk assessing, monitoring and escalating acutely ill patients. Education and training efforts must focus on building an understanding that the value of a safety tool is contingent on the 'craft' of the person using it.</li> </ul>	

**PLEASE NOTE:** Comments received in the course of consultations carried out by the Institute are published in the interests of openness and transparency, and to promote understanding of how recommendations are developed. The comments are published as a record of the submissions that the Institute has received, and are not endorsed by the Institute, its officers or advisory committees.

Stakeholder	Agree?	Comments	Comments on areas excluded from original scope	Comments on equality issues
			We are finalising a paper for the BMJ for submission in December 2010	
Surrey and Sussex Healthcare NHS Trust	Yes		The effectiveness of critical care outreach is difficult to quantify in monetary point of view and impact on morbidity and mortality but the unmeasured attribute of quality of care has not been measured and studied. I think this is an important but difficult facet to measure of the critical care outreach service.	

**PLEASE NOTE:** Comments received in the course of consultations carried out by the Institute are published in the interests of openness and transparency, and to promote understanding of how recommendations are developed. The comments are published as a record of the submissions that the Institute has received, and are not endorsed by the Institute, its officers or advisory committees.

These organisations were approached but did not respond:

5 Boroughs Partnership NHS Trust  
Age UK  
Aintree University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust  
Airedale Acute Trust  
Aksys Healthcare Ltd  
Association for Clinical Biochemistry  
Association for Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy in the NHS (APP)  
Association of Clinical Biochemists, The  
Association of Medical Microbiologists  
Avon, Gloucestershire & Wiltshire Cardiac Network  
Barking Havering & Redbridge Acute Trust  
Barnet & Chase Farm Hospitals Trust  
Barnsley PCT  
Bedford Hospital NHS Trust  
Birmingham City University  
Bolton Council  
Bolton Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust  
Bradford & Airedale PCT  
Bradford Hospitals NHS Trust  
British Association for Counselling and Psychotherapy  
British Association of Art Therapists  
British Association of Stroke Physicians (BASP)  
British Dietetic Association  
British Geriatrics Society  
British Heart Foundation  
British Infection Society  
British National Formulary (BNF)  
British Orthopaedic Association  
British Psychological Society, The  
British Renal Society  
British Society of Interventional Radiology  
British Thoracic Society  
Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College  
Calderdale PCT  
Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (Addenbrookes)  
Cardiff and Vale NHS Trust  
Care Quality Commission (CQC)  
Central North West London NHS Trust  
Chartered Society of Physiotherapy (CSP)  
Clatterbridge Centre for Oncology NHS Trust  
Clinical Practice Research Unit  
College of Emergency Medicine  
College of Emergency Medicine  
Connecting for Health

**PLEASE NOTE: Comments received in the course of consultations carried out by the Institute are published in the interests of openness and transparency, and to promote understanding of how recommendations are developed. The comments are published as a record of the submissions that the Institute has received, and are not endorsed by the Institute, its officers or advisory committees.**

ConvaTec  
Cornwall & Isles of Scilly PCT  
Coventry and Warwickshire Cardiac Network  
Department of Health  
Department of Health Advisory Committee on Antimicrobial  
Resistance and Healthcare Associated Infection (ARHAI)  
Doncaster & Bassetlaw Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust  
Dudley Group of Hospitals NHS Trust  
East and North Herts NHS Trust  
East Kent Hospitals University Foundation Trust  
Faculty of Intensive Care Medicine  
General Chiropractic Council  
General Osteopathic Council  
Gloucestershire Acute Trust  
Good Hope Hospitals NHS Trust  
Greater Manchester Critical Care Network  
Guys and St Thomas NHS Foundation Trust  
Hampshire PCT  
Health and Safety Executive  
Heatherwood and Wexham Park Hospitals Trust  
Herts & Beds Critical Care Network  
Home Office  
Humber NHS Foundation Trust  
ICUsteps  
Institute of biomedical Science  
Intensive Care National Audit & Research Centre (ICNARC)  
James Whale Fund for Kidney Cancer  
Kent & Sussex Hospital  
Kidney Research UK  
Lancashire Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust  
Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust  
LEO pharma  
Leukaemia CARE  
Liverpool John Moores University  
LNR Cardiac Network  
London Clinic, The  
London Network of Nurses & Midwives Critical Care Group  
Lundbeck Ltd  
Luton & Dunstable Hospital NHS Foundation Trust  
Maidstone and Tunbridge Wells NHS Trust  
Manchester Children's Hospital Trust  
Manchester Royal Infirmary  
Meat & Livestock Commission  
Medicines and Healthcare Products Regulatory Agency  
(MHRA)  
Medway NHS Foundation Trust  
Mental Health Act Commission  
Mid Staffordshire General Hospitals NHS Trust  
Mid Trent Critical Care Network

**PLEASE NOTE: Comments received in the course of consultations carried out by the Institute are published in the interests of openness and transparency, and to promote understanding of how recommendations are developed. The comments are published as a record of the submissions that the Institute has received, and are not endorsed by the Institute, its officers or advisory committees.**

National Outreach Forum  
National Patient Safety Agency (NPSA)  
National Public Health Service for Wales  
National Treatment Agency for Substance Misuse  
Newcastle Upon Tyne Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust  
Newcastle Upon Tyne Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust  
NHS Calderdale - substance misuse commissioning programme  
NHS Direct  
NHS Oxfordshire  
NHS Plus  
NHS Quality Improvement Scotland  
NHS Sheffield  
Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital NHS Trust  
North Cumbria Hospitals NHS Trust  
North East & Cumbria Critical Care Network  
North East London Cancer Network  
North Middlesex University Hospital NHS Trust  
North Tees & Hartlepool NHS Foundation Trust  
North Trent Critical Care Network  
North West London Critical Care Network  
North West Midlands Critical Care Network  
North West Wales NHS Trust  
Northumbria Acute Trust  
Nottingham City Hospital  
Nutricia Ltd (UK)  
Nutrition Society  
Outreach Nurses in Kent (ONIK)  
Oxford Radcliffe Hospitals NHS Trust  
Oxfordshire & Buckinghamshire Mental Health Partnership NHS Trust  
Pancreatic Cancer UK  
Peninsula Clinical Managed Cardiac Network  
Pennine Acute Hospitals NHS Trust  
PERIGON Healthcare Ltd  
Pfizer Limited  
Queens Hospital NHS Trust (Burton upon Trent)  
Renal Association  
Rotherham Acute Trust  
Royal Berkshire NHS Foundation Trust  
Royal Brompton & Harefield NHS Foundation Trust  
Royal College of Nursing  
Royal College of Pathologists  
Royal College of Physicians Edinburgh  
Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists  
Royal Hospitals  
Royal Liverpool and Broadgreen University Hospitals NHS Trust  
Royal Shrewsbury Hospital NHS Trust

**PLEASE NOTE: Comments received in the course of consultations carried out by the Institute are published in the interests of openness and transparency, and to promote understanding of how recommendations are developed. The comments are published as a record of the submissions that the Institute has received, and are not endorsed by the Institute, its officers or advisory committees.**

Royal United Hospital Bath NHS Trust  
Royal Wolverhampton NHS  
Sacyl  
Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelines Network (SIGN)  
Sheffield PCT  
Shrewsbury & Telford Hospital NHS Trust  
Siemens Medical Solutions Diagnostics  
Social Care Institute for Excellence (SCIE)  
Society and College of Radiographers  
Society for Acute Medicine  
Society of British Neurological Surgeons  
Society of Vascular Nurses  
South East London Cardiac Network  
South Manchester University Hospitals NHS Trust  
South Tees Hospitals NHS Trust  
Southport & Ormskirk Hospital NHS Trust  
St Helens & Knowsley NHS Trust  
Surrey Wide Critical Care Network  
Sussex Critical Care Network  
Teenagers and Young Adults with Cancer (TYAC)  
Tees Esk & Wear Valleys NHS Trust  
Tees Valley and South Durham Critical Care Network  
Thames Valley Critical Care Network  
The Royal Society of Medicine  
UCLH NHS Foundation Trust  
UK Clinical Pharmacy Association  
United Lincolnshire Hospitals NHS Trust  
University Hospital Aintree  
University Hospital of North Staffordshire Acute Trust  
University Hospitals Coventry & Warwickshire NHS Trust  
University of North Durham  
Urgent Care Board  
Walton Centre for Neurology and Neurosurgery NHS Trust  
Welsh Assembly Government  
Welsh Scientific Advisory Committee (WSAC)  
Western Cheshire Primary Care Trust  
Whipps Cross University Hospital NHS Trust  
Wirral Hospital Acute Trust  
Worcestershire Acute Hospitals NHS Trust  
York NHS Foundation Trust

**PLEASE NOTE: Comments received in the course of consultations carried out by the Institute are published in the interests of openness and transparency, and to promote understanding of how recommendations are developed. The comments are published as a record of the submissions that the Institute has received, and are not endorsed by the Institute, its officers or advisory committees.**