

Clinical Evidence Series

Effect of an automated notification system for deteriorating ward patients on clinical outcomes



What's different

An electronic automated advisory vital-signs monitoring and notification systems replaces exclusive reliance on manual observation made by bedside staff with redundant, system-level detection and escalation, automatically notifying the rapid response team when early warning scores worsen.



Interpretation

Automating the afferent limb of rapid response systems was associated with more timely escalation, earlier intervention, and fewer failure-to-rescue events, supporting the concept that reliability in deterioration detection drives patient outcomes on general wards.



Key takeaways

After implementation of automated notification, rapid response activations increased, while cardiac arrests and hospital mortality declined.



Background

- Delayed recognition of clinical deterioration on hospital wards contributes to preventable cardiac arrest and death
- Rapid response teams have been shown to reduce hospital mortality, but failure-to-rescue still occurs, which may be related to monitoring strategies and delayed rapid response team activation



Intervention

Automated vital sign capture and real-time wireless notifications to rapid response teams using the Philips IntelliVue Guardian* solution.



Study design

Prospective before-and-after study of adult patients admitted to two UK general medicine wards using automated EWS monitoring with RRT notification versus standard care.

*Product no longer in active support.



Objectives

Evaluate whether monitoring technology with real-time notification to rapid response teams improves escalation of care and patient outcomes on general wards.



Results



Care escalation

Increase in RRT notifications

1.33 → 1.43 per patient ($p = 0.001$)



Clinical outcomes

Decrease in cardiac arrests
14 → 2 ($p = 0.002$)

Decrease in hospital mortality
8.1% → 6.5% ($p = 0.042$)

Decrease in ICU mortality
45% → 24% ($p < 0.04$)

Decrease in serious adverse events
12.5% → 8.2% ($p < 0.001$)