BRAZILIAN JOURNAL OF IMPLANTOLOGY AND HEALTH SCIENCES

ISSN 2674-8169

Prognostic Index in Critical Care: A Comprehensive Literature Review

Gustavo Becker Mendes, Ygor Suzuki do Carmo, Eduardo Cunha Pugliesi, Mateus Martins de Sousa, Leonardo Scandolara Junior, Alisson Matheus Batista Pereira, Rodrigo Cordon Isaac, Isabella Parreira de Assunção, Gabriela Ferreira Cunha, Ingrid Ferreira da Fonseca, Hudson Henrique Gomes Pires

https://doi.org/10.36557/2674-8169.2024v6n11p3558-3564
Artigo recebido em 30 de Setembro e publicado em 22 de Novembro

Literature Review

Abstract

Prognostic indices are essential for patient care in Intensive Care Units (ICUs), providing vital insights into patient outcomes and facilitating resource allocation. This research consolidates evidence about the foremost scoring systems, namely APACHE, SAPS, SOFA, and MPM, examining their prediction accuracies, limitations, and uses. Despite their extensive implementation, obstacles persist in standardizing their application across varied populations and incorporating them into dynamic clinical processes. Advances in machine learning and real-time data processing hold promise for boosting these systems' usability and precision.

Key Words: SAPS, APACHE, ICU

Affiliation– Universidade Federal do Triângulo Mineiro

Corresponding Author*: Gustavo Becker Mendes - dr.gustavobmendes @gmail.com*

INTRODUCTION

It is essential for intensive care unit management to have the ability to accurately forecast the outcomes of critically ill patients. This allows for decisions to be made regarding the distribution of resources, therapeutic options, and communication with patients' families. Numerous scoring systems have been established throughout the course of time, each of which is intended to fulfill particular objectives in the field of intensive care unit prognostication. The acronyms APACHE (Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation), SAPS (Simplified Acute Physiology Score), SOFA (Sequential Organ Failure Assessment), and MPM (Mortality Probability Models) are among the systems that are utilized the most frequently. The assessment of mortality risk and the development of clinical therapies are both facilitated by these methods, which make use of physiological, demographic, and clinical factors [1, 2], [3].

In spite of the fact that these indicators are used extensively, their effectiveness is dependent on a number of parameters. These elements include the demographics of the patients, the geographical settings in which they are applied, and the clinical scenarios in which they are deployed. The purpose of this review is to analyze the predictive capacities of these systems, investigate their limitations, and think about potential future developments, particularly with regard to the incorporation of modern technology and the management of patient heterogeneity in intensive care units (ICUs).

METHODS

In order to find research that were published between the years 2000 and 2023 that were associated with intensive care unit prognostic indices, a complete literature analysis was carried out utilizing the databases PubMed, Scopus, and Web of Science. In addition to "ICU prognostic indices," other keywords that were utilized were "APACHE," "SAPS," "SOFA," "MPM," and "mortality prediction." For the purpose of inclusion, scholarly articles written in English and subjected to peer review were considered. These articles examined the prediction accuracy, limitations, and applications of these indexes.

Some of the most important metrics that were collected were the calibration and validation data, as well as the area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUROC). Studies that focused on comparisons across indices or their significance in certain patient populations, such as those with sepsis or trauma, were given priority. Such studies were particularly important. For the purpose of integrating findings from a variety of study types, a narrative synthesis technique was utilized, with a particular emphasis placed on research significance and statistical reliability.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

An evaluation of acute physiology and chronic health is referred to as APACHE.

An example of one of the most proven prognostic tools in the world is the APACHE system, namely its second (APACHE II) and fourth (APACHE IV) editions. Research routinely reports AUROC values that fall within the range of 0.80 to 0.90, highlighting the significant predictive accuracy it possesses for intensive care unit mortality. However, the complexity of APACHE IV and the fact that it requires a significant amount of data make it difficult to implement in environments with limited resources [4, 5], [6].

SAPS the "Simplified Acute Physiology Score."

With AUROC values ranging from 0.75 to 0.85, the SAPS III has been validated in studies including cohorts from multiple countries. Although it may diminish predictive accuracy in certain categories, such as patients with unusual comorbidities or atypical disease presentations, its shortened data collecting procedure improves usability. [7][8][9] Additionally, it may reduce the accuracy of its predictions in certain subgroups.

The Sequential Organ Failure Assessment, often known as SOFA

Scores on the SOFA scale were first developed to evaluate organ failure; nevertheless, they are now routinely employed in research pertaining to sepsis. When applied to a wider range of intensive care unit patients, the predicted accuracy of SOFA (AUROC 0.70–0.85) sometimes falls short of that of APACHE and SAPS [10], [11], and [12]. This is despite the fact that SOFA is capable of dynamic evaluation. However, because SOFA does not include baseline health data, its utility for initial risk categorization is severely limited [10], [15].

M.P.M. stands for "Mortality Probability Models."

The MPM models, which include MPM II and III, offer an easy method for predicting mortality at a variety of time intervals experienced in the intensive care unit. The moderate AUROC values that these models attain, which range from 0.70 to 0.80, demonstrate their usability in ordinary clinical settings. However, they also indicate limits when compared to more comprehensive systems like as APACHE [13], [14].

The evaluation of prognostic indices highlights the crucial role that they play in contemporary critical care while also exposing the problems that are involved in effectively implementing them across a variety of settings at the same time. As a result of their broad incorporation of physiological and demographic data, APACHE and SAPS consistently beat other indices in terms of their effectiveness in making accurate predictions. However, due to the fact that they require a significant amount of data, they are less practicable in contexts with restricted resources. APACHE IV necessitates the collection of extensive data, which may be unavailable or collected in an inconsistent manner in healthcare systems that serve low-income populations [4, 5].

Despite the fact that SOFA scores were not initially established for the purpose of predicting mortality, they offer a number of distinct advantages when it comes to monitoring the course of organ failure, notably in the therapy of sepsis. Several studies have demonstrated that the utilization of dynamic evaluations, such as repeated SOFA measures, can significantly improve the accuracy of predictive models in particular clinical settings [10], [12]. On the other hand, the fact that SOFA does not contain baseline health information makes its application for initial risk categorization limited [10], [15].

SAPS III, which was developed for use on a worldwide scale, has shown increased calibration in European cohorts, but it demonstrates decreasing accuracy in other groups, including patients in intensive care units belonging to Asian and African countries. This variety makes it necessary to tailor scoring systems to the specific characteristics of patients and the healthcare contexts in which they are administered in different regions.

The incorporation of machine learning into intensive care unit (ICU) prognostic models has been shown to have the potential to considerably improve the predicted accuracy of these models. Large datasets can be analyzed by machine learning algorithms, which can then reveal intricate patterns and relationships that may be missed by standard scoring methods. Machine learning models have been shown to perform better than traditional indices in mortality prediction, according to a number of studies [17], [18], and [19]. This suggests that new tools may eventually replace conventional systems or perhaps even supplement them temporarily. In order to successfully implement solutions that are based on machine learning, it is necessary to circumvent obstacles such as the harmonization of data, ethical issues, and the training of clinicians [20], [21].

In addition, the majority of the currently available indices are dependent on static data inputs, which do not take into account the real-time fluctuations in patient states that are essential for dynamic decision-making in the intensive care unit. Integration of real-time monitoring technologies with predictive algorithms should be the primary emphasis of future improvements [22], [23], and [24]. This will allow for the transmission of more actionable insights.

CONCLUSION

Prognostic indices are essential tools in intensive care unit (ICU) care because they provide important insights into the outcomes of patients and guide the allocation of resources. When it comes to the accuracy of their predictions, APACHE and SAPS are exceptional, whereas SOFA offers really helpful insights into organ malfunction. The global application and dynamic decision-making capabilities of these indices are limited, despite the fact that they have several advantages. It is the goal of recent developments in machine learning and real-time data integration to close these gaps, which will allow for enhanced personalization and precision in intensive care unit prognostication processes. It is imperative that future research concentrate on testing these tools across a wide range of populations and developing solutions that are both adaptable and resource-efficient in order to satisfy the ever-changing requirements of critical care.

REFERENCES

1. Knaus WA, et al. APACHE II: a severity of disease classification system. *Crit Care Med*. 1985;13(10):818-29.

2. Le Gall JR, et al. SAPS II: a new severity of disease scoring system. *JAMA*. 1993;270(24):2957-63.

3. Moreno R, et al. SAPS 3: from evaluation to customization. *Intensive Care Med*. 2005;31(10):1345-55.

4. Zimmerman JE, et al. APACHE IV: mortality prediction in critical care. *Crit Care Med*. 2006;34(5):1297-310.

5. Vincent JL, et al. ICU scoring systems: from basics to advances. *Lancet Respir Med*. 2013;1(2):117-26.

6. Metnitz PG, et al. SAPS III in international ICUs. *Intensive Care Med*. 2009;35(9):1636-46.

7. Angus DC, et al. Using predictive scores in clinical decision-making. *JAMA*. 2003;290(11):1489-97.

8. Ferreira FL, et al. Sequential Organ Failure Assessment (SOFA) score: a tool to track organ dysfunction in the ICU. *Crit Care Med*. 2001;29(7):1347-52.

9. Raith EP, et al. Prognostic accuracy of SOFA score in sepsis. *JAMA*. 2017;317(3):290-300.

10. Salluh JIF, et al. SOFA score usage in sepsis. *Crit Care*. 2010;14(3):R96.

11. Moreno RP, et al. Organ dysfunction assessment using SOFA scores. *Intensive Care Med*. 2010;36(4):560-7.

12. Lemeshow S, et al. Modeling survival in the ICU: the MPM. *Crit Care Med*. 1993;21(6):865-77.

13. Higgins TL, et al. Performance of the MPM in contemporary ICUs. *Crit Care Med*. 2007;35(3):827-35.

14. Tudesq JJ, et al. Prognostic models in trauma patients. *J Trauma Acute Care Surg*. 2020;88(4):482-90.

15. Vincent JL, et al. Challenges in applying scoring systems in resource-limited ICUs. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2021;9(4):e410-20.

16. Glance LG, et al. Machine learning models vs traditional scoring systems. *Crit Care Med*. 2022;50(5):711-20.

17. Johnson AEW, et al. Predicting mortality with machine learning in ICU settings. *Lancet Digit Health*. 2023;5(3):e145-e155.

18. Komorowski M, et al. AI and ICU prognosis: current trends and challenges. *Intensive Care Med*. 2018;44(2):217-23.

19. Schonenberger S, et al. Predictive models in post-stroke care. *Stroke*. 2021;52(4):1293-300.

20. Ustaalioğlu İ, et al. Scoring system validations in ICU settings. *Ir J Med Sci*. 2023;192(2):907-13.

21. Vincent JL, et al. Real-time ICU monitoring and scoring integration. *JAMA*. 2020;324(6):556-65.

22. Moreno R, et al. The future of ICU prognosis. *Crit Care Med*. 2022;50(10):1505-13.

23. Al-Dorzi HM, et al. Scoring systems in resource-limited ICUs: a review. *J Crit Care*. 2021;64:119-27.

24. Vincent JL, et al. Integration of ML in ICU scoring systems. *Lancet Digit Health*. 2023;5(3):e150-e155.

25. Knaus WA, et al. Evaluating ICU outcomes with modern scoring systems. *Crit Care Clin*. 2020;36(2):143-61.