medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.15.20194910; this version posted September 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Implementation of the Maternal Early Warning Criteria during early postpartum. A prospective observational study.

(Short title: Implementation MEWC during early postpartum)

Cristina Ibáñez-Lorente[a], Rubén Casans-Francés[b], Soledad Bellas-Cotán[a], Luis E. Muñoz-Alameda[a].

[a]: Department of Anesthesia, Hospital Universitario Fundación Jiménez Díaz, Madrid, Spain.

[B]: Department of Anesthesia, Hospital Universitario Infanta Elena, Valdemoro, Madrid, Spain.

Corresponding author: Cristina Ibáñez Lorente

Postal address: Hospital Universitario Fundación Jiménez Díaz

Servicio de Anestesiología

Av. Reyes Católicos 2,

28040 Madrid, Spain.

Email: cristinaibanez21@hotmail.com

Phone number: +34 625077419

Conflict of interest: The authors have no conflict of interest concerning this manuscript.

Funding: The authors did not receive public or private funds for the realization of this manuscript.

Level of authorship: Studio design: SBC, IM, LEMA. Studio execution: SBC, CI. Statistical analysis: RCF. First draft: SBC, RCF, Final Draft: SBC, RCF, LEMA.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.15.20194910; this version posted September 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

ABSTRACT

Objective: To evaluate the implementation of an early warning system in obstetric patients (MEWC) during the first two hours after delivery in a tertiary-care hospital.

Method: The MEWC system implementation was carried out from 15th March to 15th September 2018, over 1166 patients. The parameters collected were systolic and diastolic blood pressure, heart rate, oxygen saturation, diuresis, uterine involution, and bleeding. A trigger was defined as any abnormal parameter that prompted the need for bedside examination by an obstetrician and an anesthesiologist. We carried out a sensitivity-specificity study of the trigger and multivariate analysis of the factors involved in developing potentially fatal disorders (PFD), reintervention, critical care admission and stay.

Results: The protocol was triggered in 75 patients (6.43%). The leading cause of alarm activation was altered systolic blood pressure (32 [42.7%] patients), followed by obstetric causes (24 [32%] patients). Of these patients, eleven developed PFD. Twenty-eight patients were false-negatives. Sensitivity and specificity of MEWC protocol were 0.28 (0.15, 0.45) and 0.94 (0.93, 0.96), respectively. Multivariate analysis showed a relationship between alarm activation and PFD.

Conclusions: Our MEWC protocol presented low sensitivity and high specificity, having a significant number of false-negative patients.

Keywords: Pregnancy, Morbidity, Warning system, Obstetric labor complications, Risk management

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.15.20194910; this version posted September 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Introduction

Lowering morbidity and mortality in the obstetric patient continues to be a quality-of-care criterion for healthcare centres. The development over the few decades shows a remarkable improvement in healthcare indicators in this population group[1]. Although mortality rates are very low for developed countries, the impact is high, both for the social repercussion that it involves and the years of life lost.

One of the approaches to reduce maternal morbidity and mortality has been using tools that would enable the rapid identification of patients who would benefit most from an aggressive intervention or a higher level of care. In December 2007, a review on maternal mortality concluded that 40-50% of the UK's mortality rates are preventable. However, the early warning signs were often not recognized.[2] Since then, most UK hospitals have adopted Maternity Early Obstetric Warning Criteria (MEWS) protocols, with these being an auditable quality criterion for the centres[3,4].

Unfortunately, the implementation of these protocols is not universal, and its use is not common practice outside English-speaking countries. Furthermore, although the adoption of these protocols has shown an improvement in the quality of assistance to pregnant women and the detection of adverse effects, it has not shown any impact on reducing maternal mortality[5].

This study aims to evaluate the usefulness and feasibility of implementing a modified obstetric early warning system in our centre and studying its possible relationship with the detection and identification of adverse effects on the mother.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.15.20194910; this version posted September 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Methods

This study analyses the implementation of a MEWC protocol on a tertiary-care hospital (Hospital Fundación Jiménez Díaz, Madrid, Spain). We designed a single-arm prospective cohort study developed during the first six months after implementing the protocol between 15th March and 15th September 2018. Our centre's ethics committee approved our research before the start of patient recruitment (Date of Approval: 12th March 2018, Code: FJD-MEOWS-17-01. Supplementary File 1, original in Spanish). This study followed the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) reporting guideline for cohort studies[6].

After receiving informed consent, we included every patient undergoing eutocic or cesarean delivery consecutively, except those who refused the study's inclusion. Given our research's nature, we were unable to make a formal calculation of the required sample size, as the sample would depend directly on the number of births during the six-month study period. However, knowing from previous studies that the incidence of maternal morbidity in our environment was 5%[7] and that in previous semesters, the number of births in the hospital was around one thousand. We estimated that our study would have a precision of ±1.4%.

Procedures

We designed our centre's MEWC protocol based on the one described by Mhyre et al.[8] that included the monitoring of systolic and diastolic blood pressure, heart and respiratory rate, oxygen saturation and diuresis at 10, 30, 60, 90 and 120 minutes. By consensus between the departments of anesthesia and obstetrics, we removed respiratory rate monitoring from the protocol. We included the measurement of uterine involution, diuresis, and any bleeding greater than 500 ml. The data collection form can be seen in Supplementary File 2.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.15.20194910; this version posted September 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Two months before the start of implementation, we provided training sessions on the usefulness of the MEWC protocols and the process of implementing them in our hospital to professionals from both services, including midwives. After implementing the protocol, nurses and midwives monitored patients for 2 hours after giving birth or undergoing a cesarean delivery by filling in the data form, either in the delivery room or in the PACU. They also collected data on age, previous parity, maternal diabetes, preeclampsia and multiple births as possible risk factors. For each variable in the protocol, specific values obliged the midwives to call the obstetricians if they were exceeded, who had to assess the patient within 15 minutes. If the trigger were not resolved, the obstetrician would make a second call to the anesthesiologists. Independently of the form's data collection, the anesthesiologists followed all patients who had given birth up until discharge.

Outcomes

The primary outcome of our study was the rate of potential fatal disorder (PFD) during the stay, defined as one of the following criteria: access to a critical care unit (CCU), surgery within two hours of delivery, or length of stay of more than seven days depending on the activation of the alert[9]. As secondary outcomes, we measured the alert activation relation on each of the PFD criteria separately.

Statistical analysis

We used R v3.6.3 (The R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria), and RStudio 1.2.5033 (RStudio PBC, Boston, USA) to perform statistical analysis. We analyzed outcomes depending on whether the alarm was activated or not. We described discrete and continuous variables as number and percentage and median (interquartile range [IQR]), and their differences analyzed using the Pearson test or the Wilcoxon rank-sum tests.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.15.20194910; this version posted September 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

We calculated the sensitivity, specificity, positive and negative predictive value (PPV and NPV) of alert activation for PFD and each criterion separately, with a 95% confidence interval. We performed a multivariate logistic analysis to study the association of PFD, access to CCU, and reintervention with alarm activation, clinical and demographic data, presenting the results in forest plots as odds ratio with 95% confidence interval. We used Cox regression for multivariate analysis of length of stay, showing the results in forest plot as a hazard ratio with 95% confidence interval. To avoid errors by multiple comparisons, we calculated the respective q-value for each p-value to maintain a false discovery rate below 5%[10]. We considered comparisons in which p-value and q-value were below .05 as being statistically significant.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.15.20194910; this version posted September 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Results

We identified 1169 eligible patients, of which three declined to participate in the study. Since there were no losses to follow-up, we included 1166 patients in the study. Figure 1 shows the STROBE flow chart.

The patients had a median age of 34 (31-37) years, were mainly primiparous (median of previous births: 0 (0-1)) and had a rate of cesarean delivery and instrumental delivery of 23.2% and 15.1%, respectively. The protocol alarm was activated in 75 patients (6.43%). The leading cause of alarm activation was altered systolic blood pressure (32 [42.7%] patients), followed by obstetric causes (24 [32%] patients). The median time of alarm activation, obstetric assessment, call to the anesthesiologist, and anesthetic assessment was 10, 11, 15, and 20 minutes from the start of postpartum monitoring (Table 1).

Table 2 shows the demographic data and the outcome results according to MEWC protocol activation. The cohort of subjects with an activated alarm had a higher rate of cesarean delivery (37.3% vs 22.3%, $p = 0.005$), preeclampsia (17.3% vs 4.8%, $p < 0.001$), and multiple birth (6.7% vs 1.5%). Also, the PFD rate was higher (14.7% vs 2.6%, $p < 0.001$), as was the CCU admission rate (12% vs 0.8%, $p < 0.001$) and length of stay (median: 2.9 [2.3-3.6 vs 2.5 [2.1-3.1] days).

Table 3 shows the sensitivity and specificity of the protocol. Our adapted MEWC had a sensitivity of 0.28 (0.15, 0.45), a specificity of 0.94 (0.93, 0.96), a positive predictive value of 0.15 (0.08-0.25) and a negative predictive value of 0.97 (0.96, 0.98) for PFD detection. Furthermore, the protocol showed a specificity of 0.94 and a negative predictive value of 0.99 for each of the PFD criteria separately (reintervention, CCU admission and length of stay longer than seven days).

With regard to multivariate regression analysis, we only found a relationship with PFD with 2 factors, preeclampsia [Odds Ratio = 8.25 (3.67, 17.9), $p < 0.001$] and MEWC

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.15.20194910; this version posted September 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

alarm activation [Odds Ratio = 3.98 (1.63, 8.99), p = 0.001] (Figure 2). The only factor related to the reintervention was the MEWC alarm activation (Odds Ratio = 4.58 [1, 15.4], p = 0.02, Figure 3-A). The main factor related to critical care admission was preeclampsia (Odds Ratio = 27.4 [8.87-94], p < 0.001), followed by MEWC alarm activation (Odds Ratio = 11.0 [3.34-36.4], p < 0.001) and cesarean delivery (Odds Ratio = 6.86 [1.87-29.3], p < 0.001) (Figure 3-B). We found no relationship between length of stay and MEWC alarm activation in the Cox regression (Figure 3-C).

No significant p-value was rejected after the calculation of q-value within the multiple comparability study.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.15.20194910; this version posted September 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Discussion

The first thing that draws attention to the results of implementing the MEWC in our hospital is the data on sensitivity, specificity, positive and negative predictive value of alarm activation. Our protocol's sensitivity is very low (0.28), while specificity and negative predictive value are very high (0.94 and 0.99, respectively). For practical purposes, these results mean that we can be confident that patients without activation of the MEWC protocol alarm are highly unlikely to suffer a PFD. However, the cost was not to detect many patients who developed PFD (28 out of 39, 71.1% of total cases). Although we do not know the causes that have led to such low sensitivity levels, we suspect that it is probably related either to the patient's monitoring period or to the different parameters that form the protocol.

Our study monitored the patients for only 2 hours after delivery. However, other studies with better sensitivity results had a much more excellent follow-up. Singh et al.[11] published the first study to validate MEWC, carrying out a prospective observational study in 676 obstetric patients to detect morbidity between the 20th week of gestation and six months postpartum. 30% of the patients had an altered trigger. They defined a MEWC sensitivity of 0.98 and a specificity of 79%. The introduction of such an extended period of obstetric monitoring is probably impossible to implement in our centre. Still, it does make us suspect that if we extend the monitoring period from the time of admission to 24 hours after birth, the number of false negatives should be reduced.

On the other hand, the modification of the protocol's composition by eliminating the respiratory rate and adding obstetric factors has also been able to modify the sensitivity and specificity of the protocol. Initially, we can think that the more complex a protocol is, the more difficult it is to generate false negatives and the more secure its implementation is. However, this is not as true as it seems. Mhyre et al.[8] described that the simpler the warning criteria, the shorter the time for recognition, diagnosis and treatment of women who are more

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.15.20194910; this version posted September 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

at risk of developing obstetric complications. The more uncomplicated measures are more reliable, less vulnerable to human calculation errors and have higher reproducibility. Mhyre et al. insist on creating multidisciplinary teams that define their warning criteria for each centre and review the evidence to date of the use of these criteria[8]. In 2015 Edwards et al.[12] compared the predictive value of six different MEWS to identify severe sepsis in women with chorioamnionitis and informed of a sensitivity range of 40%-100% with a degree of 4%-97% specificity. The authors concluded that the MEWC tools with simpler designs tended to be more sensitive while more complex ones tended to be more specific. Probably, by adding the obstetric items, we increased the complexity of the protocol and caused an increase in specificity.

Likewise, a complex MEWC protocol that causes a high number of false positives is a severe limitation in its application since it can lead to professional fatigue due to the high number of false alarms[13]. Of course, no MEWC protocol is ideal, and we fully agree with Friedman et al.[13]. They exposed that the data cannot be extrapolated to other healthcare centres, arguing that the results should be obtained for individual hospitals. Further studies are necessary to validate and generalize MEWC principles.

Lastly, although the results found have not been as satisfactory as we would have liked, there are positive readings about the implementation of our MEWC protocol. Multivariate analyses have shown us a direct relationship between the activation of the MEWC protocol alarm and the appearance of a PFD, a reintervention or a CCU admission. Probably, as an isolated event, the activation of the alarm has low sensitivity, but, together with the other correlated factors, it will allow us to create risk profiles. If we analyze our sample, which contained 65 patients with preeclampsia, 14 of them, i.e. 21%, suffered a PFD, and 35.9% of PFD was in paeclampsia patients. The odds ratio found in the relationship between preeclampsia and PFD [8.25 (3.67, 17.9)] indicates that when the MEWC alarm is

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.15.20194910; this version posted September 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

activated in a preeclampsia patient, the risk of PFD will be very high. Therefore, this patient profile should be monitored very closely.

Conclusion

Our MEWC protocol presented low sensitivity and high specificity with a high negative predictive value, having many false-negative patients. Our study showed an association between alarm activation and PFD, reintervention rate and critical care admission rate, with preeclampsia being the most related factor in all of them.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.15.20194910; this version posted September 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

References

1. de Miguel Sesmero JR., Cacho PM., Solano AM., et al. Mortalidad materna en España en el periodo 2010-2012: resultados de la encuesta de la Sociedad Española de Ginecología (SEGO). Prog Obstet Ginecol 2015.
2. McClure JH., Cooper GM., Clutton-Brock TH., et al. Saving mothers' lives: reviewing maternal deaths to make motherhood safer: 2006-8: a review. Br J Anaesth 2011;107:127–32. https://doi.org/10.1093/bja/aer192.
3. Bogod D., Mushambi M., Craig SK. Guidelines for the provision of anaesthesia services for an obstetric population. Lond R Coll Anaesth 2019.
4. Armitage M., Eddleston J., Stokes T., et al. Recognising and responding to acute illness in adults in hospital: summary of NICE guidance. BMJ 2007;335:258–9. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.39272.679688.47.
5. Umar A., Ameh CA., Muriithi F., et al. Early warning systems in obstetrics: A systematic literature review. PloS One 2019;14:e0217864. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0217864.
6. von Elm E., Altman DG., Egger M., et al. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) Statement: Guidelines for reporting observational studies. Int J Surg 2014;12:1495–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsu.2014.07.013.
7. Cueto Hernández I. Análisis de la mortalidad y morbilidad materna según criterios de la organización mundial de la salud y del Euro-Peristat en el período 2011-2015 en el Hospital General Universitario Gregorio Marañón. info:eu-repo/semantics/doctoralThesis, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Madrid, España, 2018.
8. Mhyre JM., D'Oria R., Hameed AB., et al. The maternal early warning criteria: a proposal from the national partnership for maternal safety. Obstet Gynecol 2014;124:782–6. https://doi.org/10.1097/AOG.0000000000000480.
9. Behling DJ., Renaud M. Development of an obstetric vital sign alert to improve outcomes in acute care obstetrics. Nurs Womens Health 2015;19:128–41. https://doi.org/10.1111/1751-486X.12185.
10. Storey JD. A direct approach to false discovery rates. J R Stat Soc Ser B Stat Methodol 2002;64:479–98. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9868.00346.
11. Singh S., McGlennan A., England A., et al. A validation study of the CEMACH recommended modified early obstetric warning system (MEOWS). Anaesthesia 2012;67:12–8. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2044.2011.06896.x.
12. Edwards SE., Grobman WA., Lappen JR., et al. Modified obstetric early warning scoring systems (MOEWS): validating the diagnostic performance for severe sepsis in women with chorioamnionitis. Am J Obstet Gynecol 2015;212:536.e1-8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajog.2014.11.007.
13. Friedman AM. Maternal early warning systems. Obstet Gynecol Clin North Am 2015;42:289–98. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ogc.2015.01.006.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.15.20194910; this version posted September 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Tables

Table 1: Causes for activation and limits of trigger thresholds of our MEWC protocol and assessment time from patient monitoring.

Variable	**Activated Alarm (n = 75)**	*Lower boundary*	*Upper boundary*
Alarm trigger, n (%)			
Oxygen saturation	2 (2.7)	*95.00%*	
Systolic arterial pressure	32 (42.7)	*90 mmHg*	*160 mmHg*
Diastolic arterial pressure	3 (4.0)		*100 mmHg*
Heart rate	14 (18.7)	*50 bpm*	*120 bpm*
Obstetrics (includes uterine involution and bleeding)	24 (32.0)		*500 ml*
Urine output	0 (0)	*35 ml in two hours*	
Time to activate the alarm (min), median (IQR)	10 (0-60)		
Time to obstetrics assessment (min), median (IQR)	11 (2.5-60)		
Time to call the anesthesiologist (min)	15 (4.5, 61.5)		
Time to anesthetic assessment (min)	20 (7-65.5)		

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.15.20194910; this version posted September 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 2: Demographic data and outcome results according to MEWC protocol alarm activation. *: statistical significance.

Variable	**Overall (n = 1166)**	**No Alarm (n = 1091)**	**Activated Alarm (n = 75)**	**P-value**
Age, median (IQR)	34 (31-37)	34 (31-37)	36 (29.5-39)	0.23
Previous deliveries, median (IQR)	0 (0-1)	0 (0-1)	0 (0-1)	0.57
Diabetes, n (%)	99 (8.5)	90 (8.2)	9 (12.0)	0.26
Preeclampsia, n (%)	65 (5.6)	52 (4.8)	13 (17.3)	<0.001*
Type of delivery, n (%)				0.005*
Eutocic delivery	719 (61.7)	685 (62.8)	34 (45.3)	
Instrumental delivery	176 (15.1)	163 (14.9)	13 (17.3)	
Cesarean delivery	271 (23.2)	243 (22.3)	28 (37.3)	
Multiple deliveries, n (%)	21 (1.8)	16 (1.5)	5 (6.7)	0.009*
Potential Fatal Disorder, n (%)	39 (3.3)	28 (2.6)	11 (14.7)	<0.001*
Reintervention, n (%)	15 (1.3)	12 (1.1)	3 (4.0)	0.07
Critical Care Admission, n (%)	18 (1.5)	9 (0.8)	9 (12.0)	<0.001*
Length of Stay, median (IQR)	2.6 (1.2-3.1)	2.5 (2.1-3.1)	2.9 (2.3-3.6)	0.005*
Length of Stay < 7 days, n (%)	13 (1.1)	11 (1.0)	2 (2.7)	0.2

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.15.20194910; this version posted September 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 3: Sensitivity, specificity, positive and negative predictive values presented by the activation of our MEWC protocol alarm for the detection of PFD and its respective criteria

Activated Alarm	**Potential Fatal Disorder**	**Reintervention**	**Critical Care Admission**	**Length of stay < 7 days**
Sensitivity (95% CI)	0.28 (0.15, 0.45)	0.20 (0.04, 0.48)	0.50 (0.26, 0.74)	0.15 (0.02, 0.45)
Specificity (95% CI)	0.94 (0.93, 0.96)	0.94 (0.92, 0.95)	0.94 (0.93, 0.96)	0.94 (0.92, 0.95)
Positive predictive value (95% CI)	0.15 (0.08, 0.25)	0.04 (0.01, 0.11)	0.12 (0.06, 0.22)	0.03 (0.00, 0.09)
Negative predictive value (95% CI)	0.97 (0.96, 0.98)	0.99 (0.98, 0.99)	0.99 (0.98, 1.00)	0.99 (0.98, 0.99)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.15.20194910; this version posted September 18, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Figure legends

Figure 1

Patients Flowchart according to the STROBE statement)

Figure 2

Forest plot of multivariate logistic analysis of the influence of MEWC activation, patient comorbidity and delivery on PFD. We present the results as an odds ratio with a 95% confidence interval. Results less than 1, left of the y-axis, imply risk reduction. We accept $p < 0.05$ as significant.

Figure 2

A and B: Forests plot of multivariate logistic analysis of the influence of MEWC activation, patient comorbidity and delivery on reintervention (A) and critical care admission (B). We present the results as an odds ratio with a 95% confidence interval. Results less than 1, left of the y-axis, imply risk reduction. We accept $p < 0.05$ as significant.

C: Forest plot of Cox regression of the influence of MEWC activation, patient comorbidity and delivery on length of stay. We present the results as a hazard ratio with a 95% confidence interval. Results more than 1, right of the y-axis, imply an increased probability of hospital discharge. We accept $p < 0.05$ as significant.


March – August 2018
Total available patients
(n = 1169)
Declined to participate
(n = 3)
Missing values
(n = 0)
Included for analysis
(n = 1166)

Potential Fatal Disorder	No PFD (n = 1127)	PFD (n= 39)	OR (95% CI)	P-value
Alarm Activation	64 (5.7)	11 (28.2)	3.98 (1.63, 8.99)	0.001*
Age	35 (31,37)	34 (30,38)	0.96 (0.90, 1.02)	0.22
Previous deliveries	0 (0-1)	0 (0-0)	1.04 (0.64, 1.53)	0.86
Diabetes	94 (8.3)	5 (12.8)	1.25 (0.38, 3.39)	0.68
Preeclamsia	51 (4.5)	14 (35.9)	8.25 (3.67, 17.9)	<0.001*
Instrumental (vs eutocic delivery)	174 (15.4)	2 (5.1)	0.44 (0.07, 1.52)	0.28
C section (vs eutocic delivery)	252 (22.4)	19 (48.7)	1.90 (0.86, 4.17)	0.11
Multiple delivery	18 (1.6)	3 (7.7)	2.31 (0.40, 9.97)	0.3

A: Reintervention	No Reintervention (n = 1151)	Reintervention (n = 15)	OR (95% CI)	P-value
Alarm Activation	72 (6.3)	3 (20)	4.58 (1.00, 15.4)	0.02*
Age	35 (31-38)	33 (30-35.5)	0.94 (0.85, 1.03)	0.16
Previous deliveries	0 (0-1)	0 (0-1)	1.29 (0.72, 2.04)	0.34
Diabetes	97 (8.4)	2 (13.3)	1.69 (0.26, 8.07)	0.45
Preeclampsia	64 (5.6)	1 (6.7)	1.61 (0.08, 9.10)	0.66
Instrumental (vs eutocic delivery)	174 (15.1)	2 (13.3)	0.72 (0.11, 2.81)	0.67
C section (vs eutocic delivery)	271 (23.5)	0 (0)	1 (0-Inf)	1
Multiple delivery	21 (1.8)	0 (0)	1 (0-Inf)	1

B: Critical Care Admission	No CCA (n = 1148)	CCA (n = 18)	OR (95% CI)	P-value
Alarm Activation	66 (5.7)	9 (50)	11.0 (3.34, 36.4)	<0.001*
Age	35 (31-37)	32 (30-38)	0.92 (0.83, 1.02)	0.11
Previous deliveries	0 (0-1)	0 (0-0)	1.79 (1.03, 3.03)	0.03*
Diabetes	96 (8.4)	3 (16.7)	1.01 (0.16, 4.68)	0.99
Preeclampsia	53 (4.6)	12 (66.7)	27.4 (8.87, 94.0)	<0.001*
Instrumental (vs eutocic delivery)	176 (15.3)	0 (0.0)	1 (0-Inf)	1
C-section (vs eutocic delivery)	258 (22.5)	13 (72.2)	6.86 (1.87, 29.3)	0.005*
Multiple delivery	20 (1.7)	1 (5.6)	0.31 (0.01, 3.72)	0.4

C: Lenght of stay	No or VS (Median, IQR) / n	Yes (Median, IQR) / n	HR (95% CI)	P-value
Alarm Activation	2.5 (2.2-3.1) / 1091	2.9 (2.3-3.8) / 75	0.89 (0.71, 1.14)	0.37
Age	-	-	0.99 (0.98, 1.00)	0.05
Previous deliveries	-	-	1.15 (1.08, 1.23)	<0.001*
Diabetes	2.5 (2.2-3.1) / 1067	3 (2.2-3.4) / 99	0.92 (0.74, 1.12)	0.41
Preeclamsia	2.6 (2.2-3.1) / 1166	3.7 (2.9-4.8) / 65	0.41 (0.31, 0.53)	<0.001*
Instrumental (vs eutocic)	2.4 (2.1-2.9) / 719	2.8 (2.2-3.2) / 176	0.67 (0.56, 0.79)	<0.001*
C-Section (vs eutocic)	2.4 (2.1-2.9) / 719	3.2 (3.0-4.1) / 271	0.40 (0.34, 0.47)	<0.001*
Multiple delivery	2.5 (2.2-3.1) / 1145	4.1 (3.1-4.3) / 21	0.55 (0.36, 0.86)	0.008*