Clinical prediction models to diagnose neonatal sepsis in low-income and middle-income countries: a scoping review

Samuel R Neal[1,2]*†, Sarah Sturrock[3]*, David Musorowegomo[4], Hannah Gannon[1], Michele Zaman[5], Mario Cortina-Borja[6], Kirsty Le Doare[3], Michelle Heys[1], Gwen Chimhini[4]‡, Felicity Fitzgerald[7]‡

*Contributed equally as first authors
†Corresponding author
‡Contributed equally as last authors

1. Population, Policy and Practice Research and Teaching Department, UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, University College London, London, UK
2. Centre for Reproductive Health, Institute for Regeneration and Repair, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK
3. Centre for Neonatal and Paediatric Infection, St George's, University of London, London, UK
4. Department of Child Adolescent and Women's Health, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, University of Zimbabwe, Harare, Zimbabwe
5. School of Medicine, Queen's University, Kingston, Canada
6. Infection, Immunity and Inflammation, UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, University College London, London, UK
7. Department of Infectious Disease, Imperial College London, London, UK

Correspondence to: Dr Samuel R Neal, samuel.neal@doctors.org.uk

Word count: 2614

SUMMARY

Neonatal sepsis causes significant morbidity and mortality worldwide but is difficult to diagnose clinically. Clinical prediction models (CPMs) could improve diagnostic accuracy. Neonates in low-income and middle-income countries are disproportionately affected by sepsis, yet no review has comprehensively synthesised CPMs validated in this setting. We performed a scoping review of CPMs for neonatal sepsis diagnosis validated in low-income and middle-income countries. From 4598 unique records, we included 82 studies validating 44 distinct models. Most studies were set in neonatal intensive or special care units in middle-income countries and included neonates already suspected of sepsis. Three quarters of models were only validated in one study. Our review highlights several literature gaps, particularly a paucity of studies validating models in low-income countries and the WHO African region, and models for the general neonatal population. Furthermore, heterogeneity in study populations, definitions of sepsis and reporting of models may hinder progress in this field.

(150 words)

INTRODUCTION

Neonatal sepsis is a clinical syndrome caused by severe systemic infection in the first month of life.[1] It is a leading cause of global neonatal mortality and disproportionately affects neonates in low-income and middle-income countries (LMICs).[2]

Conventionally, neonatal sepsis is divided into early-onset sepsis (EOS) usually due to vertical transmission of pathogens from the maternal genitourinary tract and occurring in the first 48-72 hours of life, and late-onset sepsis (LOS) usually due to pathogens acquired from the home or hospital environment and occurring after 48-72 hours.[3] For infections caused by group B streptococcus (GBS), EOS is often considered to occur up to the seventh day of life.[3] However, there is increasing recognition that this conventional classification of neonatal sepsis is misplaced in LMICs where neonates may be exposed from birth to organisms traditionally associated with LOS due to high rates of healthcare-associated infections.[4]

Neonatal sepsis is difficult to diagnose clinically due to non-specific signs and symptoms. Identifying a pathogenic organism from a normally sterile site (e.g. blood or cerebrospinal fluid) remains the gold standard method for diagnosis.[3] Nevertheless, 'clinical' or 'culture-negative' sepsis – where a sterile culture is obtained from a neonate with signs and symptoms of sepsis – is a recognised entity.[5] When sepsis is suspected, a fine balance must be struck between the risk of failing to treat a true invasive infection and the risks of unnecessary antimicrobial use, which can contribute to antimicrobial resistance,[4] and adverse neonatal outcomes.[6] Additionally, national guidelines advise starting antimicrobial therapy within one hour of suspecting sepsis to maximise the chance of survival, leaving little time for clinicians to make a diagnosis.[7]

Clinical prediction models (CPMs) are tools that combine characteristics to estimate the probability of a diagnosis or prognostic outcome.[8] Models exist to diagnose neonatal sepsis in both high-income countries and LMICs based on various clinical features, risk factors and/or laboratory tests. These CPMs aim to improve diagnostic accuracy and therefore rationalise antibiotic use. The benefits of early recognition and treatment could be significant for neonates in low-resource settings where specialist care is limited.[9] Furthermore, reducing the growing threat of antimicrobial resistance is even more crucial where access to sufficiently broad-spectrum antimicrobials may be unaffordable for patients.[10]

While several existing reviews examine CPMs to diagnose neonatal sepsis,[11-14] there has been no comprehensive synthesis of models validated in LMICs. Therefore, the aim of this scoping review was to map the literature of CPMs to diagnose neonatal sepsis in LMICs.

Specific objectives were:

1. To provide an overview of existing CPMs to diagnose neonatal sepsis in LMICs
2. To determine the evidence underlying the use of CPMs to diagnose neonatal sepsis in LMICs
3. To compare the performance of CPMs using different approaches to risk stratification or different target populations
4. To identify unanswered research questions surrounding CPMs to diagnose neonatal sepsis in LMICs, which may guide future primary research or systematic reviews

METHODS

We conducted this review according to an *a priori* published protocol,[15] developed with reference to the scoping review guidelines provided by the Joanna Briggs Institute.[16] We report methods and results in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews (see supplementary appendix).[17]

Search strategy

Eligibility criteria are shown in Table 1. After reviewing the extent and breadth of the literature from our initial searches, we narrowed the scope of our original protocol to focus specifically on studies that validate a CPM to diagnose neonatal sepsis in a LMIC, as defined by the World Bank in 2020.[18] We searched six electronic databases from their inception: Ovid MEDLINE, Ovid Embase, Scopus, Web of Science Core Collection, Global Index Medicus, and the Cochrane Library. Searches were initially performed on 20 December 2019 and updated on 5 September 2022 and 16 June 2024. Search terms were chosen to capture the three domains of the research question ('neonate', 'sepsis', and 'clinical prediction model') through collaboration with a child health specialist librarian. The search strategy was developed for Ovid MEDLINE and adapted for each database (see supplementary appendix). Additional studies were identified by citation analysis and by hand searching the reference lists of included studies.

Record screening

We imported identified records into EndNote 21 for deduplication.[19] Unique records were then uploaded to the Rayyan application for screening by two independent reviewers (DM, HG, MZ, SRN or SS).[20] Titles and abstracts were first examined against the eligibility criteria to determine if each record was potentially eligible for inclusion. Next, full texts of potentially eligible studies were obtained and reviewed to confirm eligibility. Authors were contacted to request full texts where these could not be found online. Conflicts were resolved by discussion amongst the review team.

Data extraction and synthesis

Data extraction was performed independently by two reviewers for the initial searches (SRN and SS) and by one reviewer for each updated search (SRN or SS). We extracted data on study, participant and model characteristics, and model performance using a pre-piloted data extraction form (see supplementary appendix). Data items were chosen based on the Transparent Reporting of a multivariable prediction model for Individual Prognosis Or Diagnosis (TRIPOD) statement.[21] We summarised results by narrative synthesis. Data for quantitative outcomes were not pooled in a meta-analysis as this is beyond the scoping review methodology. Where multiple variations of a model were presented in the same study (e.g. different combinations of predictors presented during model specification), or model performance was presented at multiple classification thresholds, we only included data for the 'optimal' or 'final' model at a single classification threshold.

RESULTS

Searches and included studies

Searches identified 4598 unique records (Figure 1). From these, 82 studies published between 2003 and 2024 were included,[22-103] and are summarised in Tables 2 and 3. The number of published studies validating a CPM to diagnose neonatal sepsis in LMICs has increased rapidly in recent years (Figure 2). Studies were conducted in 22 individual countries (Figure 3 and Table 4), with the greatest number of studies conducted in the World Health Organization (WHO) South-East Asian

Region (*n*=48, 59%), particularly in India (*n*=37, 45%). The fewest studies were conducted in the WHO African Region (*n*=4, 5%). Regarding economic status, 51 studies were conducted exclusively in lower middle-income countries (62%) and 30 exclusively in upper middle-income countries (37%). One study pooled data from both low-income and lower middle-income countries.[98] Most studies were set in intensive care or special care admission units (*n*=64, 78%). The remainder included all live births at study sites (*n*=12, 15%), neonates presenting to emergency care services (*n*=3, 4%), all hospitalised neonates (*n*=1, 1%), or the setting was unclear (*n*=2, 2%).

In total, 26078 neonates were included across all studies. The median number of participants per study was 152 (range 36 to 3303, interquartile range [IQR] 204). Few studies restricted the study population based on gestational age or birthweight, with only 8 studies (10%) specifically investigating preterm neonates and 5 studies (6%) specifically investigating low or very low birthweight neonates. Most studies included neonates clinically suspected of sepsis or with specific maternal risk factors including chorioamnionitis (*n*=58, 71%).

Almost all studies included a positive blood and/or CSF culture in their outcome definition for sepsis (*n*=75, 91%). Of these, 18 (22% of all studies) also included clinical features or clinical suspicion of sepsis. One study used a consultant neonatologist's clinical diagnosis of sepsis,[76] one study used the International Classification of Diseases 10th Revision criteria for sepsis,[77] and in three studies the outcome was unclear.

Model characteristics

The 82 included studies performed 109 evaluations validating 44 distinct models (Table 3).[22-25,32,33,40,46,47,49-51,54,56,57,63,68,72,76-78,81,83,86,87,90,92,98-101,103-113] The most frequently validated model was the Hematological Scoring System by Rodwell et al. (*n*=32, 39% of studies; including studies that made minor modifications to the original model).[112] Most models were only validated in one study (*n*=34, 77% of models).

A total of 135 predictors of sepsis were included across all models, of which 82 were clinical parameters (signs, symptoms or risk factors) and 53 were laboratory parameters (see supplementary appendix). The median number of predictors per model was 6 (range 2 to 110, IQR 4). 14 models (32%) included only clinical parameters, 12 models (27%) included only laboratory parameters, and 18 models (41%) included both. The commonest laboratory parameters were white cell count (*n*=17 models, 39%), C-reactive protein (CRP) (*n*=16 models, 36%) and platelet count (*n*=15 models, 34%). The commonest clinical parameters were neonatal fever (*n*=13 models, 30%) and gestational age (*n*=11 models, 25%).

Most models were developed using logistic regression (*n*=16 models, 36%) (often with stepwise selection to select predictors) or consisted of a scoring system based on univariable predictor performance or literature review and expert opinion (*n*=10 models, 23%).

Model performance

Model performance was principally reported using sensitivity and/or specificity (with or without a confusion matrix); only 4 studies (5%) did not report either metric. 31 studies (38%) reported area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC). Less frequent methods of quantifying performance included predictive values, likelihood ratios, accuracy, change in antibiotic use, and mortality statistics. Across all 109 evaluations, median sensitivity was 81% (range 3% to 100%) and median specificity was 83% (range 11% to 100%).

Performance stratified by clinical vs. laboratory parameters
In models containing both clinical and laboratory parameters (*n*=24 evaluations), median sensitivity was 73% (range 3% to 100%) and median specificity was 80% (range 18% to 98%). In models containing only clinical parameters (*n*=23 evaluations), median sensitivity was 67% (range 3% to 100%) and median specificity was 72% (range 11% to 99%). In models containing only laboratory parameters (*n*=62 evaluations), median sensitivity was 83% (range 9% to 100%) and median specificity was 86% (range 33% to 100%).

Performance stratified by target population
Models validated in a population with existing clinical suspicion of sepsis (due to signs and symptoms and/or presence of maternal risk factors for sepsis) had a median sensitivity of 82% (range 3% to 100%) and median specificity of 84% (range 18% to 100%) (*n*=75 evaluations). In comparison, models evaluated in the general population had a median sensitivity of 77% (range 15% to 100%) and median specificity of 80% (range 11% to 100%) (*n*=34 evaluations).

Performance stratified by sepsis timing
In models developed to diagnose both EOS and LOS (*n*=59 evaluations), median sensitivity was 82% (range 3% to 100%) and median specificity was 85% (range 33% to 100%). In models to diagnose only EOS, median sensitivity was 82% (range 9% to 100%) and median specificity was 82% (range 11% to 98%) (*n*=29 evaluations). In models to diagnose only LOS, median sensitivity was 57% (range 3% to 100%) and median specificity was 75% (range 18% to 99%) (*n*=21 evaluations).

DISCUSSION

Our scoping review provides a comprehensive overview of CPMs to diagnose neonatal sepsis in LMICs. Previous reviews of CPMs to diagnose neonatal sepsis have been published, but we included more studies than were identified in existing reviews despite them additionally including studies from high-income countries.[11-14] The breadth of literature highlights the need for, and academic interest in, effective risk stratification for neonatal sepsis in LMICs.

Several common themes emerged from our review. First, 99% of studies were conducted in middle-income countries, with only one study including neonates born in a low-income country,[98] and no studies conducted exclusively in a low-income country. Furthermore, fewer studies were conducted in the African region than any other WHO region, despite the high burden of neonatal sepsis and slower progress in neonatal mortality in these countries.[114,115] Two thirds of models required access to at least basic laboratory facilities. Access to laboratory facilities is limited in many low-resource settings or turnaround times are too long to usefully inform management.[116]

Second, although many CPMs have been validated in LMICs, 78% of studies were conducted in neonatal intensive care or special care units and only 29% were validated in a population of neonates that includes infants without existing suspicion of sepsis. A substantial benefit of CPMs for neonatal sepsis in LMICs lies in their ability to promote early, targeted antibiotic therapy in an undifferentiated population of neonates, reducing antibiotic overuse and the resultant antimicrobial resistance and adverse neonatal outcomes.[6] Whilst diagnostic decision support in high-risk neonates is useful, models are needed that can be applied at the time of birth to facilitate the rapid antimicrobial therapy required to reduce morbidity and mortality from EOS.[7]

Third, description of model performance and clinical implications was highly variable between studies. Most studies only presented sensitivity and specificity at arbitrarily selected classification thresholds; just over one third of studies reported easily comparable global metrics such as AUC. Furthermore, few studies included practical discussion of how the proposed models could be integrated into routine neonatal care in LMICs. This includes how the probability or score can be calculated by healthcare workers (e.g. using a paper proforma or a computer-based system). Most models were developed using logistic regression, but authors often simplify the final model to present a scoring system where each predictor is assigned an integer score. This benefits interpretation and application but can negatively impact the resulting predictions, particularly if continuous predictors are categorised.[8]

One solution could be to implement models using app or web-based interfaces for clinicians such as the Neotree platform, which consists of an android app that also includes data visualisation, linkage and export capabilities.[117] This would also aid implementation of more flexible classification methods, such as the artificial neural network proposed by Helguera-Repetto et al.[47] Other considerations that are rarely discussed is how management decisions should be made based on model predictions, such as appropriate classification thresholds and how these can be incorporated into a wider sepsis management pathway within neonatal units. These oversights could be addressed if authors adhere to the TRIPOD checklist, which specifically includes 'implications' of the model as a checklist item.[21]

Finally, three quarters of models were only validated in one study in a LMIC, often only in the derivation cohort (internal validation). This may lead to overoptimistic performance results due to overfitting.[8] Several authors caution against the current focus on developing new models, and advocate for further validation (including external validation) of promising existing models.[118] Additionally, few studies included in our review assessed calibration performance of their models, which is an especially important consideration when models are intended for decision support.[119]

Several limitations of our review should be considered. First, we included only published studies. It may be that individual neonatal units or networks have developed their own clinical prediction models or tools that are in local use but have not been published and therefore would not have been identified by our search. Centres may use existing clinical prediction models without publishing performance data, particularly if studies show poor model performance. Second, there was significant heterogeneity in study populations, definitions of sepsis, and classification thresholds, which makes comparing model performance between studies particularly challenging. Despite the high incidence of neonatal sepsis globally, there is no internationally accepted consensus definition of neonatal sepsis.[120] A systematic review of model performance in specific populations and for specific definitions of sepsis would help to address this. Given the vast number of model variations presented in included studies, and the often arbitrarily selected classification thresholds at which model performance is reported, it is impractical for a single review to be completely comprehensive and there is necessarily a degree of selective reporting in our review. Finally, we included only studies published in English or Spanish and were unable to obtain full texts for 36 potentially eligible studies despite contacting authors. The nature of scientific publishing in LMICs means that studies are not always published in journals indexed in major biomedical databases. We identified 13 of the 82 included studies outwith our primary database searches through citation analysis and reference lists only (especially for studies published in India), which raises the possibility of retrieval bias influencing our review.

CONTRIBUTORS

FF and MH conceived the idea for this review. SRN developed the review protocol and all authors reviewed and approved it before publication. SRN and SS performed the literature searches and extracted the data. DM, HG, MZ, SRN and SS screened the records. FF, MH, GC, KLD and MCB supervised the review process and provided clinical expertise for the manuscript. MCB translated records from Spanish and provided statistical advice. All authors critically edited and approved the final manuscript.

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

FF and MH are trustees of Neotree, a UK registered charity that provides technology, software information, education and support to healthcare workers and medical practitioners throughout England and Wales, Malawi and Zimbabwe (charity number: 1186748). All other authors declare no competing interests.

DATA SHARING

Extracted data and code used to synthesise results will be uploaded at publication. A list of all records identified through database searches is available on request.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank Heather Chesters (Deputy Librarian at the UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health Library) for her advice and guidance when developing the search strategy for this review. This review was conducted without specific funding support.

REFERENCES

1. Nizet V, Klein JO. Bacterial sepsis and meningitis. In: Wilson CB, Nizet V, Maldonado YA, Remington JS, Klein JO, eds. Remington and Klein's Infectious Diseases of the Fetus and Newborn Infant. 8th ed. Philadelphia: Elsevier Saunders; 2016: 217-71.

2. Rudd KE, Johnson SC, Agesa KM, et al. Global, regional, and national sepsis incidence and mortality, 1990-2017: analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study. *Lancet (London, England)* 2020; **395**(10219): 200-11.

3. Shane AL, Sanchez PJ, Stoll BJ. Neonatal sepsis. *Lancet* 2017; **390**(10104): 1770-80.

4. Zaidi AK, Huskins WC, Thaver D, Bhutta ZA, Abbas Z, Goldmann DA. Hospital-acquired neonatal infections in developing countries. *Lancet* 2005; **365**(9465): 1175-88.

5. Wynn JL, Wong HR, Shanley TP, Bizzarro MJ, Saiman L, Polin RA. Time for a neonatal-specific consensus definition for sepsis. *Pediatric Critical Care Medicine* 2014; **15**(6): 523-8.

6. Esaiassen E, Fjalstad JW, Juvet LK, van den Anker JN, Klingenberg C. Antibiotic exposure in neonates and early adverse outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy* 2017; **72**(7): 1858-70.

7. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Neonatal infection: antibiotics for prevention and treatment (NG195). 2024 2021. https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng195 (accessed 26 Aug 2024).

8. Steyerberg EW. Clinical Prediction Models. 2 ed. Switzerland: Springer International Publishing; 2019.

9. World Health Organization. Human resource strategies to improve newborn care in health facilities in low- and middle-income countries. Geneva, 2020.

10. Thomson KM, Dyer C, Liu F, et al. Effects of antibiotic resistance, drug target attainment, bacterial pathogenicity and virulence, and antibiotic access and affordability on outcomes in neonatal sepsis: an international microbiology and drug evaluation prospective substudy (BARNARDS). *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* 2021; **21**(12): 1677-88.

11. Verstraete EH, Blot K, Mahieu L, Vogelaers D, Blot S. Prediction models for neonatal health care-associated sepsis: a meta-analysis. *Pediatrics* 2015; **135**(4): e1002-14.

12. Sofouli GA, Kanellopoulou A, Vervenioti A, Dimitriou G, Gkentzi D. Predictive Scores for Late-Onset Neonatal Sepsis as an Early Diagnostic and Antimicrobial Stewardship Tool: What Have We Done So Far? *Antibiotics (Basel)* 2022; **11**(7).

13. Sahu P, Raj Stanly EA, Simon Lewis LE, Prabhu K, Rao M, Kunhikatta V. Prediction modelling in the early detection of neonatal sepsis. *World J Pediatr* 2022; **18**(3): 160-75.

14. Fung A, Shafiq Y, Driker S, et al. Diagnostic Accuracy of Clinical Sign Algorithms to Identify Sepsis in Young Infants Aged 0 to 59 Days: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Pediatrics* 2024; **154**(Suppl 1).

15. Neal SR, Musorowegomo D, Gannon H, et al. Clinical prediction models to diagnose neonatal sepsis: a scoping review protocol. *BMJ Open* 2020; **10**(8): e039712.

16. Joanna Briggs Institute. Development of a scoping review protocol. 2019. https://wiki.joannabriggs.org/display/MANUAL/11.2+Development+of+a+scoping+review+protocol (accessed 04 Apr 2020).

17. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, et al. PRISMA extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): checklist and explanation. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 2018; **169**(7): 467-73.

18. The World Bank. World Bank Country and Lending Groups. 2020. https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519-world-bank-country-and-lending-groups (accessed 21 Aug 2020).

19. The EndNote Team. EndNote. EndNote 21 ed. Philadelphia, PA: Clarivate; 2013.

20. Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, Elmagarmid A. Rayyan - a web and mobile app for systematic reviews. *Systematic Reviews* 2016; **5**(1): 210.

21. Moons KG, Altman DG, Reitsma JB, et al. Transparent Reporting of a multivariable prediction model for Individual Prognosis or Diagnosis (TRIPOD): explanation and elaboration. *Ann Intern Med* 2015; **162**(1): W1-73.

22. Abiramalatha T, Santhanam S, Mammen JJ, et al. Utility of neutrophil volume conductivity scatter (VCS) parameter changes as sepsis screen in neonates. *Journal of Perinatology* 2016; **36**(9): 733-8.

23. Afjeiee SA, Golnabi A, Rafiee Tabatabaei S. Determining the Frequency of Neonatal Sepsis Based on Premature Rupture of Membrane (PROM) -Scoring System at Mahdieh Hospital in Tehran. *Pajoohande* 2008; **13**(2): 159-65.

24. Ahire N, Patil SV, Marakwad D, Gaikwad R, Singh5 J. To Study the Hematological Indices and CRP in the Screening of Neonatal Sepsis. *International Journal of Pharmaceutical and Clinical Research* 2022; **14**(1): 132-8.

25. Ahmed Z, Ghafoor T, Waqar T, Ali S, Aziz S, Mahmud S. Diagnostic value of C-reactive protein and haematological parameters in neonatal sepsis. *Journal of College of Physicians and Surgeons Pakistan* 2005; **15**(3): 152-6.

26. Al-Lawama M, AlZaatreh A, Elrajabi R, Abdelhamid S, Badran E. Prolonged rupture of membranes, neonatal outcomes and management guidelines. *Journal of Clinical Medicine Research* 2019; **11**(5): 360-6.

27. Amir N, Ahmad M, Akhtar K, Hassan MJ. Hematological Scoring System and its Correlation with Blood Culture, C-reactive Protein, and Micro-erythrocyte Sedimentation Rate in Early Diagnosis of Neonatal Sepsis. *Journal of Applied Hematology* 2023; **14**: 225-9.

28. Annam V, Medarametla V, Chakkirala N. Evaluation of cord blood - Haematological Scoring System as an early predictive screening method for the detection of early onset neonatal sepsis. *Journal of Clinical and Diagnostic Research* 2015; **9**(9): SC04-6.

29. Beandda AS, Doctor KM. The comparison between management recommendations of the Neonatal Early Onset Sepsis Calculator and CDC/AAP Guidelines among culture-proven early onset sepsis admitted at University of East Ramon Magsaysay Memorial Medical Center from January 2013 to December 2017. *Health Sciences Journal* 2018; **8**(1).

30. Bhalodia MJ, Hippargi SB, Patil MM. Role of hematological scoring system in diagnosis of neonatal sepsis. *Journal of Clinical Neonatology* 2017; **6**(3): 144-47.

31. Buch A, Srivastava V, Kumar H, Jadhav PS. EVALUATION OF HAEMATOLOGICAL PROFILE IN EARLY DIAGNOSIS OF CLINICALLY SUSPECTED CASES OF NEONATAL SEPSIS. *International Journal of Basic and Applied Medical Sciences* 2011; **1**(1): 1-6.

32. Bülbül A, Bülbül L, Zübarioğlu U, Ocak S, Uslu S. The Comparison of the Management Models for Identifying the Risk of Serious Bacterial Infection in Newborn Infants with a Newly Developed Scale. *JAREM* 2020; **10**(1): 70-4.

33. Celik IH, Demirel G, Sukhachev D, Erdeve O, Dilmen U. Neutrophil volume, conductivity and scatter parameters with effective modeling of molecular activity statistical program gives better results in neonatal sepsis. *International Journal of Laboratory Hematology* 2013; **35**(1): 82-7.

34. Chitra W, Lubis BM, Siregar OR, Hasibuan BS, Lubis IND, Nafianti S. Role of Modified Hematologic Scoring System and Platelet Indices in Diagnosing Neonatal Sepsis. *Perinatology* 2022; **23**(1): 22-8.

35. de Souza CG. Variabilidade da frequência cardíaca na sepse neonatal [Doutor]. São Paulo: Universidade de São Paulo; 2015.

36. Debroy A, Joshi D, Sinha TD. Reappraisal of the Haematological Scoring System (HSS) for early diagnosis of neonatal sepsis in a remote geographical location of North East India. *Indian Journal of Pathology and Oncology* 2016; **3**: 366-71.

37. Derbala SG, M. HN, Eldin Hasan BB, F. E-SH. Performance of the Hematological Scoring System for Early Diagnosis of Neonatal Sepsis in a Neonatal Intensive Care Unit of a Developing Country. *Infectious Diseases and Tropical Medicine* 2017; **3**(4): E429.

38. Dutta NR, Medhi P, Hazarika R. Haematological Scoring System (HSS) in early diagnosis of neonatal sepsis: a study from tertiary care hospital from North East India. *Journal of Evolution of Medical and Dental Sciences* 2016; **5**(52): 3459-66.

39. El-Said SAAM, Salama KM, El-Din El Hawary IMB, Samy RM, Akmal DM. Diagnostic Value of Neutrophil CD64, CD11b and Hematological Scoring System in Neonatal Sepsis. *African Journal of Biological Sciences (South Africa)* 2024; **6**: 323-37.

40. Fitriana L, Ramadanti A. Scoring model to predict early-onset bacterial sepsis at Dr. Mohammad Hoesin Hospital, Palembang. *Paediatrica Indonesiana(Paediatrica Indonesiana)* 2023; **63**(1): 29-36.

41. Godoy Torales GM, Rienzi Grassi RR, León Rodas LA, et al. Sepsis neonatal en embarazos a término con corioamnionitis clínica, utilidad de la escala de sepsis. *Revista del Nacional (Itauguá)* 2020; **12**: 71-90.

42. Gupta C, Makkar M, Mahajan NC. Haematological scoring system: A screening test for early diagnosis of neonatal sepsis. *Indian Journal of Hematology and Blood Transfusion* 2011; **27**(4): 264.

43. Gupta K, Bhaskar V, Narayanan A, Batra P. Re-visiting micro ESR as a screening tool for neonatal sepsis. *Trop Doct* 2022; **52**(3): 382-5.

44. Hassan HR, Gohil JR, Desai R, Mehta RR, Chaudhary VP. Correlation of blood culture results with the sepsis score and sepsis screen in the diagnosis of early-onset neonatal septicemia. *Journal of Clinical Neonatology* 2016; **5**(3): 193-8.

45. He Y, Chen J, Liu Z, Yu J. Efficacy and safety of applying a neonatal early-onset sepsis risk calculator in China. *J Paediatr Child Health* 2020; **56**(2): 237-43.

46. He Y, Du WX, Jiang HY, et al. Multiplex cytokine profiling identifies interleukin-27 as a novel biomarker for neonatal early onset sepsis. *Shock* 2017; **47**(2): 140-7.

47. Helguera-Repetto AC, Soto-Ramírez MD, Villavicencio-Carrisoza O, et al. Neonatal Sepsis Diagnosis Decision-Making Based on Artificial Neural Networks. *Front Pediatr* 2020; **8**: 525.

48. Himasree M, Varsha MH, Hymavathi KTL, Induja K. A Study of Umbilical Cord Blood Haematological Parameters in High Risk Pregnant Women in Predicting Early Onset Neonatal Sepsis. *Journal of Cardiovascular Disease Research* 2024; **15**: 109-17.

49. Hu J, Qin X. Bacteria profiles and risk factors for proven early-onset sepsis in preterm neonates. *Saudi Med J* 2021; **42**(12): 1281-8.

50. Huang Y, Yu X, Li W, et al. Development and validation of a nomogram for predicting late-onset sepsis in preterm infants on the basis of thyroid function and other risk factors: Mixed retrospective and prospective cohort study. *J Adv Res* 2020; **24**: 43-51.

51. Husada D, Chanthavanich P, Pengsaa K, et al. Predictive model for diagnosis of neonatal sepsis. *Clinical Microbiology and Infection* 2010; **16**(2): S49.

52. Ibrahim MMM, El-Sewefy DA, Ibrahim MJA, Pessar SA. Diagnostic Evaluation of Modified Hematological Sepsis Score and Presepsin in Neonatal Sepsis. *QJM: An International Journal of Medicine* 2023; **116**(Supplement_1).

53. Ikhsaniatun F, Hidayah D, Moelyo AG. Early-Onset Sepsis Online Calculator as a Predictor of Early-Onset Sepsis in Neonates Born at ≥ 34 Weeks of Gestation. *Perinatology* 2022; **22**(4): 245-51.

54. Iqbal F, Chandra P, Lewis LES, et al. Application of artificial intelligence to predict the sepsis in neonates admitted in neonatal intensive care unit. *Journal of Neonatal Nursing* 2024; **30**(2): 141-7.

55. Jadhav S, Misra R, Vyawahare C, Angadi K, Gandham N, Ghosh P. Role of sepsis screen in the diagnosis of neonatal sepsis. *Medical Journal of Dr DY Patil University* 2013; **6**: 254.

56. James J, Tewari VV, Jain N. Diagnostic Accuracy of Clinical Tool 'STOPS' and Serum Procalcitonin for Optimizing Antibiotic Therapy in Neonates Born at ≥ 28 Weeks of Gestation with Neonatal Sepsis. *Mediterr J Hematol Infect Dis* 2021; **13**(1): e2021019.

57. Kar S, Dube R, Mahapatro S, Kar S. Role of Clinical Signs in the Diagnosis of Late-onset Neonatal Sepsis and Formulation of Clinical Score. *Asian Journal of Critical Care* 2010; **6**: 10-4.

58. Khair KB, Rahman MA, Sultana T, Roy CK, Rahman MQ, Ahmed AN. Early diagnosis of neonatal septicemia by hematologic scoring system, C-reactive protein and serum haptoglobin. *Mymensingh Med J* 2012; **21**(1): 85-92.

59. Krishnamurthy V, Thandaveshwar D, Doreswamy SM. Modified hematological sepsis score in early diagnosis of neonatal sepsis. *International Journal of Research in Medical Sciences* 2017; **5**(8): 3573-7.

60. Kudawla M, Dutta S, Narang A. Validation of a clinical score for the diagnosis of late onset neonatal septicemia in babies weighing 1000-2500 g. *Journal of Tropical Pediatrics* 2008; **54**(1): 66-9.

61. Liestiadi D, Azlin E, Nafianti S. A hematologic scoring system and C-reactive protein compared to blood cultures for diagnosing bacterial neonatal sepsis. *Paediatrica Indonesiana* 2017; **57**(2): 70-5.

62. Lloyd LG, Dramowski A, Bekker A, Malou N, Ferreyra C, Van Weissenbruch MM. Performance Comparison of Infection Prediction Scores in a South African Neonatal Unit: A Retrospective Case-Control Study. *Front Pediatr* 2022; **10**: 830510.

63. Lloyd LG, van Weissenbruch MM, Dramoswski A, Gleeson B, Ferreyra C, Bekker A. Development and internal validation of a Neonatal Healthcare-associated infectiOn Prediction score (NeoHoP score) for very low birthweight infants in low-resource settings: a retrospective case-control study. *Bmj Paediatrics Open* 2023; **7**(1).

64. Mahale R, Dutta S, Ahluwalia J, Kishore SS, Narang A. Baseline illness severity does not alter accuracy of neonatal sepsis screen. *American Journal of Perinatology* 2010; **27**(4): 327-32.

65. Makkar M, Gupta C, Pathak R, Garg S, Mahajan NC. Performance evaluation of hematologic scoring system in early diagnosis of neonatal sepsis. *Journal of Clinical Neonatology* 2013; **2**(1): 25-9.

66. Malini KP, Padma S, Srivani N, Kumari C, Kumar OS, Rao JV. Application and correlation of hematological scoring system and serum prolactin levels in early diagnosis of neonatal sepsis 3 year study. *International Archives of Integrated Medicine* 2016; **3**(11): 36-45.

67. Manvitha G, Geetha K, Padmaja GJV, Devi AM. Correlation of Haematological Scoring System with C - Reactive Protein and Blood Culture in the Diagnosis and Prognosis of Neonatal Sepsis in A Tertiary Care Hospital, Hyderabad. *Journal of Cardiovascular Disease Research* 2023; **14**: 1579-92.

68. Matsushita FY, Krebs VLJ, de Carvalho WB. Complete blood count and C-reactive protein to predict positive blood culture among neonates using machine learning algorithms. *Clinics (Sao Paulo, Brazil)* 2023; **78**: 100148.

69. Meirina F, Lubis B, Sembiring T, Rosdiana N, Siregar OR. Hematological scoring system as an early diagnostic tool for neonatal sepsis. *Paediatrica Indonesiana* 2015; **55**(6): 315-21.

70. Mishra KN, Mishra RK. Evaluation and Role of Basic Hematological Scoring System in Early detection of Neonatal Sepsis. *International Journal of Medical and Health Research* 2019; **5**(11): 109-13.

71. Mohamed HE, Akl HK, El Banna EA. CD64: diagnostic accuracy compared with the hematologic scoring system and CRP in neonatal sepsis. *The Egyptian Journal of Haematology* 2012; **37**(4).

72. Mondal SK, Nag DR, Bandyopadhyay R, Chakraborty D, Sinha SK. Neonatal sepsis: Role of a battery of immunohematological tests in early diagnosis. *Int J Appl Basic Med Res* 2012; **2**(1): 43-7.

73. Nabi SN, Basak AK, Kamruzzaman M, et al. Performance of Haematological Parameters in Early Diagnosis of Clinically Suspected Neonatal Sepsis. *Mymensingh Med J* 2019; **28**(1): 193-9.

74. Nair A, George v, Mohandas L. Utility of Hematological Scoring System in Diagnosis of Neonatal Sepsis. 2020.

75. Narasimha A, Harendra Kumar ML. Significance of Hematological Scoring System (HSS) in early diagnosis of neonatal sepsis. *Indian Journal of Hematology and Blood Transfusion* 2011; **27**(1): 14-7.

76. Neal SR, Fitzgerald F, Chimhuya S, Heys M, Cortina-Borja M, Chimhini G. Diagnosing early-onset neonatal sepsis in low-resource settings: development of a multivariable prediction model. *Archives of Disease in Childhood* 2023; **108**(8): 608-15.

77. Nguyen TM, Poh KL, Chong SL, Lee JH. Effective diagnosis of sepsis in critically ill children using probabilistic graphical model. *Translational Pediatrics* 2023; **12**(4): 538-51.

78. Okascharoen C, Sirinavin S, Thakkinstian A, Kitayaporn D, Supapanachart S. A bedside prediction-scoring model for late-onset neonatal sepsis. *Journal of Perinatology* 2005; **25**(12): 778-83.

79. Padhy S, Thandaveshwara D, Doreswamy SM, Krishnamurthy V. Sepscore - An Improved Armament in the Diagnosis of Neonatal Sepsis. *Journal of Clinical and Diagnostic Research* 2023; **17**: EC05-EC7.

80. Pinto MC, Bueno AC, Vieira AA. Implementation of a protocol proposed by the Brazilian National Health Surveillance Agency for antibiotic use in very low birth weight infants. *J Pediatr (Rio J)* 2013; **89**(5): 450-5.

81. Pokhylko V, Cherniavska Y, Adamchuk N, Tsvirenko S, Klimchuk Y. CLINICAL PREDICTION OF EARLY ONSET SEPSIS IN PRETERM NEONATES. *Wiad Lek* 2020; **73**(10): 2219-23.

82. Pramana KP, Kardana IM, Nilawati GAP. Diagnosis accuracy of Hematological Scoring System in early identification of neonatal sepsis. *Bali Medical Journal* 2016; **5**(3): 139-44.

83. Pukhtinskaya M, Estrin V. The Early Diagnostics of the Sepsis of Newborns on Mechanical Ventilation. SciTech Immuno-Microbiology; 2021; Online; 2021.

84. Raguindin PFN, Samonte MVA, Dans LF. Bedside prediction scoring or emergent diagnosis of late onset neonatal sepsis. *Pediatric Infectious Disease Society of the Philippines* 2014: 48-58.

85. Reyna Figueroa J, Briseño-Vázquez R, Ortiz- Ibarra F. Validación de la escala NOSEP-1 para el diagnóstico de sepsis nosocomial en recién nacidos prematuros menores de 1500g. *Bol Med Hosp Infant Mex* 2005; **62**: 321-8.

86. Rosenberg RE, Ahmed AS, Saha SK, et al. Nosocomial sepsis risk score for preterm infants in low-resource settings. *Journal of Tropical Pediatrics* 2010; **56**(2): 82-9.

87. Selimovic A, Skokic F, Bazardzanovic M, Selimovic Z. The predictive score for early-onset neonatal sepsis. *Turkish Journal of Pediatrics* 2010; **52**(2): 139-44.

88. Shah HY, Jha BM. Early diagnosis and evaluation of neonatal septicemia by hematological scoring system. *International Journal of Medical Science and Public Health* 2019.

89. Sharma R, Bombeshwar V, Varma R, Neral A, Gupta C. Role of Modified Rodwell's Haematological Scoring System in Early Diagnosis of Neonatal Sepsis: A Study in Tertiary Care Centre of Central India. *International Journal of Pharmaceutical and Clinical Research* 2024; **16**: 539-43.

90. Shuai X, Li X, Wu Y. Prediction for late-onset sepsis in preterm infants based on data from East China. *Frontiers in Pediatrics* 2022; **10**: 924014.

91. Shukla G, Goyal P, Arya S. Diagnostic Accuracy of Haematological Scoring System in Paired cord Blood and Peripheral Venous Blood for early Detection of Neonatal Sepsis - A Prospective Analytical Study. *Journal of Nepal Paediatric Society* 2023; **43**: 15-21.

92. Singh SA, Dutta S, Narang A. Predictive clinical scores for diagnosis of late onset neonatal septicemia. *Journal of Tropical Pediatrics* 2003; **49**(4): 235-9.

93. Sriram R. Correlation of blood culture results with the sepsis score and the sepsis screen in the diagnosis of neonatal septicemia. *International Journal of Biological and Medical Research* 2011; **2**(1): 360-8.

94. Swarnkar K, Swarnkar M. A study of early onset neonatal sepsis with special reference to sepsis screening parameters in a tertiary care centre of rural India. *Internet Journal of Infectious Diseases* 2012; **10**(1): 2.

95. Thermiany AS, Retayasa W, Kardana M, Lila IN. Diagnostic accuracy of septic markers for neonatal sepsis. *Paediatrica Indonesiana* 2008; **48**(5): 299-305.

96. Varughese PM. Modified hematological sepsis score: an easy and cost effective measure to combat neonatal septicemia. *International Journal of Research in Medical Sciences* 2020; **8**(2): 517-23.

97. Vinay BS, Girish GN, Adhikari S, Hugara S. Evaluation of Septic Screen as a Diagnostic Tool for Neonatal Sepsis in a Tertiary Hospital at Mysore. *Scholars Journal of Applied Medical Sciences* 2015; **3**(2G): 1005-10.

98. Weber MW, Carlin JB, Gatchalian S, et al. Predictors of neonatal sepsis in developing countries. *Pediatric Infectious Disease Journal* 2003; **22**(8): 711-7.

99. Wu M, Deng Y, Wang X, He B, Wei F, Zhang Y. Development of risk prediction nomogram for neonatal sepsis in Group B Streptococcus-colonized mothers: a retrospective study. *Scientific Reports* 2024; **14**(1): 5629.

100. Yadav BB, Maini B, Kumari N, Indu A. Assessment of platelet indices as a biomarker for diagnosis neonatal sepsis. *Journal of Cardiovascular Disease Research* 2023; **14**: 1422-7.

101. Yin Z, Chen Y, Zhong W, et al. A Novel Algorithm With Paired Predictive Indexes to Stratify the Risk Levels of Neonates With Invasive Bacterial Infections: A Multicenter Cohort Study. *Pediatr Infect Dis J* 2022; **41**(4): e149-e55.

102. Zarkesh M, Hashemian H, Momtazbakhsh M, Rostami T. Assessment of febrile neonates according to low risk criteria for serious bacterial infection. *Iran J Pediatr* 2011; **21**(4): 436-40.

103. Zhang Y, Zhang C, Shu J, Zhang F. Establishment and Validation of Models Based on Clinical Parameters/Symptoms for Diagnostic and Prognostic Assessment of Neonatal Sepsis. *Iranian Journal of Pediatrics* 2023; **33**.

104. Baker MD, Bell LM, Avner JR. Outpatient management without antibiotics of fever in selected infants. *The New England journal of medicine* 1993; **329**(20): 1437-41.

105. Baskin MN, O'Rourke EJ, Fleisher GR. Outpatient treatment of febrile infants 28 to 89 days of age with intramuscular administration of ceftriaxone. *J Pediatr* 1992; **120**(1): 22-7.

106. Bekhof J, Reitsma JB, Kok JH, Van Straaten IH. Clinical signs to identify late-onset sepsis in preterm infants. *Eur J Pediatr* 2013; **172**(4): 501-8.

107. Kuzniewicz MW, Puopolo KM, Fischer A, et al. A quantitative, risk-based approach to the management of neonatal early-onset sepsis. *JAMA Pediatrics* 2017; **171**(4): 365-71.

108. Mahieu LM, De Dooy JJ, Cossey VR, et al. Internal and external validation of the NOSEP prediction score for nosocomial sepsis in neonates. *Crit Care Med* 2002; **30**(7): 1459-66.

109. Mahieu LM, De Muynck AO, De Dooy JJ, Laroche SM, Van Acker KJ. Prediction of nosocomial sepsis in neonates by means of a computer-weighted bedside scoring system (NOSEP score). *Crit Care Med* 2000; **28**(6): 2026-33.

110. Powell KR. Evaluation and management of febrile infants younger than 60 days of age. *Pediatr Infect Dis J* 1990; **9**(3): 153-7.

111. Puopolo KM, Benitz WE, Zaoutis TE, et al. Management of Neonates Born at ≥35 0/7 Weeks' Gestation With Suspected or Proven Early-Onset Bacterial Sepsis. *Pediatrics* 2018; **142**(6).

112. Rodwell RL, Leslie AL, Tudehope DI. Early diagnosis of neonatal sepsis using a hematologic scoring system. *Journal of Pediatrics* 1988; **112**(5): 761-7.

113. Takkar VP, Bhakoo ON, Narang A. Scoring system for the prediction of early neonatal infections. *Indian Pediatr* 1974; **11**(9): 597-600.

114. Golding N, Burstein R, Longbottom J, et al. Mapping under-5 and neonatal mortality in Africa, 2000–15: a baseline analysis for the Sustainable Development Goals. *Lancet* 2017; **390**(10108): 2171-82.

115. Li J, Shen L, Qian K. Global, regional, and national incidence and mortality of neonatal sepsis and other neonatal infections, 1990-2019. *Front Public Health* 2023; **11**: 1139832.

116. Chimhini G, Chimhuya S, Madzudzo L, et al. Auditing use of antibiotics in Zimbabwean neonates. *Infection Prevention in Practice* 2020; **2**(2): 100046.

117. Heys M, Kesler E, Sassoon Y, et al. Development and implementation experience of a learning healthcare system for facility based newborn care in low resource settings: The Neotree. *Learning Health Systems* 2022; **e10310**.

118. Van Calster B, Steyerberg EW, Wynants L, van Smeden M. There is no such thing as a validated prediction model. *BMC Medicine* 2023; **21**(1): 70.

119. Van Calster B, McLernon DJ, van Smeden M, Wynants L, Steyerberg EW. Calibration: the Achilles heel of predictive analytics. *BMC Med* 2019; **17**(1): 230.

120. Molloy EJ, Wynn JL, Bliss J, et al. Neonatal sepsis: need for consensus definition, collaboration and core outcomes. *Pediatr Res* 2020; **88**(1): 2-4.

FIGURES



Figure 1. PRISMA flowchart of study selection.
GIM = Global Index Medicus. Adapted from Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71.



Figure 2. Number of studies included in our review by year of publication. Red line represents a local regression (LOESS) model fitted on the yearly publication counts.



Figure 3. Choropleth map of number of included studies by country. Created with DataWrapper: Lorenz, Aisch, and Kokkelink, 'Datawrapper: Create Charts and Maps'.

TABLES

Table 1. Eligibility criteria.

Population	• Neonates aged ≤ 30 days of life, or hospitalised in a neonatal unit, being evaluated for neonatal sepsis. • The definition of neonatal sepsis was left to the discretion of individual studies. • Studies examining a range of patient ages were included, provided that sufficient data were available to examine model performance in neonates specifically.
Concept	• Studies that develop or validate a CPM to diagnose neonatal sepsis in a LMIC, as defined by the World Bank in 2020. • Studies were considered to have validated a CPM if they reported any of: C-statistic denoting AUC, sensitivity, specificity, predictive values or likelihood ratios. • Studies evaluating prognostic models (e.g. to predict mortality or morbidity) were excluded.
Context	• Studies from any healthcare setting, including neonatal units, emergency departments, outpatient settings, or community settings. • Studies were only included if the model they refer to has been internally and/or externally validated in a LMIC, regardless of the country where the model was initially developed.
Type of studies	• Randomised and quasi-randomised controlled trials, cohort studies, cross-sectional studies, case-control studies and clinical guidelines. • Also, letters, comments and conference proceedings (providing sufficient details were provided for data extraction). • Systematic reviews, meta-analyses and editorials were excluded, but were used to identify relevant primary literature. • No time period restrictions, but only studies published in English or Spanish were considered, to reflect the languages spoken by the review team.

AUC = area under the receiver operating characteristic curve; CPM = clinical prediction model; LMIC = low-income and middle-income country.

Table 2. Summary of included studies and model performance.

Model	Study, country	Population	No. participants (with outcome)	Outcome definition	Sensitivity	Specificity	Other
Abiramalatha	Abiramalatha 2016, India	All births, at risk or suspected of sepsis	600 (240)	Blood culture	90.8%	99.7%	Cutoff unclear
Ahire	Ahire 2022, India	NICU, high sepsis risk	80 (57)	Blood culture	94.5%	80.0%	Cutoff unclear
Ahmed	Ahmed 2005, Pakistan	NICU, suspected sepsis	200 (28)	Blood culture	96.4-100%	72.0-92.0%	Various 3 test combinations
American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP)	Beandda 2019, the Philippines	All births, ≥34 weeks, treated for sepsis	330 (11)	Blood culture	54.6%	72.2%	
Bekhof	Lloyd 2022, South Africa	NICU, very low birthweight	841 (224)	Blood culture	55%	71%	Cutoff ≥1 sign positive
Boston protocol	Bulbul 2019, Turkey	NICU, ≥35 weeks, fever ≥38°C	328 (126)	Blood, CSF, sputum or urine culture	61.6%	81.7%	
Celik	Celik 2013, Turkey	NICU	304 (206)	Clinical diagnosis ± blood culture	95.9%	91.2%	Cutoff 0.2429 AUC 0.98 (95% CI 0.95-0.99)
Fitriana	Fitriana 2023, Indonesia	NICU, all admitted	162 (15)	Blood culture	80%	47%	Cutoff ≥2.5
He	He 2017, China	NICU, suspected sepsis	151 (68)	Blood or CSF culture	42.7%	94.0%	AUC 0.83 (95% CI 0.77-0.89)
Helguera-Repetto	Helguera-Repetto 2020, Mexico	NICU	238 (106)	Blood culture	93.3%	80.0%	AUC 0.94 (95% CI 0.86-1.00)
Hematological Scoring System (HSS)	Amir 2023, India	NICU, suspected sepsis	70 (9)	Blood culture	100.0%	75.4%	Cutoff ≥4
	Annam 2015, India	All births, term	153 (59)	Blood culture	100%	78.7%	Cutoff ≥4
	Bhalodia 2017, India	NICU, suspected sepsis	150 (48)	Blood culture	100%	100%	Cutoff ≥5
	Debroy 2016, India	NICU, suspected sepsis	40 (10)	Blood culture	80%	90%	Cutoff ≥5
	Derbala 2017, Egypt	NICU, suspected sepsis	200 (80)	ND	95.0%	96.7%	Cutoff ≥4 AUC 0.95 (95% CI 0.94-1.00)
	Dutta 2016, India	NICU, suspected sepsis	210 (48)	Blood culture	100%	69.8%	Cutoff ≥5

El-Said 2024, Egypt	NICU, culture proven sepsis and negative controls	225 (107)	Blood culture	87.85%	94.92%	Cutoff ≥3 AUC 0.964
Gupta 2011, India	NICU, at risk or suspected of sepsis	80 (44)	Clinical diagnosis ± blood culture	ND	ND	75% with clinical sepsis scored ≥5
Ibrahim 2023, Egypt	NICU	81 (51)	Clinical diagnosis ± blood culture	72.6%	100.0%	Cutoff >1 AUC 0.863 (95% CI 0.768 to 0.929)
Khair 2012, India	NICU, suspected sepsis	100 (12)	Blood culture	75%	87%	Cutoff ≥5
Krishnamurthy 2017, India	NICU, full blood count performed at admission	75 (25)	Clinical diagnosis ± blood culture	80%	70%	Cutoff ≥3
Liestiadi 2017, Indonesia	NICU, suspected sepsis	43 (14)	Blood culture	100.0%	82.7%	Cutoff ≥4
Makkar 2013, India	Presenting to hospital, suspected sepsis	110 (42)	Clinical diagnosis ± blood culture	Preterm: 92.3% Term: 75.0%	Preterm: 86.4% Term: 77.8%	Cutoff unclear
Malini 2016, India	NICU, suspected sepsis	200 (116)	Blood culture	95%	86%	Cutoff ≥5
Manvitha 2023, India	NICU, suspected sepsis	300 samples (185 samples)	Blood culture and CRP	96.55%	59.23%	Cutoff ≥3
Meirina 2015, Indonesia	NICU, suspected sepsis	40 (10)	Blood culture	20.0%	96.7%	Cutoff ≥5 AUC for cutoff ≥4: 0.90 (95% CI 0.80-1.00)
Mishra 2019, India	NICU, suspected sepsis	50 (18)	Blood culture	88.9%	100.0%	Cutoff ≥5
Nair 2020, India	NICU, suspected sepsis	80 (12)	Blood culture	41%	92%	Cutoff unclear
Narasimha 2011, India	NICU, at risk or suspected of sepsis	50 (12)	Blood culture	100%	66%	Cutoff ≥5
Padhy 2023, India	NICU, suspected sepsis and non-septic controls	350 (146)	Clinical diagnosis and SIRS	79%	39%	Cutoff ≥3
Pramana 2016, Indonesia	All births, at risk or suspected of sepsis	62 (21)	Blood culture	80.9%	92.7%	Cutoff ≥5
Shah 2019, India	NICU, suspected sepsis	100 (19)	Blood culture	10.5%	100%	Cutoff ≥5

	Shukla 2023, India	NICU, at risk of sepsis	100 (35)	Clinical diagnosis ± blood culture	63%	88%	Cutoff ≥3
	de Souza 2015, Brazil	All births, suspected sepsis	50 (ND)	Blood culture	15%	97%	Cutoff ≥3 AUC 0.61
HSS (cord blood)	Himasree 2024, India	All births, at risk of sepsis	100 (56)	Blood culture	100.0%	54.7%	Cutoff ≥2
	Shukla 2023, India	NICU, at risk of sepsis	100 (35)	Clinical diagnosis ± blood culture	74%	92%	Cutoff ≥3
HSS (+) CRP	Amir 2023, India	NICU, suspected sepsis	70 (9)	Blood culture	100.0%	86.9%	Cutoff ≥4 plus CRP
	Khair 2012, India	NICU, suspected sepsis	100 (12)	Blood culture	75%	85%	Cutoff ≥4 plus CRP
	Nabi 2019, Bangladesh	All births	140 (22)	Blood culture	93%	55-57%	Various 3 test combinations
HSS (+) PCR	Godoy Torales 2020, Paraguay	NICU, term, chorioamnionitis	71 (11)	Clinical diagnosis ± blood culture	At mean 3.8 hours of life: 9.0%; At median 45.5 hours of life: 30.0%	At mean 3.8 hours of life: 98.3%; At median 45.5 hours of life: 96.1%	Cutoff ≥3
HSS (+) CRP, micro-ESR	Amir 2023, India	NICU, suspected sepsis	70 (9)	Blood culture	100.0%	91.8%	Cutoff ≥4 plus CRP and micro-ESR
HSS (+) nucleated RBCs (-) I:M ratio ('Sepscore')	Padhy 2023, India	NICU, suspected sepsis and non-septic controls	350 (146)	Clinical diagnosis and SIRS	68%	61%	Cutoff ≥3
	Sharma 2024, India	Unclear, at risk or suspected of sepsis	108 (35)	Blood culture	82.85%	91.78%	Cutoff ≥3 AUC 0.6083
HSS (+) nucleated RBCs (-) I:M ratio, immature PMN count ('modified HSS')	Ibrahim 2023, Egypt	NICU	81 (51)	Clinical diagnosis ± blood culture	76.5%	100.0%	Cutoff >1 AUC 0.882 (95% CI 0.792 to 0.943)
	Krishnamurthy 2017, India	NICU, full blood count performed at admission	75 (25)	Clinical diagnosis ± blood culture	84%	82%	Cutoff ≥3
HSS (+) CRP, CD64 (-) PMN changes	Mohamed 2012, Egypt	NICU, suspected sepsis and healthy term controls	36 (13)	Clinical diagnosis and blood, CSF or urine culture	100.0%	82.6%	Cutoff ≥3
HSS (+) cord CRP, 48-hour CRP (-) I:T ratio	Varughese 2019, India	NICU, ≥34 weeks	550 (17)	Blood culture	94.1%	89.9%	Cutoff ≥5

HSS (+) nucleated RBCs (-) I:M ratio, PMN changes	Chitra 2022, Indonesia	NICU, suspected sepsis	95 (28)	Blood culture	82.1%	83.6%	Cutoff ≥3 AUC 0.849
HSS (+) nucleated RBCs, MPV, PDW (-) I:M ratio, PMN changes	Chitra 2022, Indonesia	NICU, suspected sepsis	95 (28)	Blood culture	92.9%	83.6%	Cutoff ≥3 AUC 0.917
HSS (+) CRP, partial blood culture result ('ANVISA handbook protocol')	Pinto 2013, Brazil	NICU, low birthweight	136 (129)	Clinical diagnosis and blood culture	ND	ND	Significant decrease in number of antibiotic regimens, days of antibiotic use, overall mortality and infection-related mortality.
Hu	Hu 2021, China	NICU, preterm	156 (65)	Blood or CSF culture	90.8%	97.8%	AUC 0.97 (95% CI 0.94-1.00)
Huang	Huang 2020, China	NICU, preterm	1708 (130)	Clinical diagnosis and blood culture	45.3%	92.3%	AUC 0.83 (95% CI 0.78-0.89)
	Shuai 2022, China	NICU, preterm, admitted within 24 hours of birth for >7 days	119 (ND)	Clinical diagnosis and blood culture	44.1%	71.7%	Cutoff 0.164 AUC 0.61 (95% CI 0.51-0.72)
Husada EOS	Husada 2010, Thailand	ND	180 (45)	ND	73.3%	84.4%	Cutoff ≥1 AUC 0.88
Husada LOS	Husada 2010, Thailand	NICU	208 (52)	Blood culture	88.5%	90.4%	Cutoff ≥2 AUC 0.96
Iqbal	Iqbal 2024, India	NICU, clinically diagnosed with sepsis	388 (184)	Blood culture	ND	ND	Cutoff 0.07396 AUC 0.994
Istanbul protocol	Bulbul 2019, Turkey	NICU, ≥35 weeks, fever ≥38°C	328 (126)	Blood, CSF, sputum or urine culture	81.7%	65.0%	
Kaiser Permanente EOS Calculator	Al-Lawama 2019, Jordan	NICU, PROM ≥18 hours, ≥34 weeks	176 (32)	Clinical diagnosis ± blood culture	ND	ND	Newborns with sepsis fit into "ill appearing" category with significantly higher proportion

	Beandda 2019, the Philippines	All births, ≥34 weeks, treated for sepsis	330 (11)	Blood culture	54.6%	87.8%	
	He 2019, China	NICU, ≥34 weeks	501 (353)	Blood culture	81.2%	93.9%	AUC 0.91 (95% CI 0.88-0.94)
	Ikhsaniatun 2022, Indonesia	NICU, ≥34 weeks, clinical diagnosis of sepsis using WHO criteria	82 (21)	Blood culture	85.7%	44.3%	Positive blood culture RR 3.46 (95% CI 1.11-10.78); Antibiotic use decreased by 36.6%
Kar	Kar 2013, India	NICU, suspected sepsis at ≥3 days of life	210 events (94)	Clinical diagnosis and blood or CSF culture	3%	99%	Cutoff ≥4
Matsushita	Matsushita 2023, Brazil	NICU	1181 (175) samples	Blood culture	8-59%	ND	AUC 0.695-0.775; various machine learning models
Mondal	Mondal 2012, India	NICU, suspected sepsis	62 (38)	Blood culture	84%	84%	Cutoff ≥2 tests positive
Neal	Neal 2023, Zimbabwe	NICU, ≥32 weeks	2628 (297)	Clinical diagnosis	95%	11%	Cutoff 0.034 AUC 0.74 (95% CI 0.70-0.77)
NeoHoP	Lloyd 2023, South Africa	NICU, very low birthweight, admitted >72 hours with suspected HAI	552 episodes (215 episodes)	Clinical diagnosis ± blood culture	54.2%	96.4%	Cutoff ≥2 AUC 0.868 (95% CI 0.837-0.900)
Nguyen	Nguyen 2023, China	PICU, all admitted <30 days	ND (ND)	ICD-10 diagnostic criteria	33.8%	96.1%	AUC 0.783 (95% CI 0.716–0.850)
NOSEP-1	Lloyd 2022, South Africa	NICU, very low birthweight	841 (224)	Blood culture	65%	75%	Cutoff ≥8
	Reyna-Figueroa 2005, Mexico	NICU, preterm, low birthweight, suspected sepsis	101 (51)	Blood culture and ≥2 SIRS features	62.7%	70.0%	Cutoff ≥8 AUC 0.68 (95% CI 0.57-0.78)
NOSEP-NEW1	Lloyd 2022, South Africa	NICU, very low birthweight	841 (224)	Blood culture	17%	97%	Cutoff ≥11 NOSEP-1 but with different cutoffs for individual parameters

Okascharoen	Okascharoen 2005, Thailand	All births, hospitalised >72 hours	73 (25)	Clinical diagnosis and positive blood, CSF, pleural, bone, joint or urine culture	92%	56%	Cutoff ≥4 AUC 0.80 (95% CI 0.69-0.90)
	Raguindin 2014, the Philippines	NICU, suspected LOS	119 (60)	Blood culture	83.3%	61.0%	Cutoff ≥6 AUC 0.75 (95% CI 0.66-0.84)
Perinatal Infection Risk Score	Hassan 2016, India	All births, at risk of sepsis	100 (63)	Blood culture	20.6%	92.0%	Cutoff ≥6
	Sriram 2011, India	NICU, suspected sepsis	115 (58)	Blood culture	43.1%	57.9%	Cutoff ≥6
Philadelphia protocol	Bulbul 2019, Turkey	NICU, ≥35 weeks, fever ≥38°C	328 (126)	Blood, CSF, sputum or urine culture	67.7%	79.9%	
Pokhylko	Pokhylko 2020, Ukraine	NICU, low birthweight	152 (121)	Blood culture	82.20%	93.55%	AUC 0.94
PROM-Scoring	Afjeiee 2008, Iran	All births, PROM ≥18 hours	270 (79)	Blood culture	100%	ND	Cutoff unclear
Pukhtinskaya	Pukhtinskaya 2021, Russia	NICU, term, admitted for mechanical ventilation within 48 hours of birth	200 (45)	Unclear	97.06%	94.67%	
Rochester protocol	Bulbul 2019, Turkey	NICU, ≥35 weeks, fever ≥38°C	328 (126)	Blood, CSF, sputum or urine culture	47.6%	72.0%	
	Zarkesh 2011, Iran	Presenting to emergency department and admitted to NICU, term, febrile	202 (38)	Clinical diagnosis and blood, CSF, urine or stool culture	2.63%	62.2%	
Rosenberg	Lloyd 2022, South Africa	NICU, very low birthweight	841 (224)	Blood culture	17%	95%	Cutoff ≥2
	Rosenberg 2010, Bangladesh	NICU, ≤33 weeks	193 (105)	Clinical diagnosis ± blood culture	15.2%	96.6%	Cutoff ≥3
Selimovic	Selimovic 2010, Bosnia & Herzegovina	All births, suspected sepsis	341 (199)	Clinical diagnosis ± blood culture	73%	89%	Cutoff 0.503 AUC 0.87
Septic screen	Buch 2011, India	NICU, suspected sepsis	120 (65)	Blood culture	81.5%	94.6%	ANC, I:T ratio, platelet count, CRP, micro-ESR

	Gupta 2022, India	NICU, ≥34 weeks, suspected sepsis	300 (38)	Blood culture	92.1%	34.0%	CRP, micro-ESR, WCC, ANC, I:T ratio
	Hassan 2016, India	All births, at risk of sepsis	100 (63)	Blood culture	81.0%	94.6%	Cutoff ≥2 tests positive
	Jadhav 2013, India	NICU, suspected sepsis	115 (75)	Blood culture	100.0%	62.5%	Cutoff ≥2 tests positive from WCC, ANC, I:T ratio, CRP
	Kudawla 2008, India	NICU, low birthweight, suspected sepsis	220 events (60)	Clinical diagnosis and blood culture	48%	70%	Cutoff ≥2 tests positive
	Mahale 2010, India	NICU, suspected sepsis	125 (28)	Blood culture	Mild/moderate: 38% Severe: 25%	Mild/moderate: 81% Severe: 77%	Cutoff ≥2 tests positive; illness severity by SNAPPE-II score
	Sriram 2011, India	NICU, suspected sepsis	115 (58)	Blood culture	65.4%	81.1%	Cutoff ≥3 tests positive
	Swarnkar 2012, India	NICU	189 (37)	Blood culture	66.7%	79.0%	Cutoff ≥3 tests positive
	Thermiany 2016, Indonesia	NICU, suspected sepsis	126 (56)	Blood culture	85.7%	97.1%	Cutoff ≥2 tests positive from WCC, platelet count, I:T ratio
	Vinay 2015, India	NICU, suspected sepsis	60 (48)	Blood culture	77%	41%	Cutoff ≥2 tests positive
	Yadav 2023, India	NICU, suspected sepsis	300 (174)	Blood culture or positive septic screen	58%	32.62%	Cutoff ≥2 tests positive
Shuai	Shuai 2022, China	NICU, preterm, admitted within 24 hours of birth for >7 days	119 (ND)	Clinical diagnosis and blood culture	67.8%	75.0%	Cutoff 0.539 AUC 0.80 (95% CI 0.72-0.88)
Singh	Singh 2003, India	NICU	105 events (30)	Blood or CSF culture	87%	29%	Cutoff ≥1
	Kudawla 2007, India	NICU, low birthweight, suspected sepsis	220 events (60)	Clinical diagnosis and blood culture	90.0%	22.5%	Cutoff ≥1
	Rosenberg 2010, Bangladesh	NICU, ≤33 weeks	193 (105)	Clinical diagnosis ± blood culture	56.6%	52.1%	Cutoff ≥3
	Lloyd 2022, South Africa	NICU, very low birthweight	841 (224)	Blood culture	32%	76%	Cutoff ≥3

Singh (+) septic screen	Kudawla 2007, India	NICU, low birthweight, suspected sepsis	220 events (60)	Clinical diagnosis and blood culture	95.0%	18.1%	Cutoff ≥1 and/or septic screen positive
STOPS tool	James 2021, India	NICU, at risk or suspected of sepsis	EOS: 330 (86) LOS: 50 (20)	Clinical diagnosis and blood culture	EOS: 90.5% LOS: 100.0%	EOS: 28.5% LOS: 90.0%	Strategy 3 for EOS, Strategy 2 for LOS; 33% decrease in antibiotic use for EOS, 54% for LOS.
Weber	Weber 2003, Ethiopia, the Gambia, Papua New Guinea & the Philippines	Presenting to study sites, <60 days of age	3303 (120)	Blood culture	0-6 days: 87%; 7-59 days: 66%	0-6 days: 41%; 7-59 days: 79%	Cutoff any 2 signs positive
Wu	Wu 2024, China	All births, term, vaginal delivery, mothers colonised with GBS	339 (84)	Clinical diagnosis	68.6%	61.9%	Cutoff 0.305 AUC 0.711 (95% CI 0.592-0.808) in validation cohort
Yadav	Yadav 2023, India	NICU, suspected sepsis	300 (174)	Blood culture or positive septic screen	41.36%	60.43%	Cutoff ≥2 tests positive
Yin	Yin 2022, China	NICU, term, suspected sepsis	1053 (166)	Blood culture and metagenomic next-generation sequencing of blood or CSF	95.3%	ND	Accuracy 98.7%
Zhang	Zhang 2023, China	NICU, suspected sepsis	111 (ND)	Blood culture	98.6%	95.0%	Cutoff 0.856 AUC 0.721 (95% CI 0.587-0.854)

ANC = absolute neutrophil count; ANVISA = Agência Nacional de Vigilância Sanitária; AUC = area under the curve; CD = cluster of differentiation; CI = confidence interval; CRP = C-reactive protein; CSF = cerebrospinal fluid; EOS = early-onset sepsis; ESR = erythrocyte sedimentation rate; HAI = healthcare-associated infection; ICD-10 = International Classification of Diseases 10th revision; I:M ratio = immature to mature neutrophil ratio; I:T ratio = immature to total neutrophil ratio; LOS = late-onset sepsis; MPV = mean platelet volume; ND = no data; NICU = neonatal intensive care unit; PCR = polymerase chain reaction; PDW = platelet distribution width; PICU = paediatric intensive care unit; PMN = polymorphonuclear neutrophil; PROM = premature rupture of membranes; RBC = red blood cell; RR = relative risk; SIRS = systemic inflammatory response syndrome; WCC = white cell count; WHO = World Health Organization.

Table 3. Summary of model characteristics

Model (derivation study)	Country of derivation cohort	Outcome	Modelling methods	Predictors in final model		
				Clinical features	Risk factors	Laboratory tests
Abiramalatha (Abiramalatha 2016)	India	All sepsis	Scoring system, ROC curves to determine cutoff values			WCC, platelet count, lower median angle light scatter, mean neutrophil volume
Ahire (Ahire 2022)	India	All sepsis	Scoring system			CRP, WCC, platelet count, neutrophil count
Ahmed (Ahmed 2005)	Pakistan	All sepsis	Scoring system, literature and clinical knowledge			CRP, neutrophil count, platelet count, gastric aspirate cytology, cytoplasmic vacuolation (3 test combinations)
American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) (Puopolo 2018)	USA	EOS	Criteria-based without specific scoring	Ill appearance	Chorioamnionitis	
Bekhof (Bekhof 2013)	The Netherlands	LOS	Nomogram from logistic regression, backward elimination	Increased respiratory support, capillary refill time, grey skin	Central venous catheter	
Boston protocol (Baskin 1992)	USA	Serious bacterial infection	Criteria-based without specific scoring	Fever ≥38°C, appearance, dehydration, focal signs of infection	Recent immunisation, recent antibiotics	WCC, CSF analysis, urinalysis, CXR
Celik (Celik 2013)	Turkey	All sepsis	Markov state models, modified stepwise selection			Mean neutrophil volume, volume distribution width, interleukin-6, CRP
Fitriana (Fitriana 2023)	Indonesia	EOS	Logistic regression		Prematurity, PROM, foul liquor, sex	
Hematological Scoring System (Rodwell 1988)	Australia	All sepsis	Scoring system, univariable predictor performance			WCC, PMN count, immature PMN count, I:T ratio, I:M ratio, platelet count, PMN degenerative changes
He (He 2017)	China	EOS	Logistic regression, stepwise selection			Interleukin-27, procalcitonin, CRP

Helguera-Repetto (Helguera-Repetto 2020)	Mexico	All sepsis	Neural network	Fever >37.5°C, hypothermia <35.5°C, tachycardia, tachypnoea, bradycardia, bradypnoea, apnoeas	PROM, chorioamnionitis, maternal age, maternal morbidity, cervicovaginitis, UTI, sex, gestational age, birthweight, foetal morbidity, catheter, mechanical ventilation	WCC, platelet count, neutrophil count, band cells, % bands, I:T ratio
Hu (Hu 2021)	China	EOS	Logistic regression, backward elimination	Apgar score		CRP, procalcitonin, interleukin-6
Huang (Huang 2020)	China	LOS	Nomogram from logistic regression, backward elimination		Birthweight, intubation, umbilical venous catheter duration	Thyroid function
Husada EOS (Husada 2010)	Thailand	EOS	Logistic regression	Oxygen requirement, poor feeding	Length of admission pre-sepsis	WCC, platelet count
Husada LOS (Husada 2010)	Thailand	LOS	Logistic regression	Oxygen requirement, poor feeding, abnormal heart rate, abnormal temperature		WCC, pH
Iqbal (Iqbal 2024)	India	All sepsis	Supervised machine learning	Apnoea, tachycardia, bradycardia, desaturation, lethargy, septic shock, meningitis, pneumonia, Apgar score	Prematurity, vaginal delivery, low birthweight, very low birthweight, IUGR, SGA, primigravida, central catheter, peripheral catheter, end-diastolic flow, CPAP, mechanical ventilation, inotropes, corticosteroids, cardiac disease, lung disorder, respiratory distress syndrome, intraventricular haemorrhage, necrotising enterocolitis, fungal infection	WCC, RBC count, platelet count, neutrophil count, CRP, hypocalcaemia, hypoglycaemia, metabolic acidosis
Istanbul protocol (Bulbul 2019)	Turkey	Serious bacterial infection	Criteria-based without specific scoring	Fever ≥38°C, appearance, dehydration, focal signs of infection	Perinatal antibiotics, chronic disease, hospitalised longer than mother	CRP, WCC, I:T ratio, urinalysis
Kaiser Permanente EOS Calculator (Kuzniewicz 2017)	USA	EOS	Bayesian logistic regression and recursive partitioning	Clinical presentation (well appearing, equivocal, clinical illness)	EOS incidence, gestational age, duration of ROM, highest maternal intrapartum temperature, maternal GBS, intrapartum antibiotics	

Kar (Kar 2013)	India	LOS	Scoring system, univariable positive likelihood ratio	Lethargy, tachycardia, fever >37.5°C, abdominal distention, increased prefeed aspirate, chest retractions, grunting		
Matsushita (Matsushita 2023)	Brazil	All sepsis	Supervised machine learning			Haemoglobin, haematocrit, MCV, MCH, MCHC, WCC, neutrophil %, neutrophil count, neutrophil left shift %, neutrophil left shift count, eosinophil %, eosinophil count, basophil %, basophil count, lymphocyte %, lymphocyte count, monocyte %, monocyte count, platelet count, neutrophil to lymphocyte ratio, monocyte to lymphocyte ratio, platelet to lymphocyte ratio, delta neutrophil index, CRP, lymphocyte to CRP ratio
Mondal (Mondal 2012)	India	All sepsis	Scoring system, univariable preselection			CRP, micro-ESR, I:T ratio, morphological changes in neutrophils
Neal (Neal 2023)	Zimbabwe	EOS	Logistic regression	Fever >37.5°C, respiratory rate, activity, chest retractions, grunting	PROM, maternal intrapartum fever, foul smelling liquor	
NeoHoP (Lloyd 2023)	South Africa	LOS (HAI)	Logistic regression, univariable preselection	Capillary refill time, lethargy, abdominal distention	Central venous catheter	CRP
Nguyen (Nguyen 2023)	China	All sepsis	Tree augmented naive Bayes	Overall symptoms, gastrointestinal symptoms, central nervous symptoms, skin symptoms, respiratory symptoms, cardiovascular symptoms, infective symptoms, abnormal temperature symptoms, heart rate, respiratory rate, temperature, oxygen saturation, systolic blood pressure, diastolic blood pressure	Age, gender, low birthweight, prematurity, use of vasoactive agents, ICU length of stay, hospital length of stay, in-hospital mortality	WCC, neutrophil count, lymphocyte count, platelet count, partial thromboplastin time, prothrombin time, ESR, glucose, lactate, creatinine, procalcitonin, CRP, positive microbiological test

NOSEP-1 and NOSEP-NEW1 (Mahieu 2000, Mahieu 2002)	Belgium	LOS	Logistic regression, univariable preselection and stepwise selection	Fever >38.2°C	Parenteral nutrition for ≥14 days	CRP, platelet count, neutrophil fraction
Okascharoen (Okascharoen 2005)	Thailand	LOS	Cox model, univariable preselection and backward elimination	Hypotension, abnormal temperature, respiratory insufficiency	Umbilical venous catheter duration	Band cell fraction, platelet count
Perinatal Infection Risk Score (Takkar 1974)	India	All sepsis	ND	Apgar score	Prematurity, low birthweight, PROM, foul smelling liquor, unclean vaginal examination before delivery, duration of labour exceeding 24 hours	
Philadelphia protocol (Baker 1993)	USA	Serious bacterial infection	Criteria-based without specific scoring	Appearance, focal signs of infection		WCC, I:T ratio, CSF analysis, urinalysis, stool analysis, CXR
Pokhylko (Pokhylko 2020)	Ukraine	EOS	Logistic regression, stepwise selection	Apgar score	Prematurity, PROM, visual changes in placenta, history of abortion	Monocyte count
PROM-Scoring (Afjeiee 2008)	Iran	All sepsis	Scoring system	Apgar score	Prematurity, PROM, foetal tachycardia, chorioamnionitis, low birthweight, sex	
Pukhtinskaya (Pukhtinskaya 2021)	Russia	EOS	Decision tree			CD95, nitric oxide, CD34, CD69, lymphocytes with expression AnnexinV-FITC+PI
Rochester protocol (Powell 1990)	USA	Serious bacterial infection	Criteria-based without specific scoring	Fever ≥38°C, appearance, focal signs of infection	Prematurity, perinatal antibiotics, chronic disease, hospitalised longer than mother	WCC, immature PMN count, urinalysis, stool analysis
Rosenberg (Rosenberg 2010)	Bangladesh	LOS	Logistic regression, univariable preselection	Pallor, apnoea, lethargy, jaundice, hepatomegaly		
Selimovic (Selimovic 2010)	Bosnia & Herzegovina	EOS	Logistic regression, univariable preselection			WCC, I:T ratio, I:M ratio, CRP
Septic screen (generic)	Various	All sepsis	NA			CRP, micro-ESR, WCC, neutrophil count, I:T ratio, platelet count

Shuai (Shuai 2022)	China	LOS	Logistic regression, univariable preselection		Dopamine use, PROM, albumin use, maternal age, gender, peripherally inserted central catheter, gestational age, antibiotic use, season of delivery, asphyxia, prenatal glucocorticoids, umbilical venous catheter, birth weight	
Singh (Singh 2003)	India	LOS	Scoring system, univariable positive likelihood ratio	Lethargy, tachycardia, fever >37.5°C, abdominal distention, increased prefeed aspirate, chest retractions, grunting		
STOPS tool (James 2021)	India	All sepsis	Scoring system	Fever >37.5°C, hypothermia <35.5°C, tachycardia, bradycardia, tachypnoea, oxygen requirement, respiratory distress, poor feeding, hypoglycaemia, lethargy, irritability, weak cry, spontaneous movements, seizures, temperature of hands and feet, increased ventilatory requirements, apnoea, capillary refill time, arterial hypotension, skin colour		Procalcitonin, glucose
Weber (Weber 2003)	Ethiopia, the Gambia, Papua New Guinea & the Philippines	All sepsis, meningitis, pneumonia, or hypoxaemia	Logistic regression, univariable preselection	Fever >38°C, reduced feeding, no spontaneous movement, drowsy or unconscious, history of feeding problems, history of change in activity, agitated, capillary refill time, chest wall indrawing, respiratory rate, grunting, cyanosis, seizures, bulging fontanelle		
Wu (Wu 2024)	China	All sepsis	Nomogram from logistic regression, univariable preselection		Maternal age, gestational diabetes, forceps delivery, umbilical cord winding, gender	

Yadav (Yadav 2023)	India	All sepsis	Scoring system			WCC, I:T ratio, neutrophil count, CRP, platelet count, mean platelet volume, platelet distribution width
Yin (Yin 2022)	China	Invasive bacterial infection	Decision tree from logistic regression, stepwise selection	Ill appearance, abnormal neurological signs	Age at admission	WCC, procalcitonin, CRP, neutrophil %
Zhang (Zhang 2023)	China	EOS	Logistic regression, backward elimination	Vomiting, cough	Age, intra-amniotic infection	

CD = cluster of differentiation; CPAP = continuous positive airway pressure; CRP = C-reactive protein; CSF = cerebrospinal fluid; CXR = chest x-ray; EOS = early-onset sepsis; ESR = erythrocyte sedimentation rate; GBS = Group B streptococcus; HAI = healthcare-associated infection; ICU = intensive care unit; I:M ratio = immature to mature neutrophil ratio; I:T ratio = immature to total neutrophil ratio; IUGR = intrauterine growth restriction; LOS = late-onset sepsis; MCH = mean cell haemoglobin; MCHC = mean cell haemoglobin concentration; MCV = mean cell volume; NA = not applicable; ND = no data; PMN = polymorphonuclear neutrophil; PROM = premature rupture of membranes; RBC = red blood cell; ROC = receiver operating characteristic; ROM = rupture of membranes; SGA = small for gestational age; USA = United States of America; UTI = urinary tract infection; WCC = white cell count.

Table 4. Summary of geographical and economic distribution of included studies.

WHO region	Country	Income classification	*n* studies
African Region (AFR)	Ethiopia	LIC	1
	South Africa	UMIC	2
	The Gambia	LIC	1
	Zimbabwe	LMIC	1
Eastern Mediterranean Region (EMR)	Egypt	LMIC	4
	Iran	LMIC	2
	Jordan	LMIC	1
	Pakistan	LMIC	1
European Region (EUR)	Bosnia and Herzegovina	UMIC	1
	Russia	UMIC	1
	Turkey	UMIC	2
	Ukraine	LMIC	1
Region of the Americas (AMR)	Brazil	UMIC	3
	Mexico	UMIC	2
	Paraguay	UMIC	1
South-East Asian Region (SEAR)	Bangladesh	LMIC	2
	India	LMIC	37
	Indonesia	UMIC	7
	Thailand	UMIC	2
Western Pacific Region (WPR)	China	UMIC	9
	Papua New Guinea	LMIC	1
	Philippines	LMIC	3

One study conducted in multiple countries across multiple WHO regions and income classifications. LIC = low-income country; LMIC = lower middle-income country; UMIC = upper middle-income country; WHO = World Health Organization.

SUPPLEMENTARY APPENDIX

Appendix 1. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) Checklist.

Appendix 2. Search strategies for each database.

Appendix 3. Data extraction form.

Appendix 4. Additional results.

Supplementary File 1. Full text decisions and exclusion reasons (.xlsx).

Supplementary File 2. Data extracted from included studies (.xlsx).

Supplementary File 3. Code used to analyse extracted data (.R).

Appendix 1. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) Checklist.

SECTION	ITEM	PRISMA-ScR CHECKLIST ITEM	REPORTED ON PAGE #
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a scoping review.	1
ABSTRACT			
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary that includes (as applicable): background, objectives, eligibility criteria, sources of evidence, charting methods, results, and conclusions that relate to the review questions and objectives.	1
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known. Explain why the review questions/objectives lend themselves to a scoping review approach.	2
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the questions and objectives being addressed with reference to their key elements (e.g., population or participants, concepts, and context) or other relevant key elements used to conceptualize the review questions and/or objectives.	2
METHODS			
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate whether a review protocol exists; state if and where it can be accessed (e.g., a Web address); and if available, provide registration information, including the registration number.	3
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify characteristics of the sources of evidence used as eligibility criteria (e.g., years considered, language, and publication status), and provide a rationale.	Table 1
Information sources	7	Describe all information sources in the search (e.g., databases with dates of coverage and contact with authors to identify additional sources), as well as the date the most recent search was executed.	3
Search	8	Present the full electronic search strategy for at least 1 database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	Appendix 2
Selection of sources of evidence	9	State the process for selecting sources of evidence (i.e., screening and eligibility) included in the scoping review.	3
Data charting process	10	Describe the methods of charting data from the included sources of evidence (e.g., calibrated forms or forms that have been tested by the team before their use, and whether data charting was done independently or in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	3

Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought and any assumptions and simplifications made.	Appendix 3
Critical appraisal of individual sources of evidence	12	If done, provide a rationale for conducting a critical appraisal of included sources of evidence; describe the methods used and how this information was used in any data synthesis (if appropriate).	Not applicable
Synthesis of results	13	Describe the methods of handling and summarizing the data that were charted.	3
RESULTS			
Selection of sources of evidence	14	Give numbers of sources of evidence screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally using a flow diagram.	Figure 1
Characteristics of sources of evidence	15	For each source of evidence, present characteristics for which data were charted and provide the citations.	3-4
Critical appraisal within sources of evidence	16	If done, present data on critical appraisal of included sources of evidence (see item 12).	Not applicable
Results of individual sources of evidence	17	For each included source of evidence, present the relevant data that were charted that relate to the review questions and objectives.	Table 2 and 3
Synthesis of results	18	Summarize and/or present the charting results as they relate to the review questions and objectives.	4-5
DISCUSSION			
Summary of evidence	19	Summarize the main results (including an overview of concepts, themes, and types of evidence available), link to the review questions and objectives, and consider the relevance to key groups.	5-6
Limitations	20	Discuss the limitations of the scoping review process.	6
Conclusions	21	Provide a general interpretation of the results with respect to the review questions and objectives, as well as potential implications and/or next steps.	5-6
FUNDING			
Funding	22	Describe sources of funding for the included sources of evidence, as well as sources of funding for the scoping review. Describe the role of the funders of the scoping review.	7

Adapted from: Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMAScR): Checklist and Explanation. Ann Intern Med. 2018;169:467–473. doi: 10.7326/M18-0850.

Appendix 2. Search strategies for each database.

Ovid MEDLINE

1	exp Infant, Newborn/
2	(neonat* or newborn* or new born* or baby or babies or premature or preterm or infant* or low birth weight or LBW or VLBW or ELBW or NICU*).ti,ab,kw.
3	1 or 2
4	exp Sepsis/
5	(sepsis or septic* or bacter?emia).ti,ab,kw.
6	4 or 5
7	Decision Support Techniques/ or Neonatal Screening/
8	((predict* or diagnos* or screen* or identif* or manag*) adj5 (model* or rule* or scor* or tool* or algorithm* or decision tree* or pathway* or calculator*)).ti,ab,kw.
9	7 or 8
10	3 and 6 and 9

Ovid Embase

1	Newborn/
2	(neonat* or newborn* or new born* or baby or babies or premature or preterm or infant* or low birth weight or LBW or VLBW or ELBW or NICU*).ti,ab,kw.
3	1 or 2
4	exp sepsis/
5	(sepsis or septic* or bacter?emia).ti,ab,kw.
6	4 or 5
7	exp decision support system/ or newborn screening/
8	((predict* or diagnos* or screen* or identif* or manag*) adj5 (model* or rule* or scor* or tool* or algorithm* or decision tree* or pathway* or calculator*)).ti,ab,kw.
9	7 or 8
10	3 and 6 and 9

Scopus

TITLE-ABS-KEY((neonat* OR newborn* OR "new born*" OR baby OR babies OR premature OR preterm OR infant* OR "low birth weight" OR lbw OR vlbw OR elbw OR nicu*) AND (sepsis OR septic* OR bacter?emia) AND ((predict* OR diagnos* OR screen* OR identif* or manag*) W/5 (model* OR rule* OR scor* OR tool* OR algorithm* OR "decision tree*" OR pathway* OR calculator*)))

Web of Science

TS=((neonat* OR newborn* OR "new born*" OR baby OR babies OR premature OR preterm OR infant* OR "low birth weight" OR lbw OR vlbw OR elbw OR nicu*) AND (sepsis OR septic* OR bacter$emia) AND ((predict* OR diagnos* OR screen* OR identif* or manag*) NEAR/5 (model* OR rule* OR scor* OR tool* OR algorithm* OR "decision tree*" OR pathway* OR calculator*)))

Global Index Medicus

((mh:("Infant, Newborn")) OR (tw:(neonat* OR newborn* OR "new born*" OR baby OR babies OR premature OR preterm OR infant* OR "low birth weight" OR lbw OR vlbw OR elbw OR nicu*))) AND ((mh:("Sepsis")) OR (tw:(sepsis OR septic* OR bacter*emia))) AND ((mh:("Decision Support Systems, Clinical" OR "Neonatal Screening")) OR (tw:(model* OR rule* OR scor* OR tool* OR algorithm* OR "decision tree*" OR pathway* OR calculator*)))

Cochrane Library

1	MeSH descriptor: [Infant, Newborn] explode all trees
2	(neonat* or newborn* or "new born*" or baby or babies or premature or preterm or infant* or "low birth weight" or LBW or VLBW or ELBW or NICU*):ti,ab,kw
3	#1or#2
4	MeSH descriptor: [Sepsis] explode all trees
5	(sepsis or septic* or bacter*emia):ti,ab,kw
6	#4or#5
7	MeSH descriptor: [Decision Support Systems, Clinical] explode all trees
8	MeSH descriptor: [Neonatal Screening] explode all trees
9	((predict* or diagnos* or screen* or identif* or manag* or estimat*) NEAR/5 (model* or rule* or scor* or tool* or algorithm* or "decision tree*" or pathway* or calculator*)):ti,ab,kw
10	#7 or #8 or #9
11	#3 and #6 and #10

Appendix 3. Data extraction form.

Study characteristics	
Study ID	Title, author, year
Country	
Context	E.g. NICU/SCBU admissions, all babies born at study site, presenting to emergency care services
Number of included participants	
Characteristics of included participants	E.g. preterm, low birthweight
Objectives	
Outcome definition	E.g. blood culture, CSF culture, clinical diagnosis
Study results	
Name of model	
Modelling methods	E.g. logistic regression, scoring system
Predictors in final model	Signs, symptoms, risk factors, laboratory parameters
Model performance	Sensitivity, specificity, predictive values, likelihood ratios, AUC, accuracy, acceptability, antibiotic use, mortality, any other factors

Appendix 4. Additional results.

Included studies by World Health Organization (WHO) region.

WHO region	***n* studies**
African Region (AFR)	4
Eastern Mediterranean Region (EMR)	8
European Region (EUR)	5
Region of the Americas (AMR)	6
South-East Asian Region (SEAR)	48
Western Pacific Region (WPR)	12

One study conducted in multiple WHO regions.

Included studies by World Bank 2020 income classification.

Income classification	***n* studies**
Lower income	1
Lower middle-income	52
Upper middle-income	30

One study conducted in countries from multiple income classifications.

Predictors in included models.

Predictor	***n* models**
Clinical features	
Abdominal distension	4
Abnormal heart rate	8
Abnormal temperature	3
Age at admission	3
Albumin use	1
Altered behaviour, altered consciousness or lethargy	9
Apgar-1	3
Apgar-5	3
Apnoea	2
Asphyxia	1

Birthweight	7
Bulging fontanelle	1
Cardiovascular symptoms	1
Catheter	1
Cervicovaginitis	1
Chorioamnionitis	4
Central nervous system symptoms	1
Colour or pallor	2
Continuous positive airway pressure	1
Cough	1
Dehydration	1
Diastolic blood pressure	1
End-diastolic flow	1
Equivocal appearance	1
Evidence of focal infection	1
Feed intolerance or increased aspirates	2
Feeding difficulty	4
Fetal or neonatal morbidity	4
Foul liquor	3
Fungal infection	1
Gastrointestinal symptoms	1
Gestational age	11
Hospital length of stay	1
Hypotension	3
Hypothermia	2
Hypoxia or oxygen saturation	3
ICU length of stay	1
Ill appearance	3
In-hospital mortality	1
Increased oxygen or ventilation requirement	4
Infective symptoms	1

Inotropes or dopamine or vasoactive drug use	3
Intrapartum antibiotics	1
Intrauterine growth restriction	1
Intubated or mechanical ventilation	3
Labour >24h	1
Length of stay pre-sepsis	1
Local incidence of sepsis	1
Maternal age	3
Maternal Group B streptococcus	1
Maternal history of abortion	1
Maternal morbidity	2
Maternal parity or gravidity	1
Maternal temperature or fever	2
Neonatal fever	13
Nitrous oxide	1
Perfusion or capillary refill time	4
Premature rupture of membrane	1
Prenatal glucocorticoid use	2
Previous hospitalisation or illness	2
Previously healthy	3
Received antibiotics	4
Received recent immunisation	1
Respiratory insufficiency or distress	7
Respiratory rate	4
Respiratory symptoms	1
Rupture of membranes duration	6
Season	1
Seizures	1
Sex	5
Signs of encephalopathy or abnormal neurological examination	1

Skin symptoms	1
Small for gestational age	1
Systolic blood pressure	1
Total parenteral nutrition	2
Type of birth	2
Urinary tract infection	1
Umbilical cord winding	1
Umbilical or central venous catheter	6
Unclean vaginal examination	1
Vomiting	1
Well appearance	5
Laboratory parameters	
Calcium	1
CD34	1
CD69	1
CD95	1
Cell volume	1
Chest x-ray	4
Conductivity for internal composition of cell	1
Creatinine	1
CRP	16
CSF white cell count	4
Degenerative changes in polymorphonuclear cells	2
Delta neutrophil index	1
Eosinophil count or percentage	1
Gastric acid cytology	1
Glucose	3
Haemoglobin	1
Haematocrit	1
I:M ratio	2
I:T ratio	9

IL-6	2
IL-27	1
Immature polymorphonuclear cell count or percentage, band cell count or percentage, or neutrophil bandaemia	4
Lactate	1
Light scatter for cytoplasmic granularity and nuclear structure	1
Lower median angle light scatter	1
Lymphocyte count or percentage	2
Lymphocyte:CRP ratio	1
Lymphocytes with expression AnnexinV-FITC+PI	1
Mean cell haemoglobin	1
Mean cell haemoglobin concentration	1
Mean cell volume	1
Mean neutrophil volume	1
Mean platelet volume	1
Micro ESR or ESR	3
Monocyte count or percentage	2
Monocyte:lymphocyte ratio	1
Neutrophil count or percentage	11
Neutrophil:lymphocyte ratio	1
Nitric oxide	1
Partial thromboplastin time	1
pH	2
Platelet count	15
Platelet distribution width	1
Platelet:lymphocyte ratio	1
Positive microbiological test	1
Procalcitonin	4
Prothrombin time	1
Red blood cell count	1
Stool white cell count	3

Thyroid function	1
Total polymorphonuclear count	1
Urine white cell count	4
Visual placental changes	1
White cell count	17