Electronic early notification of sepsis in hospitalized ward patients: a study protocol for a stepped-wedge cluster randomized controlled trial

Yaseen M Arabi, MD, FCCP, FCCM, ATSF

College of Medicine, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
Intensive Care Department, King Abdulaziz Medical City
Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
yaseenarabi@yahoo.com

Abdulmohsen Al Saawi, MD, MSc PH, MSc EBHC

College of Medicine, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
King Abdulaziz Medical City
Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
SaawiA@NGHA.MED.SA

Mohammed Al Zahrani, FACS, ABS, SSC-Surg

College of Medicine, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
King Abdulaziz Medical City
Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
zahranimo@NGHA.MED.SA

Ali Al Khathaami, MD, MPH, FRCPC

College of Medicine, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
Quality and Patient Safety Department, King Abdulaziz Medical City
Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
KhathamiA@NGHA.MED.SA

Raed H AlHazme, PhD

College of Health Informatics, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
Information Systems and Informatics Division, King Abdulaziz Medical City
Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
College of Osteopathic Medicine
Nova Southeastern University
Fort Lauderdale, Florida
rhazmi@gmail.com

Abdullah Al Mutrafy, MD

College of Medicine, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
King Abdullah Specialized Children's Hospital
Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
AnaziAF@ngha.med.sa

Ali Al Qarni, MD, SBIM, JBIM, FACP, FRCP, FACE

King Abdullah International Medical Research Center, Eastern Region

53 King Abdulaziz Hospital
54 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Al Ahsa, Saudi Arabia
55 QarniAA@ngha.med.sa
56

57 **Ahmed Al Shouabi, MD SBFM, ABFM, MSc**
58 College of Medicine, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
59 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
60 Imam Abdulrahman Al Faisal Hospital
61 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Dammam, Saudi Arabia
62 ShuaibiA@ngha.med.sa
63

64 **Eman Al Qasim, RN, MSN**
65 College of Medicine, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
66 Research Office, King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
67 Intensive Care Department, King Abdulaziz Medical City
68 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
69 Eman77al-qasim@hotmail.com
70

71
72 **Sheryl Ann Abdukahil, RN**
73 College of Medicine, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
74 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
75 Intensive Care Department, King Abdulaziz Medical City
76 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
77 abdukahil.sheryl@gmail.com
78

79 **Fawaz Q Al-Rabeeah, RPh**
80 College of Health Informatics, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
81 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
82 Information Systems and Informatics Division, King Abdulaziz Medical City
83 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
84 RabeeahF@NGHA.MED.SA
85

86 **Huda Al Ghamdi**
87 College of Health Informatics, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
88 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
89 Information Systems and Informatics Division, King Abdulaziz Medical City
90 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
91 GhamdiH3@NGHA.MED.SA
92

93 **Ebtisam Al Ghamdi**
94 College of Health Informatics, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
95 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
96 Information Systems and Informatics Division, King Abdulaziz Medical City
97 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
98 Alghamdieb@NGHA.MED.SA
99

100 **Mariam Alansari, MD**
101 College of Medicine, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
102 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
103 Department of Internal Medicine, Imam Abdulrahman Al Faisal Hospital
104 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Dammam, Saudi Arabia
105 AlansariMA@NGHA.MED.SA
106

Khadega A Abuelgasim, MD

College of Medicine, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
Oncology Department, King Abdulaziz Medical City
Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
ahmedkh1@NGHA.MED.SA

Abdulaleem Alattasi, MBBS, FRCPC

College of Medicine, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
Quality and Patient Safety Department, King Abdulaziz Medical City
Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
aaatassi@yahoo.com

John Alchin, RN, MHA

King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
Nursing Services Department, King Abdulaziz Medical City
Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
alchinjo@NGHA.MED.SA

Hasan M Al-Dorzi, MD

College of Medicine, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
Intensive Care Department, King Abdulaziz Medical City
Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
aldorzih@yahoo.com

Abdulaziz A Ghamdi, MBBS

College of Medicine, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
Quality and Patient Safety Department, King Abdulaziz Hospital Ministry of National Guard
Health Affairs, Al Ahsa, Saudi Arabia
GhamdiAA7@ngha.med.sa

Fahad Al-Hameed, MD, FRCPC

College of Medicine, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
Intensive Care Department, King Abdulaziz Medical City
Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
HameedF@ngha.med.sa

Ahmad Alharbi, MBBS

Division of Infectious Diseases
Department of Medicine, King Abdulaziz Medical City
Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
alharbiah3@NGHA.MED.SA

Mohamed Hussein, MSCS, MsPH, PhD

King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
Bioinformatics and Bioinformatics Department, King Abdullah International Medical
Research Center
King Abdulaziz Medical City

161 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
 162 moally2002@gmail.com
 163
 164 **Wasil Jastaniah, MBBS, FAAP, FRCPC**
 165 College of Medicine, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
 166 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
 167 Princess Noorah Oncology Center, King Abdulaziz Medical City
 168 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
 169 JastaniahWA@ngha.med.sa
 170
 171 **Mufareh Edah AlKatheri, MD, MBBS**
 172 College of Medicine, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
 173 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
 174 Quality and Patient Safety Department, King Abdulaziz Medical City
 175 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
 176 KatheriM@NGHA.MED.SA
 177
 178 **Hassan AlMarhabi, MD**
 179 College of Medicine, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
 180 Quality and Patient Safety Department
 181 Department of Medicine, King Abdulaziz Medical City
 182 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
 183 MarhabiHA@NGHA.MED.SA
 184
 185 **Hani T Mustafa, FRACP**
 186 Department of Medicine, King Abdulaziz Hospital
 187 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Al Ahsa, Saudi Arabia
 188 MustafaH@ngha.med.sa
 189
 190 **Joan Jones, RN, MA (Health Management)**
 191 King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
 192 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
 193 Nursing Services Department, King Abdulaziz Medical City
 194 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
 195 OlivierJ@NGHA.MED.SA
 196
 197 **Saad Al-Qahtani, MD, MMED, MAHA, FRCPC**
 198 College of Medicine, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
 199 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
 200 Intensive Care Department, King Abdulaziz Medical City
 201 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
 202 QahtaniS4@NGHA.MED.SA
 203
 204 **Shaher Qahtani, MD**
 205 King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
 206 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
 207 Quality and Patient Safety Department, Imam Abdulrahman Al Faisal Hospital
 208 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Dammam, Saudi Arabia
 209 qahtanis8@NGHA.MED.SA
 210
 211 **Ahmad S Qureshi, MD**
 212 College of Medicine, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
 213 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
 214 Intensive Care Department, Prince Mohammed bin Abdulaziz Hospital

215 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Madinah, Saudi Arabia
 216 QURESHIAH@NGHA.MED.SA
 217
 218 **Salih Bin Salih, MD, FACP, FRCP (Edin)**
 219 College of Medicine, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
 220 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
 221 Department of Medicine, King Abdulaziz Medical City
 222 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
 223 binsalihs@NGHA.MED.SA
 224
 225 **Nahar Alselaim, MBBS, MPH, FRCSC**
 226 College of Medicine, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
 227 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
 228 Department of Surgery, King Abdulaziz Medical City
 229 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
 230 n.alselaim@hotmail.com
 231
 232 **Nabeeha Tashkandi, BSN, RN, MSN**
 233 King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
 234 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
 235 Nursing Services Department, King Abdulaziz Medical City
 236 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
 237 Saudi Nursing Professional Council
 238 Saudi Commission for Health Specialties
 239 tashkann@NGHA.MED.SA
 240
 241 **Ramesh Kumar Vishwakarma, PhD**
 242 King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
 243 Bioinformatics and Bioinformatics Department, King Abdullah International Medical
 244 Research Center
 245 King Abdulaziz Medical City
 246 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
 247 VISHWAKARMARA@NGHA.MED.SA
 248
 249 **Emad AlWafi, MD**
 250 College of Medicine, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
 251 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
 252 Department of Medicine, King Abdulaziz Medical City
 253 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
 254 WafiEM@NGHA.MED.SA
 255
 256 **Ali H Alyami, MD**
 257 College of Medicine, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
 258 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
 259 Department of Surgery, King Abdulaziz Medical City
 260 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
 261 alyamia@yahoo.com
 262
 263 **Zeyad Al Yousef, MD, SSC (Ortho),ABOS**
 264 College of Medicine, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
 265 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
 266 Department of Surgery, King Abdulaziz Medical City
 267 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
 268 yousefz@NGHA.MED.SA

269

270

271 **for the SCREEN Trial Group***

272

273

274 **Corresponding Author**

275 **Yaseen Arabi, MD, FCCP, FCCM, ATSF**

276 College of Medicine, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences

277 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center

278 Intensive Care Department, King Abdulaziz Medical City

279 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia

280 yaseenarabi@yahoo.com

281

282

283 **Word Count: 4619**

284

285

286

287 **Abstract**

288 **Background**

289 To examine the effect of screening for sepsis using an electronic sepsis alert versus no alert
290 in hospitalized patients admitted to wards on hospital mortality.

291 **Methods**

292 This study is conducted in 45 medical-surgical-oncology wards in five hospitals. Based on
293 the quick Sequential Organ Failure Assessment (qSOFA), an electronic alert has been
294 developed in the hospital Electronic Medical Record system. The alert system sends
295 notifications of “Possible Sepsis Alert” to the bedside nurse, charge nurse, and primary
296 medical team and requires an acknowledgment in the health information system from the
297 bedside nurse and physician. In addition, data on the alert are displayed on management
298 dashboards for each ward. Initially, all wards had a masked alert for 2 months. Hospital
299 wards are then allocated in a randomized fashion to either active or masked alert, such that
300 the alert is activated in five new randomly selected wards every two months until all wards
301 have the active alert. The primary endpoint is in-hospital mortality by 90 days.

302 **Discussion**

303 The trial has started in October 2019 and is expected to continue for 22 months enrolling
304 more than 62550 hospitalized patients.

305 **Trial registration**

306 ClinicalTrials.gov NCT04078594. Registered on September 6, 2019,
307 <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04078594>

308 **Keywords**

309 Sepsis, Alert, Screening, qSOFA, mortality, electronic medical records

310

Background

Sepsis is a major cause of morbidity and mortality among hospitalized patients and the outcome of affected patients is greatly dependent on the time-sensitive administration of appropriate antimicrobials, fluid resuscitation, and source control.(1, 2) Using machine learning analytics, a retrospective multicenter study evaluated the impact of delaying the implementation of the Surviving Sepsis Campaign 3-hour bundle elements in 5,072 adult patients with severe sepsis or septic shock.(3) The study found that the time delays significantly associated with mortality were 20 minutes for serum lactate, 50 minutes for blood culture, 100 minutes for intravenous crystalloids, and 125 minutes for antibiotic therapy.(3) Unfortunately, studies have shown that these elements of sepsis management are often delayed because of delayed sepsis recognition.(4-6)

To facilitate early sepsis recognition, the Surviving Sepsis Campaign guidelines have recommended that hospitals have a performance improvement program for sepsis, including sepsis screening for acutely ill, high-risk patients.(7) Several observational studies have demonstrated that screening patients on hospital wards for sepsis was associated with improved processes of care and reduced mortality. A study from our center found that the implementation of a multifaceted intervention including sepsis electronic alert (e-alert) with sepsis response team was associated with earlier identification of sepsis, increase in compliance with sepsis resuscitation bundle, and reduction in the need for mechanical ventilation and in-hospital mortality and length of stay.(8) A pre and post study evaluated a system using a triad of real-time electronic surveillance, mobile alerts received by nurses for all positive sepsis screenings as well as severe sepsis and shock alerts, and specific decision support for early goal-directed therapy.(9) During the study period, sepsis-related mortality decreased by 53% from 90 to 42 deaths per 1000 sepsis cases ($p=0.03$) and the 30-day readmission rate by 30.8% from 19.1% to 13.2% ($p=0.05$).(9) A prospective observational study compared a real-time sepsis alert with no alert in 6 medical wards in a 1250-bed academic medical center.(10) The study found that within 12 hours of the sepsis

alert, 70.8% of patients in the intervention group had received ≥ 1 intervention vs. 55.8% in the control group ($p=0.02$).⁽¹⁰⁾ Antibiotic escalation, intravenous fluid administration, oxygen therapy, and diagnostic tests were all increased in the intervention group.⁽¹⁰⁾ More recently, a randomized controlled trial (RCT) at two medical-surgical intensive care units (ICUs) compared an electronic sepsis alert with the same alert combined with a machine learning algorithm (experimental group).⁽¹¹⁾ On receiving an alert, the care team evaluated the patient and initiated the severe sepsis bundle, if appropriate.⁽¹¹⁾ The length of stay decreased from 13.0 days in the control group to 10.3 days in the experimental group ($p=0.04$) and hospital mortality by 12.4% ($p=0.02$).⁽¹¹⁾ A before-after study evaluated the impact of a multidisciplinary sepsis education program targeting sepsis recognition by using both the quick Sequential Organ Failure Assessment (qSOFA) and organ dysfunction criteria with nurse empowerment to activate the rapid response team (RRT) when sepsis was suspected.⁽¹²⁾ The study found that the time to recognition (qSOFA-to-RRT) improved from a median of 11.8 hours (interquartile range: 3.4, 34.3) pre to 1.7 hours (interquartile range: 0, 11.7) post ($p=0.005$).⁽¹²⁾ Time from qSOFA to antibiotics improved from 1.4 hours (interquartile range: 2.4, 6.2) pre to -4.7 hours (interquartile range: -25.4, 1.8) post ($p < 0.01$).⁽¹²⁾ Using qSOFA, compliance improved for antibiotics administration within 3 hours from 60% pre to 87% post ($p=0.02$).⁽¹²⁾ A systematic review of 16 observational studies found that digital alert systems for sepsis were associated with a reduction in length of hospital stay.⁽¹³⁾

On the other hand, some data questioned the benefit of sepsis screening among hospitalized patients. A systematic review of six studies of electronic and paper-based sepsis screening suggested improvement in care processes on the use of diagnostics.⁽¹⁴⁾ However, the effect on treatment (fluid resuscitation and antibiotic administration) and outcome measures was less consistent.⁽¹⁴⁾ Most existing studies are pre-post intervention studies,⁽¹⁵⁻²⁴⁾ and showed a large reduction in mortality even with modest improvement in the compliance with the bundle. One of the potential explanations is that early detection

leads to the inclusion of mild cases (ascertainment bias) and therefore artificially improving mortality rates. Therefore, the observed effect may be exaggerated or even maybe solely related to this phenomenon. Two RCTs showed no benefit of screening for sepsis in the ICU setting. A trial in a medical ICU (n= 442) showed that electronic screening using modified systemic inflammatory response syndrome versus usual care was not associated with a difference in time to new antibiotics, amount of fluid administered, ICU length of stay, hospital length of stay, and mortality.(25) Another trial in medical-surgical ICU patients (n=417) found no difference between the electronic tool and usual care in the primary outcome of time to completion of all indicated Surviving Sepsis Campaign 6-hour Sepsis Resuscitation Bundle elements, ICU mortality, ICU-free days, and ventilator-free days.(26) Besides, RCTs that tested real-time electronic alerts for clinical deterioration, which included sepsis in ward patients, found no significant difference in outcomes.(27, 28) Finally, screening for sepsis may lead to unintended consequences, such as overtreatment. One study found that the implementation of an electronic sepsis alert was associated with increases in antibiotic use and health care facility–onset *Clostridium difficile* infection.(29)

Therefore, it is unclear whether screening for sepsis using an electronic alert in hospitalized patients improves outcomes. The true effect of these interventions remains uncertain and an RCT is needed. The objective of the Stepped-wedge Cluster Randomized Controlled Trial of Electronic Early Notification of Sepsis in Hospitalized Ward Patients (SCREEN Trial) is to examine the effect of electronic screening for sepsis compared to no screening among hospitalized ward patients on all-cause 90-day hospital mortality.

Methods

Settings

The study is conducted in the 5 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs (MNGHA) hospitals (King Abdulaziz Medical City- Riyadh, King Abdulaziz Medical City- Jeddah, and Prince

Mohammed Bin Abdul Aziz Hospital – Al Madinah, King Abdulaziz Hospital - Al Ahsa, and Imam Abdulrahman Al Faisal Hospital – Dammam) (**Supplementary file Table S1**). All MNGHA hospitals have an integrated Electronic Medical Record (EMR) system, BESTCare, which has been implemented as a joint venture with the Seoul National University Bundang Hospital, South Korea. Its critical applications include the clinical documentation, computerized physician order entry, clinical decision support system, and clinical data warehouse. The system is also interfaced with the hospital's vital signs measurement devices.

Study Design

The SCREEN trial is designed as a stepped-wedge cluster RCT. Hospital wards are randomized to have active sepsis alert versus masked alert in phases. The study consists of nine periods of two-month steps with a phased introduction of the intervention. Initially, all wards had a masked alert for 2 months (see the section on sample size calculation). At each step, the alert is activated in five new randomly selected wards, until all wards eventually have the active alert (**Figure 1**). This design is suitable for quality improvement projects and allows comparison with the control group as well as over time. In addition, by having the masked alert, an additional comparison between patients with masked and active alerts will be performed. A SPIRIT figure is included as **Figure 2**, with a checklist included as a supplementary file.

This study was approved by the MNGHA Institutional Review Board (IRB). The study has been registered in clinicaltrials.gov (NCT0407859).

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Ward level inclusion and exclusion criteria

Inclusion Criteria:

Inpatient wards, defined as wards used to manage inpatients, in the five MNGHA hospitals.

Exclusion Criteria:

1. Cardiology, transplant, pediatric, obstetric wards
2. ICUs and emergency departments
3. Operating rooms
4. Outpatient clinics
5. Daycare wards, endoscopy, outpatient procedure areas, hemodialysis units

Patient-level inclusion and exclusion criteria

Inclusion Criteria:

1. Aged 14 years or older
2. Checked in as inpatient status to one of the study wards

Exclusion Criteria:

No commitment for full life support at the time of arrival to the study ward (designated as Do-Not-Resuscitate status)

Interventions

The sepsis alert

In the study wards, vital signs are logged into the electronic medical record (BESTCare system) every 4 hours, and the Glasgow Coma Scale (GCS) every 12 hours. We developed a sepsis alert in the hospital information system based on qSOFA. The alert works as follows (Figure 3):

- 435 1. The screening tool automatically scans the documented vital signs and GCS and assigns
436 one point for low blood pressure (systolic blood pressure $\leq$ 100 mmHg), increased
437 respiratory rate ($\geq$ 22 breaths/ min), or altered mentation (Glasgow Coma Scale $<$ 15).
- 438 2. If the total score is 2 or more based on the above vital signs documented within 12
439 hours, the system generates an electronic alert.
- 440 3. This alert results in the following:
 - 441 a. In the bedside nurse workflow: The alert appears in the nurse work list as “Possible
442 Sepsis Alert” and a pop-up message appears to notify the primary medical team and
443 to document that a physician has received the message.
 - 444 b. In the treating physician workflow: A pop-up message appears on the physician
445 screen when the patient’s file is accessed as “Possible Sepsis Alert”. The physician
446 is asked to assess the patient’s medical record and document if the patient has
447 sepsis or not. Other options include “remind me later” and “I am not from the primary
448 team”. By responding “Yes”, the sepsis alert is closed and the system is deactivated
449 for 24 hours. By responding “No”, the system is deactivated for 12 hours only. By
450 responding “remind me later” or “I am not from the primary team”, the pop-up
451 message appears on each subsequent physician access of the file (**Figure 2**).
 - 452 c. The ward charge nurse gets a notification on a mobile device (iPod) that has a
453 custom built application for an immediate alert with visual and sound notification.
 - 454 d. If the goals of care for a given patient are modified to Do-Not-Resuscitate, the system
455 is deactivated for that patient.
- 456 4. Data are also be used to create a dashboard for each ward with the following indicators
 - 457 a. Number of alerts
 - 458 b. Percent of alerts with documented notification by nurse to the primary medical
459 team and time to notification.

460 c. Percent of alerts with documented assessment by physician and time to
461 assessment.

462 Access to the dashboard is provided to all nursing and physician managers. Reports and
463 feedback is provided every two weeks, with frequent meetings to review results and discuss
464 approaches for improvement in the involved wards.

465 **Intervention Group (active alert)**

466 In this group of wards, the alert is active, which means that the alert is visible to the treating
467 team as described above. The alert prompts a nurse-to-physician communication and a
468 physician assessment of patients.

469 **Control Group (masked alert)**

470 In this group of wards, the alert will be inactive in EMR frontend for the treating team and will
471 remain active in the backend of the EMR. Sepsis recognition is according to existing
472 practice. This enables collecting data on the sepsis alert patients whether they are on active
473 or masked control wards.

474 **Co-interventions**

475 Hospital-wide sepsis awareness campaign in all 5 hospitals was started at the beginning of
476 the study with training sessions open to all staff on the importance of timely interventions for
477 sepsis. Project in-service training sessions are provided to the involved medical and nursing
478 departments at the beginning of the project. Monthly webinars are conducted with active
479 ward leaders. An intranet page was developed with educational resources (videos,
480 presentations, documents, posters and related links) that explained this project and provided
481 guidance. The medical management and assessment are at the discretion of the treating
482 team. However, this project adopts the 2016 Surviving Sepsis Campaign guidelines and the
483 hour-1 bundle, but without any specific monitoring of bundle compliance.(30, 31)

484 **Randomization**

The five hospitals have collectively 46 eligible wards; two wards were merged due to similarities to create 9 clusters of 5 wards each. Wards are randomized into a total of 10 steps, one baseline and 9 implementation steps (**Figure 1**). The randomization list is maintained concealed by the study biostatistician from the study team and hospital teams. One month prior to each 5-ward implementation step, the allocation of the upcoming 5 wards is made open, so the ward staff prepare for the implementation.

Study Cohorts

Intention-to-treat (ITT) cohort

This cohort includes all patients checked in to the candidate wards. This population constitutes the patients who are subjected to sepsis screening by the sepsis alert system, whether they develop an alert or not. The ITT analysis also implies that patients in the ITT cohort in the wards belonging to a particular randomization period will be analyzed in accordance with their planned randomization regardless of what happen during the trial. For example, if a ward was planned to receive an alert during a period and for technical reasons that alert system was not operational, patients recruited in that ward during that period will be analyzed as receiving the alert. The primary analysis will be based on this population.

Alert cohort

This cohort represents the subset of patients who had the alert.

Data

Data extraction

All data will be extracted from the EMR. Data will be extracted as per the definitions in

Tables 1, Supplementary file Table S4-S10.

Baseline Data (ITT and alert cohorts- Supplementary file Table S7)

- 508 • Age and Sex
- 509 • Admission source: emergency room, operating room, clinic, ICU, others
- 510 • Admitting ward: medical, surgical, oncology, mixed (any combination)
- 511 • Co morbidities: end-stage renal disease, cancer without metastasis, immune-
- 512 compromised non-complicated, diabetes, complicated diabetes, congestive heart failure,
- 513 acquired immunodeficiency syndrome, moderate to severe chronic kidney disease,
- 514 myocardial infarction, chronic pulmonary disease, peripheral vascular disease, stroke or
- 515 transient ischemic attack, dementia, hemiplegia or paraplegia, connective tissue disease,
- 516 peptic ulcer disease, mild liver disease, moderate to severe liver disease
- 517 • Charlson Comorbidity Index
- 518 • Source of infection on admission to the ward: No infection, pneumonia, urinary tract
- 519 infection, skin and soft tissue infection, intra-abdominal infection, other infections
- 520 • Dialysis
- 521 • Alert count, time to first alert and the parameters leading to alert (respiratory rate ≥ 22
- 522 breath/minute, systolic blood pressure ≤ 100 mmHg, GCS < 15)
- 523 **Physiological parameters and treatments at baseline (ITT population) and pre-alert**
- 524 **(Alert population) (Supplementary file Table S8)**
- 525 • Systolic and diastolic blood pressure: lowest values in the first 12 hours of check in to the
- 526 ward (ITT population) and in the 12 hours before the alert
- 527 • Heart rate and respiratory rate: highest values in the first 12 hours of check in to the
- 528 ward (ITT population) and in the 12 hours before the alert
- 529 • Temperature: highest value and lowest value in the first 12 hours of check in to the ward
- 530 (ITT population) and in the 12 hours before the alert
- 531 • Lactate level: highest lactate 12 hours before check in to the ward to 12 hours of check-
- 532 in to the ward (ITT population) and highest value in the 12 hours before the alert (alert
- 533 population).

- White blood cell count, bilirubin, and creatinine: highest values in the 12 hours before check-in to the ward to 12 hours after check-in to the ward (ITT population) and highest value in the 12 hours before alert (alert population)
- Blood, respiratory, urine and body fluid cultures: percentage of patients with cultures ordered in the 12 hours before check-in to the ward to 12 hours after check-in to the ward (ITT population) and in the 12 hours before alert (alert population)
- Intravenous fluid (NS, ½NS, D5NS, D5½NS, LR, D5LR, albumin 5%, 20%) given in the 12 hours before check-in to the ward to 12 hours after check-in to the ward (ITT population) and in the 12 hours before the alert (alert population)
- Antibiotics: percentage of patients on antibiotics in the 12 hours before check-in to the ward to 12 hours after check-in to the ward (ITT population) and in the 12 hours before alert (alert population)

Processes measures (Supplementary file Table S9)

- Post-alert lactate level
 - Percentage of patients with lactate reported 12 hours if not reported in the 12 hours before alert
 - Highest value reported in the 12 hours after the alert
- Post-alert blood culture:
 - Percentage of patients with blood culture ordered in 12 hours if not performed in the 12 hours before alert
- Post-alert respiratory, urine and body fluid cultures
 - Percentage of patients with respiratory, urine and body fluid cultures ordered in 12 hours if not performed in the 12 hours before alert
 - Intravenous fluid administered in 12 hours after alert (yes, no)
- Post-alert antibiotics
 - Percentage of patients who were not on antibiotics in the 12 hours before alert and had new antibiotic administered within 3 and 12 hours of alert

- 561 ▪ Percentage of patients who were on antibiotics in the 12 hours before alert and had
- 562 new antibiotic administered within 3 and 12 hours of alert
- 563 • Post-alert systolic blood pressure: lowest value in the 12 hours after the alert.
- 564 • Post-alert diastolic blood pressure: lowest value in the 12 hours after the alert
- 565 • Post-alert heart rate: highest value in the 12 hours after the alert
- 566 • Post-alert respiratory rate: highest value respiratory in the 12 hours after the alert

567 **Outcomes**

568 **Primary outcome (Supplementary file Table S10)**

569 In-hospital mortality, percentage of patients who die in the hospital up to 90 days

570 **Secondary outcomes**

- 571 • Outcome measures
- 572 ▪ Hospital length of stay (LOS), censored at 90 days
- 573 ▪ Transfer to ICU within 90 days (ITT cohort) and 14 days of alert (alert cohort)
- 574 ▪ ICU-free days in the first 90 days (ITT cohort and alert cohort)
- 575 ▪ Critical Care Response team (CCRT) activation within 90 days (ITT cohort) and
- 576 14 days of alert (alert cohort)
- 577 ▪ Cardiac arrest within 90 days (ITT cohort) and 14 days of alert (alert cohort)
- 578 ▪ The need for mechanical ventilation, vasopressor therapy, incident renal
- 579 replacement therapy within 90 days (ITT cohort) and 14 days of alert (alert
- 580 cohort)
- 581 ▪ Organ dysfunction during hospitalization up to 90 days, assessed by electronic
- 582 SOFA (32)
- 583 • Balancing measures
- 584 ▪ Antibiotic-free days within 90 days (ITT cohort and alert cohort)
- 585 ▪ The acquisition of multidrug resistant organisms within 90 days (ITT cohort and
- 586 alert cohort)

587 ▪ Clostridium difficile infection within 90 days (ITT cohort and alert cohort)

588 **Sample size**

589 The sample size for this stepped-wedge cluster RCT [(33-37)] was calculated for 45 clusters
590 with 10 time periods (1 baseline step period followed by 9 steps) using Power Analysis and
591 Sample Size software (PASS 15 Power Analysis and Sample Size Software (2017)). NCSS,
592 LLC. Kaysville, Utah, USA, ncss.com/software/pass). At each of the 9 steps, 5 clusters
593 (wards) will switch from masked alert to active alert. We calculated a baseline rate of 3.13%
594 for mortality in the hospital by day 90 in the “Possible Sepsis Alert” cohort from historical
595 data obtained from the hospital information system. Based on the same dataset, 18.3% of
596 eligible ward patients had sepsis alert with hospital mortality of 8.2% compared to 2.0% in
597 the non-alert patients. For sample size calculations, we made the following assumptions: A)
598 the impact on mortality of implementing the alert occurs only in patients with the alert, B)
599 Only half of patients with alert have sepsis, C) 90% of deaths among the patients with
600 qSOFA occurred among septic patients, D) early intervention resulting from the sepsis alert
601 will reduce the sepsis-related mortality by 50%, resulting in reduction from 8.2% to 4.1% in
602 the patients with the alert and would lead to an overall change in hospital mortality for the
603 whole cohort from 3.13% to 2.46%, risk difference of -0.67%.), E) 80 % power using two-
604 sided Wald Z-Test and significance level of 5% and, F) an intra-cluster correlation (ICC, a
605 measure of the relatedness of cluster) of 0.22 as estimated from retrospective electronic
606 database. As such, a risk difference of mortality in hospital by 90 days by -0.67% (from
607 3.13% to 2.46%) requires a total sample size of 62550 subjects (average of 1390 subjects
608 per cluster with an average of 139 subjects per cluster per time period). With all five
609 hospitals combined, this is expected to require 20 months (2 months per time period).

610 **Statistical analysis**

611 For the SCREEN trial, the analysis will be implemented under the guiding principles of the
612 ICH E9 for the analysis of randomized controlled trials.(38) The stepped wedge design is
613 essentially a matched design with before and after comparisons for each unit of

randomization. In this case, a unit is a ward where each ward is randomized to a particular starting point.

Raw data will be processed in accordance with the best practices for raw data management to identify any inaccuracies or incompleteness in advance of the statistical analysis. In order to accomplish this task, all interval variables will be checked and summarized in terms of maximum and minimum values. Minimum and maximum values will be checked and compared against the nominal maximum and minimum value of each variable, and variables with implausible values will be flagged. All variables will be summarized and reported for the study using descriptive statistics. Interval variables will be summarized and reported in terms of n, mean and median, standard deviation, the first and third quartiles. Categorical variables will be summarized and reported in terms of frequency distribution. All demographic and clinical variables would be summarized between study groups at baseline by wards and overall.

Analysis of the primary endpoint

The analysis for the primary outcome will be conducted on the ITT cohort. The rate of all-cause hospital mortality by day 90 will be compared between patients in the intervention wards and control wards using Poisson mixed effect model by adding an offset term to account for variation due to lengths of time to the control and intervention periods. The clusters would be considered as random effect and each step as fixed effect in the model.

Analysis of secondary endpoints

For transfer to ICU, the proportion of patients transferred to ICU will be compared between the sepsis alert and the no sepsis no alert group using Chi-squared tests, with adjustment for cluster sampling. Possible confounding will be assessed using mixed-effects logistic regression models with random effect for cluster and fixed effect for each step. All covariates that were significantly associated (Chi-squared test adjusted for cluster sampling) with the outcome (proportion of patient transfer to ICU) will be included in the final model. The other

secondary endpoints CCRT activation, cardiac arrests, mechanical ventilation, vasopressor therapy, renal replacement therapy and hospital mortality by day 180 will be analyzed in a similar fashion as described above for transfer-to-ICU endpoint.

For hospital length of stay (LOS), the number of days patient stayed at the hospital will be analyzed using negative binomial mixed model with random effect for cluster and fixed effect for each step.

Subgroups analysis

We will perform the following a priori subgroup analyses: medical, surgical and oncology wards, age $>$ and $\leq$ 65 years, patients already on antibiotics versus those not on antibiotics at the time of positive qSOFA, patients with alerts within 48 hours of check-in to ward versus patients with later alerts and patients in the different hospitals.

All analyses will be conducted with SAS version 9.4. There will be no interim analysis due to the nature of implementation.

Analysis of the Alert cohort

Secondary analyses of the alert cohort will follow the same approach used in the ITT cohort.

Ethical considerations

This is a quality improvement project that is implemented in the participating hospitals in phases. The stepped wedge design is a well-accepted for this type of project,(39) since it ensures that all patients will eventually receive an intervention that is considered to be beneficial. It is expected that the quality of care might improve with time by using the electronic sepsis alert and detecting all at high risk patients. Moreover, the study does not interfere with the routine management of patients and does not require any direct interaction between the research team and patients.(40). Additionally, data are obtained from the electronic medical records for a large sample size of ward patients. Therefore, this study is

considered as minimal risk and consent is not required, similar to other studies of the same nature.(41, 42)

Discussion

This trial evaluates the value of electronic screening for sepsis in patients hospitalized in the wards. Screening for sepsis is of substantial benefit as sepsis is frequent in hospitalized patients, is often under-recognized, is a common cause of organ dysfunction and death, and earlier appropriate management is associated with improved outcomes.(3-6) It is estimated that 32% of sepsis cases are identified in hospital wards,(43) such that hospital-onset sepsis complicates 1 in 200 hospitalizations with an associated mortality of > 30%.(44) (45) Sepsis management is often delayed among patients hospitalized in the ward.(46) (47) A study found that lactate levels were measured within the mandated window in only 32% of patients with severe sepsis in the ward compared with 55% in the ICU and 79% in the ED.(47) Delayed lactate level measurement was associated with longer time to antibiotic administration.(47) The evidence for electronic alerts to early recognize sepsis and improve care processes and outcomes in general ward patients is modest,(48) which affirms the need for an RCT. The stepped-wedge approach to include wards in this trial avoids several pitfalls and retains controlled data elements and randomization.

The optimal tool for screening for sepsis has been debated. A qSOFA score ≥ 2 has been suggested for identification of patients at risk of sepsis outside the ICU. A study in medical wards (481 patients) found that qSOFA had lower sensitivity (44.7% vs. 80.0%), but higher specificity (83.6% vs. 25.7%) and positive predictive value (75.5% vs. 54.8%) for predicting sepsis compared with SIRS.(49) A large prospective cohort study of approximately 1 million hospitalized patients in 85 US hospitals found that 27.0% were qSOFA-positive within 1 day of admission.(50) The sensitivities of qSOFA for suspected infection and sepsis were 41% and 63%, respectively and the positive predictive values were 31% and 17%, respectively.(50) As we prepared for this trial, we initially used SIRS to build the electronic

screening tool. Based on analysis of historical data from our hospital information system, qSOFA identified ward patients who were at risk for subsequent ICU admission and death more frequently and earlier than SIRS.(51) Therefore, we revised our alert system to be based on qSOFA. Similar results were observed in multiple systematic reviews.(52-55) SIRS was found to be more sensitive than qSOFA for the diagnosis of sepsis (risk ratio, 1.32; 95% confidence interval, 0.40-2.24; $I^2 = 100\%$).(52) The pooled specificity of qSOFA in patients with suspected infection outside the ICU was 79.6% (95% confidence interval, 73.3-84.7%).(53) However, current evidence favored qSOFA over SIRS as a predictor of hospital mortality (risk ratio, 0.03; 95% confidence interval, 0.01-0.05; $I^2 = 48\%$).(52) Therefore, qSOFA may be better than SIRS for identifying high-risk patients.

Real-time electronic screening for sepsis using the electronic record provides multiple advantages over other methods, as it is considered a low-cost solution for more reliable, reproducible, unbiased, and sustainable screening in large hospitals.(56) However, the challenges encountered with our electronic alert development and implementation include resource allocation, changing and un-agreed-upon sepsis screening tools (qSOFA and SIRS), charting behaviors, alert fatigue (false positive), inappropriate response (false negative) and differences in health care delivery models.(57) (58) We have conducted multiple presentations to ward medical and nursing staff and provided online materials on the alert system and sepsis management in line with the Surviving Sepsis Campaign guidelines.(7, 31) The actual management of patients with positive sepsis alert is left to the discretion of the treating team. We also utilized dashboards during the study to provide opportunities for ward medical and nursing leaders to review and improve provided care.

The SCREEN trial provides an opportunity for a novel trial design and analysis of routinely collected and entered data to evaluate the effectiveness of an intervention (sepsis alert) for a common medical problem (sepsis in ward patients). Its results may open the door for other trials on other interventions in other conditions.

716 **Trial status**

717 The trial started in October 1, 2019 and is expected to continue for 20 months enrolling more
718 than 62550 hospitalized patients.

719 This protocol is the 3rd version dated September 15, 2019.

720 **Abbreviations**

721 **CCRT** Critical Care Response Team

722 **ED** Emergency department

723 **EMR** Electronic Medical Record

724 **ICU** Intensive Care Unit

725 **ITT** Intention To Treat

726 **LOS** Length of Stay

727 **qSOFA** Quick Sequential Organ Failure Assessment

728 **SIRS** Systemic Inflammatory Response Syndrome

729 **SOFA** Sequential Organ Failure Assessment

730 **Declarations**

731 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

732 The study was approved by the National Guard Health Affairs Institutional Review Board
733 (IRB). Informed consent was waived by the IRB because of the nature of the study.

734 **Consent for publication**

735 Not applicable.

736 **Availability of data and materials**

737 The datasets will be available from the corresponding author as per the regulations of
738 KAIMRC.

739 **Competing interests**

740 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

741 **Funding**

742 Not applicable.

743 **Authors' contributions**

744 YA is the Chief Investigator; conception and design, analytical plan, drafting of the
745 manuscript, critical revision of the manuscript for important and intellectual content. AS,AM,
746 MZ, AAQ, AS, AK, FR, HG, EG, RH, EQ, NT, HD, RV, SA, MH, ZY, SS, FH, KA, MK, AQ,
747 MA, AA, NS, AHA, AY, WJ,JA, SQ, AH contributed to the development of the protocol,
748 critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content. All authors read and
749 approved the final manuscript.
750

751 **Acknowledgement/collaborators**

752 **SCREEN Trial Group**

753

754 **Ahmed Al Arfaj, MD**

755 College of Medicine, King Saud bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences,
756 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center, Al Ahsa, Saudi Arabia
757 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Eastern Region, Saudi Arabia
758

759 **Mohamed S. Al Moammery, ABIM FRCP(Edin) MBA-LS FCCP**

760 College of Medicine, King Saud bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences,
761 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center, Riyadh Saudi Arabia
762 King Abdulaziz Medical City
763 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
764

765 **Soud Rasheed, MBBS, FRCP**

766 College of Medicine, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
767 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
768 King Abdulaziz Medical City
769 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
770

771 **Turki Alwasaidi, MD**
772 College of Medicine, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
773 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
774 Prince Mohammed bin Abdulaziz Hospital
775 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Madinah, Saudi Arabia
776
777 **Amal Matroud, RN**
778 King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
779 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
780 Nursing Services Department, King Abdulaziz Medical City
781 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
782
783 **Amar M Alhasani, MD**
784 College of Medicine, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
785 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
786 Prince Mohammed bin Abdulaziz Hospital
787 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Madinah, Saudi Arabia
788
789 **Haifa Al Shammari, RN**
790 College of Medicine, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
791 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
792 Intensive Care Department, King Abdulaziz Medical City
793 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
794
795 **Majid M Alshamrani, MD**
796 College of Medicine, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
797 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
798 Infection Prevention and Control Department, King Abdulaziz Medical City
799 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
800
801 **Saleh Qasim, MD**
802 College of Medicine, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
803 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
804 Intensive Care Department, King Abdulaziz Medical City
805 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
806
807 **Saeed Obbed, MD**
808 College of Medicine, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
809 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
810 Intensive Care Department, King Abdulaziz Medical City
811 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
812
813 **Adnan A Munshi**
814 King Saud bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences,
815 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
816 Medical Imaging Informatics, King Abdulaziz Medical City
817 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
818
819 **Hadia Al Tabsh, RN, MSN**
820 King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
821 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
822 Nursing Services Department, King Abdulaziz Medical City
823 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
824

825 **Basem R Banat, RN**

826 King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
827 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
828 Nursing Services Department, King Abdulaziz Medical City
829 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia

830

831 **Omar Abuskout, RN, MSN**

832 King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
833 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
834 Nursing Services Department, King Abdulaziz Medical City
835 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia

836

837 **Anna Liza Marcelo, RN**

838 King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
839 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
840 Nursing Services Department, King Abdulaziz Medical City
841 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia

842

843 **Mayadah M Alhabshi, RN, DNE, MSN**

844 King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
845 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
846 Quality and Patient Safety Department, King Abdulaziz Medical City
847 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia

848

849 **Ibrahim J. Jaber, RN**

850 King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
851 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
852 Nursing Services Department, Prince Mohammed bin Abdulaziz Hospital
853 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Madinah, Saudi Arabia

854

855 **Mohammad Shahin, RN, MSN**

856 King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
857 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
858 Nursing Services Department, King Abdulaziz Hospital
859 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Al Ahsa, Saudi Arabia

860

861 **Jamielah Yaakob, RN**

862 King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
863 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
864 Nursing Services Department, King Abdulaziz Hospital
865 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Al Ahsa, Saudi Arabia

866

867 **Hanan Al Somali, RN**

868 College of Medicine, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
869 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
870 Nursing Services Department, Imam Abdulrahman Al Faisal Hospital
871 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Dammam, Saudi Arabia

872

873 **Clara Masala, RN**

874 College of Medicine, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
875 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
876 Nursing Services Department, Imam Abdulrahman Al Faisal Hospital
877 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Dammam, Saudi Arabia

878

879 **Mohammed Al Qarni, MHHA, RRT**
880 College of Medicine, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
881 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
882 Quality and Patient Safety Department, King Abdulaziz Medical City
883 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
884
885 **Jamal Chalabi, MD**
886 College of Medicine, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
887 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
888 Intensive Care Department, King Abdulaziz Hospital
889 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Al Ahsa, Saudi Arabia
890
891 **Johanna E Greyvenstein, RN, MSN**
892 King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
893 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
894 Nursing Services Department, King Abdulaziz Hospital
895 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Al Ahsa, Saudi Arabia
896
897 **Abdul Rahman Jazieh, MD, MPH**
898 College of Medicine, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
899 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
900 Oncology Department, King Abdulaziz Medical City
901 Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
902
903 **Noha Omaish, RN**
904 King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
905 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
906 Nursing Services Department, Prince Mohammed bin Abdulaziz Hospital
907 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Madinah, Saudi Arabia
908
909 **Azura Abdrahim, RN**
910 King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
911 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
912 Nursing Services Department, Prince Mohammed bin Abdulaziz Hospital
913 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Madinah, Saudi Arabia
914
915 **Mohammad Abdrabo, MD**
916 College of Medicine, King Saud Bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
917 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
918 Quality and Patient Safety Department, Prince Mohammed bin Abdulaziz Hospital
919 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Madinah, Saudi Arabia
920
921 **Abdullah Al Hamdan**
922 King Saud bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
923 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
924 Medical Imaging Informatics, King Abdulaziz Medical City
925 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
926
927 **Abdulaziz Al Qasem**
928 King Saud bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
929 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
930 Information Systems and Informatics Division, King Abdulaziz Hospital
931 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Al Ahsa, Saudi Arabia
932

933 **Hattan Esilan, MD**
934 King Saud bin Abdulaziz University for Health Sciences
935 King Abdullah International Medical Research Center
936 Quality and Patient Safety Department, King Abdulaziz Hospital
937 Ministry of National Guard Health Affairs, Al Ahsa, Saudi Arabia
938

REFERENCES

1. Dellinger RP, Levy M, Rhodes A, Annane D, Gerlach H, Opal S, et al. Surviving Sepsis Campaign: International Guidelines for Management of Severe Sepsis and Septic Shock, 2012. *Intensive Care Medicine*. 2013;39(2):165-228.
2. Rivers E, Nguyen B, Havstad S, Ressler J, Muzzin A, Knoblich B, et al. Early goal-directed therapy in the treatment of severe sepsis and septic shock. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2001;345(19):1368-77.
3. Pruinelli L, Westra BL, Yadav P, Hoff A, Steinbach M, Kumar V, et al. Delay Within the 3-Hour Surviving Sepsis Campaign Guideline on Mortality for Patients With Severe Sepsis and Septic Shock. *Critical care medicine*. 2018.
4. Phua J, Koh Y, Du B, Tang YQ, Divatia JV, Tan CC, et al. Management of severe sepsis in patients admitted to Asian intensive care units: prospective cohort study. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)*. 2011;342:d3245.
5. Rhodes A, Phillips G, Beale R, Cecconi M, Chiche JD, De Backer D, et al. The surviving sepsis campaign bundles and outcome: results from the international multicentre prevalence study on sepsis (the IMPReSS study). *Intensive care medicine*. 2015;41(9):1620-8.
6. Levy MM, Dellinger RP, Townsend SR, Linde-Zwirble WT, Marshall JC, Bion J, et al. The Surviving Sepsis Campaign: results of an international guideline-based performance improvement program targeting severe sepsis. *Intensive care medicine*. 2010;36(2):222-31.
7. Rhodes A, Evans LE, Alhazzani W, Levy MM, Antonelli M, Ferrer R, et al. Surviving Sepsis Campaign: International Guidelines for Management of Sepsis and Septic Shock: 2016. *Intensive Care Med*. 2017.
8. Arabi YM, Al-Dorzi HM, Alamry A, Hijazi R, Alsolamy S, Al Salamah M, et al. The impact of a multifaceted intervention including sepsis electronic alert system and sepsis response team on the outcomes of patients with sepsis and septic shock. *Ann Intensive Care*. 2017;7(1):57.
9. Manaktala S, Claypool SR. Evaluating the impact of a computerized surveillance algorithm and decision support system on sepsis mortality. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*. 2016;24(1):88-95.
10. Sawyer AM, Deal EN, Labelle AJ, Witt C, Thiel SW, Heard K, et al. Implementation of a real-time computerized sepsis alert in nonintensive care unit patients. *Critical care medicine*. 2011;39(3):469-73.
11. Shimabukuro DW, Barton CW, Feldman MD, Mataraso SJ, Das R. Effect of a machine learning-based severe sepsis prediction algorithm on patient survival and hospital length of stay: a randomised clinical trial. *BMJ Open Respiratory Research*. 2017;4(1):e000234.
12. Raines K, Berrios RAS, Guttendorf J. Sepsis Education Initiative Targeting qSOFA Screening for Non-ICU Patients to Improve Sepsis Recognition and Time to Treatment. *Journal of nursing care quality*. 2019;34(4):318-24.
13. Joshi M, Ashrafian H, Arora S, Khan S, Cooke G, Darzi A. Digital Alerting and Outcomes in Patients With Sepsis: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *J Med Internet Res*. 2019;21(12):e15166.
14. Alberto L, Marshall AP, Walker R, Aitken LM. Screening for sepsis in general hospitalized patients: a systematic review. *The Journal of hospital infection*. 2017;96(4):305-15.
15. Castellanos-Ortega A, Suberviola B, Garcia-Astudillo LA, Holanda MS, Ortiz F, Llorca J, et al. Impact of the Surviving Sepsis Campaign protocols on hospital length of stay and mortality in septic shock patients: results of a three-year follow-up quasi-experimental study. *Crit Care Med*. 2010;38(4):1036-43.

16. Ferrer R, Artigas A, Levy MM, Blanco J, Gonzalez-Diaz G, Garnacho-Montero J, et al. Improvement in process of care and outcome after a multicenter severe sepsis educational program in Spain. *JAMA*. 2008;299(19):2294-303.
17. Giuliano KK, Lecardo M, Staul L. Impact of protocol watch on compliance with the surviving sepsis campaign. *Am J Crit Care*. 2011;20(4):313-21.
18. Levy MM, Dellinger RP, Townsend SR, Linde-Zwirble WT, Marshall JC, Bion J, et al. The Surviving Sepsis Campaign: results of an international guideline-based performance improvement program targeting severe sepsis. *Intensive Care Med*. 2010;36(2):222-31.
19. Memon JI, Rehmani RS, Alaithan AM, El Gammal A, Lone TM, Ghorab K, et al. Impact of 6-hour sepsis resuscitation bundle compliance on hospital mortality in a saudi hospital. *Crit Care Res Pract*. 2012;2012:273268.
20. Na S, Kuan WS, Mahadevan M, Li CH, Shrikhande P, Ray S, et al. Implementation of early goal-directed therapy and the surviving sepsis campaign resuscitation bundle in Asia. *Int J Qual Health Care*. 2012;24(5):452-62.
21. Schramm GE, Kashyap R, Mullon JJ, Gajic O, Afessa B. Septic shock: a multidisciplinary response team and weekly feedback to clinicians improve the process of care and mortality. *Crit Care Med*. 2011;39(2):252-8.
22. Shiramizo SC, Marra AR, Durao MS, Paes AT, Edmond MB, Pavao dos Santos OF. Decreasing mortality in severe sepsis and septic shock patients by implementing a sepsis bundle in a hospital setting. *PLoS One*. 2011;6(11):e26790.
23. Wang Z, Xiong Y, Schorr C, Dellinger RP. Impact of sepsis bundle strategy on outcomes of patients suffering from severe sepsis and septic shock in china. *J Emerg Med*. 2013;44(4):735-41.
24. Laguna-Perez A, Chilet-Rosell E, Delgado Lacosta M, Alvarez-Dardet C, Uris Selles J, Munoz-Mendoza CL. Clinical pathway intervention compliance and effectiveness when used in the treatment of patients with severe sepsis and septic shock at an Intensive Care Unit in Spain. *Rev Lat Am Enfermagem*. 2012;20(4):635-43.
25. Hooper MH, Weavind L, Wheeler AP, Martin JB, Gowda SS, Semler MW, et al. Randomized trial of automated, electronic monitoring to facilitate early detection of sepsis in the intensive care unit. *Critical care medicine*. 2012;40(7):2096.
26. Semler MW, Weavind L, Hooper MH, Rice TW, Gowda SS, Nadas A, et al. An Electronic Tool for the Evaluation and Treatment of Sepsis in the ICU: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Crit Care Med*. 2015;43(8):1595-602.
27. Umscheid CA, Betesh J, VanZandbergen C, Hanish A, Tait G, Mikkelsen ME, et al. Development, implementation, and impact of an automated early warning and response system for sepsis. *Journal of hospital medicine*. 2015;10(1):26-31.
28. Kollef MH, Chen Y, Heard K, LaRossa GN, Lu C, Martin NR, et al. A randomized trial of real-time automated clinical deterioration alerts sent to a rapid response team. *Journal of hospital medicine*. 2014;9(7):424-9.
29. Hiensch R, Poeran J, Saunders-Hao P, Adams V, Powell CA, Glasser A, et al. Impact of an electronic sepsis initiative on antibiotic use and health care facility-onset *Clostridium difficile* infection rates. *American journal of infection control*. 2017;45(10):1091-100.
30. Rhodes A, Evans LE, Alhazzani W, Levy MM, Antonelli M, Ferrer R, et al. Surviving sepsis campaign: international guidelines for management of sepsis and septic shock: 2016. *Intensive care medicine*. 2017;43(3):304-77.
31. Levy MM, Evans LE, Rhodes A. The surviving sepsis campaign bundle: 2018 update. *Intensive care medicine*. 2018;44(6):925-8.
32. Control CfD, Prevention. Hospital toolkit for adult sepsis surveillance. Atlanta, US Department of Health and Human Services. 2018.
33. Hussey MA, Hughes JP. Design and analysis of stepped wedge cluster randomized trials. *Contemporary clinical trials*. 2007;28(2):182-91.

- 1042 34. Hemming K, Lilford R, Girling AJ. Stepped-wedge cluster randomised controlled
1043 trials: a generic framework including parallel and multiple-level designs. *Statistics in*
1044 *medicine*. 2015;34(2):181-96.
- 1045 35. Hemming K, Girling A. A menu-driven facility for power and detectable-difference
1046 calculations in stepped-wedge cluster-randomized trials. *Stata Journal*. 2014;14(2):363-80.
- 1047 36. Baio G, Copas A, Ambler G, Hargreaves J, Beard E, Omar RZ. Sample size
1048 calculation for a stepped wedge trial. *Trials*. 2015;16:354.
- 1049 37. Hemming K, Taljaard M. Sample size calculations for stepped wedge and cluster
1050 randomised trials: a unified approach. *Journal of clinical epidemiology*. 2016;69:137-46.
- 1051 38. ICH E9 Statistical Principles for Clinical Trials.
1052 [https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-guideline/ich-e-9-statistical-principles-](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-guideline/ich-e-9-statistical-principles-clinical-trials-step-5_en.pdf)
1053 [clinical-trials-step-5_en.pdf](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-guideline/ich-e-9-statistical-principles-clinical-trials-step-5_en.pdf) Accessed 10 November 2020. [
- 1054 39. Mdege ND, Man MS, Taylor Nee Brown CA, Torgerson DJ. Systematic review of
1055 stepped wedge cluster randomized trials shows that design is particularly used to evaluate
1056 interventions during routine implementation. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2011;64(9):936-48.
- 1057 40. Porsdam Mann S, Savulescu J, Sahakian BJ. Facilitating the ethical use of health
1058 data for the benefit of society: electronic health records, consent and the duty of easy
1059 rescue. *Philosophical transactions Series A, Mathematical, physical, and engineering*
1060 *sciences*. 2016;374(2083).
- 1061 41. Gonzales R, Anderer T, McCulloch CE, Maselli JH, Bloom FJ, Graf TR, et al. A
1062 Cluster-Randomized Trial of Decision Support Strategies for Reducing Antibiotic Use for
1063 Acute Bronchitis. *JAMA internal medicine*. 2013;173(4):267-73.
- 1064 42. van Wyk JT, van Wijk MA, Sturkenboom MC, Mosseveld M, Moorman PW, van der
1065 Lei J. Electronic alerts versus on-demand decision support to improve dyslipidemia
1066 treatment: a cluster randomized controlled trial. *Circulation*. 2008;117(3):371-8.
- 1067 43. Levy MM, Rhodes A, Phillips GS, Townsend SR, Schorr CA, Beale R, et al. Surviving
1068 Sepsis Campaign: association between performance metrics and outcomes in a 7.5-year
1069 study. *Intensive care medicine*. 2014;40(11):1623-33.
- 1070 44. Rhee C, Wang R, Zhang Z, Fram D, Kadri SS, Klompas M, et al. Epidemiology of
1071 hospital-onset versus community-onset sepsis in US hospitals and association with mortality:
1072 a retrospective analysis using electronic clinical data. *Critical care medicine*.
1073 2019;47(9):1169-76.
- 1074 45. Rothman M, Levy M, Dellinger RP, Jones SL, Fogerty RL, Voelker KG, et al. Sepsis
1075 as 2 problems: Identifying sepsis at admission and predicting onset in the hospital using an
1076 electronic medical record-based acuity score. *Journal of critical care*. 2017;38:237-44.
- 1077 46. Zhang D, Micek ST, Kollef MH. Time to appropriate antibiotic therapy is an
1078 independent determinant of postinfection ICU and hospital lengths of stay in patients with
1079 sepsis. *Critical care medicine*. 2015;43(10):2133-40.
- 1080 47. Han X, Edelson DP, Snyder A, Pettit N, Sokol S, Barc C, et al. Implications of centers
1081 for Medicare & Medicaid Services Severe Sepsis and septic shock early management
1082 bundle and initial lactate measurement on the Management of Sepsis. *Chest*.
1083 2018;154(2):302-8.
- 1084 48. Makam AN, Nguyen OK, Auerbach AD. Diagnostic accuracy and effectiveness of
1085 automated electronic sepsis alert systems: a systematic review. *Journal of hospital*
1086 *medicine*. 2015;10(6):396-402.
- 1087 49. Dykes LA, Heintz SJ, Heintz BH, Livorsi DJ, Egge JA, Lund BC. Contrasting qSOFA
1088 and SIRS Criteria for Early Sepsis Identification in a Veteran Population. *Federal*
1089 *Practitioner*. 2019;36(Suppl 2):S21.
- 1090 50. Anand V, Zhang Z, Kadri SS, Klompas M, Rhee C, Program CPE. Epidemiology of
1091 Quick Sequential Organ Failure Assessment Criteria in Undifferentiated Patients and
1092 Association With Suspected Infection and Sepsis. *Chest*. 2019.
- 1093 51. Arabi Y, Al-Hameed F, Alyafi W, AlQarni A, Shouabi AA, AlZahrani M, et al. 1574:
1094 QSOFA COMPARED TO SIRS IN PREDICTING MORTALITY AMONG WARD PATIENTS
1095 IN 5 HOSPITALS. *Critical Care Medicine*. 2019;47(1):762.

1096 52. Serafim R, Gomes J, Salluh J, Póvoa P. A Comparison of the Quick-SOFA and
1097 Systemic Inflammatory Response Syndrome Criteria for the Diagnosis of Sepsis and
1098 Prediction of Mortality: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. 2018.
1099 53. Fernando S, Tran A, Taljaard M, Cheng W, Rochwerg B, Seely A, et al. Prognostic
1100 Accuracy of the Quick Sequential Organ Failure Assessment for Mortality in Patients With
1101 Suspected Infection: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. 2018.
1102 54. Waligora G, Gaddis G, Church A, Mills L. Rapid Systematic Review: The Appropriate
1103 Use of Quick Sequential Organ Failure Assessment (qSOFA) in the Emergency Department.
1104 The Journal of emergency medicine.S0736-4679 (20) 30594-1.
1105 55. Gando S, Shiraishi A, Abe T, Kushimoto S, Mayumi T, Fujishima S, et al. The SIRS
1106 criteria have better performance for predicting infection than qSOFA scores in the
1107 emergency department. Scientific Reports. 2020;10.
1108 56. Thompson DS, Oberteuffer R, Dorman T. Sepsis alert and diagnostic system:
1109 integrating clinical systems to enhance study coordinator efficiency. Computers, informatics,
1110 nursing : CIN. 2003;21(1):22-6; quiz 7-8.
1111 57. Schorr C, Odden A, Evans L, Escobar GJ, Gandhi S, Townsend S, et al.
1112 Implementation of a multicenter performance improvement program for early detection and
1113 treatment of severe sepsis in general medical–surgical wards. Journal of hospital medicine.
1114 2016;11:S32-S9.
1115 58. Harrison AM, Gajic O, Pickering BW, Herasevich V. Development and
1116 implementation of sepsis alert systems. Clin Chest Med. 2016;37(2):219-29.

1117

Figure 1: SCREEN trial design as a stepped-wedge cluster randomized trial.

Figure 2: SPIRIT Figure for the SCREEN trial.

Figure 3: Workflow of the electronic alert.

Figure 2. SPIRIT Figure for the SCREEN trial.

	Study Period											
	Baseline		Randomization/Intervention									Follow-Up
Time points (months)	0	2	4	6	8	10	12	14	16	18	20	+90 days
RANDOMIZATION												
0		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
1 st 5 wards			x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
2 nd 5 wards				x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
3 rd 5 wards					x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
4 th 5 wards						x	x	x	x	x	x	
5 th 5 wards							x	x	x	x	x	
6 th 5 wards								x	x	x	x	
7 th 5 wards									x	x	x	
8 th 5 wards										x	x	
9 th 5 wards											x	
OUTCOMES												
Data extraction												x
Analysis												x

Standard Protocol Items: Recommendations for Interventional Trials (SPIRIT) schedule.

Table 1: Time windows for data extraction. All data points within the time window will be extracted.

Variables	Attribute	Type of variable	Check-in cohort	Alert cohort
Age (years)	All values			
Sex (Percentage)	All values			
Location before check in	All ICD-10-AM*			
Service	All ICD-10-AM*			
Admission diagnoses, main and secondary	All ICD-10-AM*			
Problem list	All ICD-10-AM*			
Discharge diagnosis	All ICD-10-AM*			
Alert criteria		Baseline data		
Alert count	All alerts dates and times	Baseline data		
Time to acknowledgment by nurse and physician	First alert: Time to acknowledgment by nurse and by physician	Process measure		
Vital signs (heart rate (HR), Systolic Blood Pressure (SBP), Diastolic Blood Pressure (DBP), Respiratory Rate (RR), Temperature)	All values, dates and times	Baseline data	Check-in to +12 hours	-12 hours to alert time
Same vital signs except temperature	All values, dates and times	Physiologic outcome		Alert time to +12 hours
Lactate	All values, dates and times	Baseline data	-12 hours to +12 hours	-12 hours to alert time
Lactate	All values, dates and times	Process measure, Physiologic outcome		Alert time to +12 hours
Other blood tests results (White blood cell count, Bilirubin, creatinine)	All values, dates and times	Baseline data	-12 hours to +12 hours	-12 hours to alert time
Cultures obtained (blood, respiratory, urine, body fluid ((pleural, ascitic, CSF, joint))	Yes vs. No, dates and times, results	Baseline data	-12 hours to +12 hours	-12 hours to alert time
Cultures obtained (blood, respiratory, urine, body fluid ((pleural, ascitic, CSF, joint))	Yes vs. No, dates and times, results	Process measure		Alert time to +12 hours
Antibiotics prescribed	All antibiotics**, date and time	Baseline data	-12 hours to +12 hours	-12 hours to alert time
	All antibiotics**, date and time	Process measure		Alert to +12 hours
Intravenous fluids administration prescribed	Yes vs. No, date and times	Baseline data	-12 hours to +12 hours	-12 hours to alert time
	Yes vs. No, date and times	Process measure		Alert to +12 hours
Hemodialysis	Yes vs. No	Baseline data	Dialysis (hemodialysis) before check-in as outpatient or as in patient in the week	Dialysis (hemodialysis) before alert as outpatient or as in patient in the week

Variables	Attribute	Type of variable	Check-in cohort	Alert cohort
	Yes vs. No, first date and time only	Outcome	preceding check in Hemodialysis post check-in during this hospital stay (including during ICU stay)	preceding check in Dialysis within 14 days from the alert (including during ICU stay)
Continuous Renal Replacement Therapy (CRRT)	Yes vs. No, first date and time only	Outcome	CRRT post check in during this hospital stay (including during ICU stay)	CRRT within 14 days from the alert (including during ICU stay)
Vasopressors (norepinephrine, dopamine, epinephrine, dobutamine, phenylephrine, vasopressin)	Yes vs. No, date and time of initiation	Outcome	Check in to 90 days	alert to 14 days
Mechanical ventilation (except Operation room)	Yes vs. No, date and time of initiation	Outcome	Check in to 90 days	alert to 14 days
ICU admission	Yes vs. No, date and time of initiation, number of days in ICU	Outcome	Check in to 90 days	alert to 14 days
Critical Care Rapid Response Team (CCRT) activation	Yes vs. No, date and time	Outcome	Check in to 90 days	alert to 14 days
Code blue	Yes vs. No, date and time	Outcome	Check in to 90 days	alert to 14 days
Hospital discharge	Date and time Status	Outcome		
Antibiotics	Yes vs. No,	Baseline data	-12 hours to +12 hours	-12 hours to alert time
	Yes vs. No, number of days on antibiotics	Process measure Outcome	Check in to 90 days	Alert to +12 hours Alert to 14 days
e-SOFA				
Creatinine	Highest value creatinine		Every day from check in to 90 days	
Bilirubin	Highest value bilirubin		Every day from check in to 90 days	
Lactate	Highest value lactate		Every day from check in to 90 days	
Platelet count	Lowest platelet		Every day from check in to 90 days	
Multidrug-resistant organism (MDROs)	Yes vs. No, type, date and time	Outcome	Check in to 90 days	Alert to 90 days
Clostridium difficile (C-diff)	Yes vs. No, date and time	Outcome	Check in to 90 days	Alert to 90 days

* ICD-10-AM: Diagnosis codes used for comorbidity and for infections are referenced in supplementary file (Table S4 & S5) ** Antibiotics list is referenced in supplementary file (Table S6)