

**POINT-OF-CARE C-REACTIVE PROTEIN TO IDENTIFY SERIOUS INFECTION IN
ACUTELY ILL CHILDREN PRESENTING TO HOSPITAL: PROSPECTIVE COHORT
STUDY**

Jan Y Verbakel^{1,2*}, Marieke B Lemiengre³, Tine De Burghgraeve¹, An De Sutter³, Bert Aertgeerts¹,
Dominique MA Bullens^{4,5}, Bethany Shinkins⁶, Ann Van den Bruel², Frank Buntinx^{1,7}

¹Department of Public Health and Primary Care, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium

²Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom

³Department of Family Medicine and Primary Health Care, Ghent University, Gent, Belgium

⁴Clinical Department of Paediatrics, University Hospitals Leuven, Leuven, Belgium

⁵Paediatric Immunology, Department of Microbiology and Immunology, KU Leuven, Leuven,
Belgium

⁶Leeds Institute of Health Sciences, University of Leeds, United Kingdom

⁷Research Institute Caphri, Maastricht University, Maastricht, The Netherlands

*Corresponding author: Jan Y Verbakel, Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences,
Woodstock Road, Oxford OX2 6GG, United Kingdom jan.verbakel@phc.ox.ac.uk, +44(0)7477201379

KEYWORDS: serious infection, child, C-reactive protein, point-of-care, paediatrics

ABSTRACT

Objective: acute infection is the most common presentation of children to hospital. A minority of these infections are serious but early recognition and adequate management are essential. We aimed to develop improved tools to assess children attending ambulatory hospital care, integrating clinical features with point-of-care CRP.

Design: prospective observational diagnostic study

Setting & Patients: 5517 acutely ill children (1 month to 16 years) with acute illness presenting to 106 paediatricians at 6 outpatient clinics and 6 emergency departments in Belgium.

Index test: point-of-care CRP alongside vital signs and objective symptoms measurements

Main outcome: hospital admission for >24 hours with a serious infection <5 days after presentation

Results: an algorithm was developed consisting of clinical features and CRP. This achieved 97.1% (95%CI 94.3-98.7%) sensitivity and 99.6% (95%CI 99.2-99.8%) negative predictive value, excluding serious infections in 36.4% of children. It stratifies patients into three groups based on CRP level: high risk group with CRP >75mg/L (26.8% risk of infection), intermediate risk with CRP 20-75mg/L and at least one of 7 clinical features (8.1%), and lower risk with CRP <20mg/L with at least one of 11 features (3.8%). Children in intermediate or low risk groups with normal clinical assessment have 0.6% and 0.4% risk of serious infections, respectively.

Conclusions: Conducting a CRP test first may enable children to be stratified into three risk groups, guiding assessment of clinical features which could be performed by junior doctors or nurses. In one third of acutely ill children, the algorithm could exclude serious infection. Prospective validation of the algorithm is needed.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

What is already known on this topic:

- Early recognition of serious infection in acutely ill children presenting to hospital is crucial to improve outcome.
- Laboratory-based C-reactive protein (CRP) testing is used in specialist settings to support diagnosis and management decisions of such children.

What this study adds:

- A point-of-care CRP test preceding clinical assessment can help stratify children into three risk groups.
- High risk (CRP >75 mg/L) children could be prioritised immediately for further assessment and management by senior staff.
- A clinical assessment, using seven features in the intermediate group and 11 features in the lower risk group which can be conducted by junior or nursing staff, will further classify children as at risk of a serious infection or not.

INTRODUCTION

Most acutely ill children suffer from self-limiting illnesses requiring little medical intervention.[1] However, prompt recognition of the few children with a serious infection (SI), such as sepsis, meningitis, pyelonephritis, is essential to avoid complications or death [2]: the mortality of meningococcal disease can be as high as 14%, and up to 19% of children who survive bacterial meningitis suffer from hearing loss, amputations, or neurodevelopmental disorders.[3-6]

The care for acutely sick children has traditionally been delivered by ambulatory care,[7] but diagnostic uncertainty has driven care upwards, from primary to secondary care. In the UK, there has been a 40% rise in the number of children attending the emergency department (ED) over the last decade, with 14% presenting with febrile illness.[8] In the same period, emergency admission rates have increased by 28%, primarily for acute infections,[1] with up to 23 per 1000 admissions annually for a condition that could be safely managed out-of-hospital.[1 9] In the US in 2011, 1 out of every 10 children visited the ED with an infectious disease.[10]

The clinician must decide whether a child needs immediate admission to hospital or can be discharged safely. However recognizing SI in children can be challenging, especially at disease onset when the severity of the infection is unclear. Nearly half of children with meningococcal disease are not identified at first contact.[3] Some clinical features have been shown to be 'red flags', increasing the likelihood of SI, but none appear to have 'rule out' value, making SI less likely in their absence.[2 11 12]

Combinations of signs and symptoms may rule out SI,[11 13 14] with only one such algorithm developed in primary care, involving features such as clinician gut-feeling and temperature $>40^{\circ}\text{C}$. [13-15]

Evidence suggests that inflammatory markers such as C-reactive protein (CRP) or procalcitonin provide the most diagnostic value in hospital settings, with CRP $<20\text{mg/L}$ and procalcitonin $<0.5\text{ng/mL}$ significantly reducing the risk of missing a SI in children.[16] A recent

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

study on point-of-care (POC) CRP in primary care found an even lower threshold of 5mg/L to rule out SI in those children.[17]

To date, these tests play a minor role in hospital ambulatory care, requiring venous blood sampling which can be bothersome when triaging acutely ill children. POC tests from a finger prick are now available in ambulatory care, testing for CRP within 4 minutes.[18 19]

We aimed to develop improved tools to assess children attending ambulatory hospital care, thus at higher risk than those presenting to primary care, by integrating clinical features with POC CRP.

METHODS

Setting and Patients

This study was conducted in Belgium, from 15th February 2013 to 28th February 2014 [14]. Children aged 1 month to 16 years, presenting with an acute illness to ambulatory care were recruited to have POC CRP testing.[20] Results in primary care have been published elsewhere,[17] this paper reports the findings of children presenting to six paediatric outpatient clinics (offering same-day appointments and urgent ambulatory care) and six EDs, assessed by paediatricians (n=106). (**Figure 1**) Children were excluded if the acute illness was caused by merely traumatic or neurological conditions, intoxication, psychiatric problems, exacerbations of a known chronic condition or if the child was referred by their GP.

Index tests

Vital Signs and symptoms

We asked physicians to assess 61 clinical features, selected based on previous research and consensus of an international team of clinicians and researchers,[13] including NICE traffic light system, Yale Observation Scale, temperature, heart rate, breathing rate, oxygen saturation and capillary refill.[13 21 22] Parents were also asked whether the illness was different from previous illnesses and whether fever improved with antipyretics.[2] (**Online**

Supplementary File 1)

The vital signs: temperature, respiratory rate, heart rate, oxygen saturation and capillary refill were measured, each according to their respective standardized method.[23]

“Body temperature” was defined as the highest temperature measured by parents or physician. Before analysis 0.5°C was added to temperatures measured under the axilla, or with a tympanic thermometer.[24 25]

POC CRP test

We used the Afinion™ CRP Test Cartridge, which has a measuring range for CRP of 5-200mg/L,[19] requires 1.5µl of blood obtained by finger prick, providing a result within 4 minutes. We trained all physicians to perform the CRP test. Internal quality control was performed per manufacturer's instructions.

Outcomes

The primary outcome of the study was hospital admission (>24 hours) for SI within 5 days after initial presentation,[14] which was verified by a search of the electronic medical records of all paediatric clinics and EDs.

SIs were defined as:

- septicaemia (including bacteraemia): pathogenic bacteria isolated from blood culture
- meningitis: pleocytosis or identification of bacteria or virus in cerebrospinal fluid
- appendicitis: histology
- pneumonia: infiltrate on chest X-ray
- osteomyelitis: pathogens from bone aspirate or MRI or bone scan suggestive for osteomyelitis
- cellulitis: acute suppurative inflammation of subcutaneous tissues
- bacterial gastro-enteritis: pathogen isolated from stool culture
- complicated urinary tract infection: >10⁵/ml pathogens of a single species isolated from urine culture and systemic effects such as fever

In cases where no definitive adjudication could be made based on the above, a committee consisting of clinicians with expertise in acute paediatric care assigned outcome by consensus, using all available information.

Sample size

To effectively rule out SI, the algorithm should have high sensitivity (>97%), as shown in previous studies from different settings.[14 15 26]

Assuming a prevalence in our population of 5%,[26 27] we estimated that recruiting 5500 children would provide a maximum margin of error of 2% around our estimate of sensitivity.[28]

We thus aimed to include 5500 acute illness episodes in children over a 12-month period.

Statistical Analysis

We calculated the area under the Receiver-Operating-Characteristics curve (AUC) as a measure of CRP's ability to discriminate between children with and without SI. We calculated accuracy for the following pre-determined cut-offs: 5 and 200mg/L (lower and upper limit of the POC CRP test), and 20 and 80mg/L (identified as ruling out and ruling in thresholds respectively in earlier studies conducted in secondary care).[2] We reported diagnostic accuracy in sensitivity, specificity, positive and negative diagnostic likelihood ratios (LR+ and LR-), and positive and negative predictive values (PPV and NPV) with their 95% confidence intervals (CI).

We developed a new algorithm, deliberately only feeding clinical features that could also be assessed by trained triage nurses and junior doctors into the algorithm. Analyses were thus limited to the POC CRP test, all items from history taking and observation, and vital signs.

(Online Supplementary File 1).[29]

From the observation features, we excluded "clinician concern" and "clinical impression child is seriously ill" considering they are holistic features encompassing all available information from clinical examination and their assessment might be influenced by experience.[29]

We used Classification and Regression Tree (CART) analyses to develop this algorithm. CART is a decision tree building method used to classify patients in different classes, based on non-parametric tests. It creates a tree by exhaustively searching all possible splits recursively until the desired fit is reached. It uses the most discriminative test at every split, dichotomizing continuous variables.[30] CART deals effectively with missing data through surrogate splits. These splits use the available information in the other predicting variables with similar outcome patterns whenever the primary variable is missing for an individual observation to decide which side of the split that observation should go to,[31] using the best

available information when variables are missing, in contrast to other methods such as multivariate regression modelling.[32]

Sensitivity and NPV were maximised by introducing a weighing factor of 100 to misclassification of SI in a data-driven way, balancing maximum sensitivity with the complexity of the tree. The minimum number of observations for a split to be attempted, was set at 20, to obtain accurate predictions. We applied a 50-fold cross-validation procedure, validating our results internally.

We conducted sensitivity analyses to explore the effect of multiple illness episodes of the same child (i.e. clustering from a predisposition for abnormal clinical findings such as high temperature or health seeking behaviour) by restricting the analyses to only the first illness episodes of all children. We conducted subgroup analyses by setting, i.e. children seen at the paediatric clinics or the EDs and by age, selecting children up to 36 months of age, to compare our results with previous research in that same age group.[7-9]

All analyses were performed with Stata software (version 13.2; Stata Corp., USA), and JMP Statistical Discovery (version Pro 12.1.0; SAS Institute Inc., USA).

Ethics

Formal written informed consent was obtained from the parent or guardian of each child. We provided age-appropriate information leaflets and assent forms.

The protocol of this study was approved by the Ethical Review Board of the University Hospitals/KU Leuven under reference ML8601.

RESULTS

Baseline characteristics

We included 5517 new illness episodes (**Figure 1**) in 4608 children;[14] 944 children had two separate illness episodes and 611 had three or more. The children's median age was 1.5 years (age range: 1 month-15.8 years) and 2951 were boys (53.5%). (**Table 1**) Baseline characteristics of children seen at outpatient clinics versus EDs are shown in **Online Supplementary File 2**.

The median number of missing data for all features was 4.3% (IQR 3.6 to 4.7%) which was higher for POC CRP (11.3%), in part due to technical failure (2%) or parental refusal (3%).

The overall prevalence of SI was 4.9% (95%CI 4.4-5.5), however higher at ED than in outpatient clinics (7.5% vs 2.6%). Pneumonia and complicated urinary tract infection were the most common SIs. Of the 27 cases of sepsis and meningitis, 16 children had viral meningitis (mostly Enterovirus or Herpes simplex meningitis), one bacterial meningeal infection (Group B Streptococcus), five *Streptococcus pneumoniae* sepsis, one *Haemophilus influenzae* type b sepsis (despite evidence of prior immunization), one *Neisseria meningitidis* sepsis, and three uropathogenic sepsis (e.g. *Escherichia coli*). No child died during the study.

Accuracy of individual features

Overall sensitivities of individual clinical features were <65%, with only fever >1 day having high sensitivity (98.7% with 95%CI 96.3-99.7%), however at a LR- of 2.3 (95%CI 0.8- 6.9).

Red flags (features substantially raising the probability of infection with LR+ >5) included the clinical impression the child is seriously ill, moaning, bloody diarrhoea, abnormal behaviour, abnormal fontanelle tension, reduced peripheral circulation, meningeal irritation, cyanosis, and peritoneal irritation (LR+ from 5 to 14). (see **Online Supplementary File 3**)

The AUC for CRP was 0.76 (95%CI 0.73-0.79), with diagnostic accuracy of CRP shown at different thresholds in **Table 2** (decreasing sensitivity and increasing specificity as threshold increases).

Algorithm

The CART analyses resulted in an algorithm with POC CRP and 18 clinical features. **(Online Supplementary File 4)**

It starts with CRP, classifying children with a CRP >75mg/L as at risk of SI. **(Figure 2)** This results in 378 children classified as at risk, of whom 100 had SI (PPV 26.8%; 95%CI 22.4-31.6%).

Children with a CRP between 20-75mg/L, should be assessed on seven features: whether the illness was different from previous illness according to parents, no improvement with antipyretics, age <6 months, fever duration <1 day, vomiting, excessive crying, and reduced intake. Any positive feature classifies a further 1065 children as at risk, of whom 86 had SI (PPV 8.1%; 95%CI 6.5-9.9%).

In children with a CRP >20mg/L, four vital signs (temperature, respiratory rate, oxygen saturation and capillary refill) and seven features (moaning, belly ache, pale skin, neck pain, petechial rash, inconsolable, drowsiness) should be assessed. Any positive feature classifies 2071 children as at high risk of whom 78 had SI (PPV 3.8%; 95%CI 3.0-4.7%).

The algorithm classifies 36.4% of the total population as low risk for SI, with 99.6% NPV (95%CI 99.2-99.8%) and 97.1% sensitivity (95%CI 94.3-98.7%) **(Table 3)**. Eight children with SI were misclassified as low risk (with CRP ranging <5-31mg/L): six children with bronchopneumonia (chest X-ray: peri-bronchitis and pulmonary infiltrate) and two children diagnosed with complicated urinary tract infection (negative dimercaptosuccinic acid scan). **(Figure 2)**

Subgroup analyses by setting and age, and sensitivity analysis in all first acute illness episodes indicated similar diagnostic outcome measures in all groups. **(Table 3)**

DISCUSSION

While low CRP levels in isolation cannot rule out SIs, a CRP level $>75\text{mg/L}$ identified 37% of all SIs, regardless of the outcome of clinical assessment. In children with an intermediate CRP level, seven easy-to-assess clinical features, identified a further 32% of all SIs. Another third of SI occurs in children with CRP $<20\text{mg/L}$ (contrary to guidelines in adults with cough in whom CRP $<20\text{mg/L}$ is used to withhold antibiotics).[33] Six children with SI were missed (NPV 99.6%), although these had either a urinary tract infection or bronchopneumonia.

This was a prospective, multicenter study involving a large representative sample of children from hospital-based ambulatory care. A long list of clinical features were assessed, selected based on a systematic review of the available evidence.[2] We acknowledge potential variability among paediatricians of assessing these features, which could lead to differential interpretation of the suggested algorithm.

Although this new algorithm was also built for junior doctors and triage nurses, the study was conducted by paediatricians with different levels of clinical experience.

Verification of our target condition relied on the quality of hospital records. We believe it to be robust by using both objective criteria and independent adjudicators. Considering our outcome included SIs and not all serious illness is infection, a normal CRP level does not necessarily mean a child is well.

CRP and procalcitonin were identified as the best inflammatory markers for SIs in children to date in a systematic review[16], which only identified studies from hospital settings. CRP $<20\text{mg/L}$ was found to provide the best rule out value for SIs in children, identical to the threshold used in our analyses, although still six children with SI had a CRP level below this threshold, underlining the importance of clinical assessment alongside the use of a single biomarker.[16] We previously published the results from the primary care arm of this study and found that CRP levels $<5\text{mg/L}$ in children at increased risk (with breathlessness, temperature $\geq 40^\circ\text{C}$, diarrhoea in children aged 12–30 months, or clinician's gut feeling) rules out SI, potentially avoiding unnecessary referrals to secondary care.[17] The lower CRP threshold of 5mg/L is probably due to the early presentation in primary care, when the inflammatory response is still developing.

Most studies on this topic quantified the value of blood tests in isolation, ignoring the relation with clinical signs and symptoms.[16 34-36]. In order to assess the value of CRP over and above clinical features while limiting the risk of selection bias,[37-40] we instructed our physicians to test CRP in every child, regardless of the clinical presentation.

Most previously reported clinical prediction rules on febrile children combining clinical features and laboratory markers either had poor external validity,[41 42] or targeted young infants.[35] One clinical prediction model including POC CRP,[37] had good diagnostic performance on external validation after updating the model coefficients in a recent single-centre diagnostic study, discriminating well between pneumonia, other bacterial SI and absence of SI.[43]

Our algorithm contains several predictors (and thresholds) similar to the NICE guideline on feverish illness in children.[23] However, we advise future updates should also include POC CRP testing, as well as parental concern and effect of antipyretics.

The Cochrane review on POC testing to guide antibiotic prescribing,[44] showed that POC CRP in primary care decreases antibiotic prescribing up to 30%, now recommended in NICE guidance and Dutch guideline for acute cough in adults [33 45]. However, it remains to be seen whether recommendations on antibiotic prescribing should be linked to CRP levels in children, considering the fairly high prevalence of SIs in the low ranges and the fact that many SIs are potentially of viral origin.

Our results support the use of POC-CRP-guided clinical assessment to help identify SI and need for hospital admission. It allows a redesign of patient flow, with triage staff performing the CRP POC test at the beginning, and stratification of subsequent assessment based on the test result. Children at high risk of SI (CRP >75mg/L) can be prioritized for further testing or treatment, under the supervision of senior paediatric staff; children with an intermediate (20-75mg/L) or low CRP level (<20mg/L) could be assessed clinically by more junior staff. Since this last category also included most missed cases (0.4% of the total population), appropriate safety netting measures ought to be put in place when their assessment proves

1 to be reassuring. **(Figure 3)** Children at high risk should be assessed per usual care,
2 considering the additional information of the POC test which in most cases would be
3 routinely available after venous blood sampling.
4
5
6
7

8
9 Although our newly developed algorithm is one of the very few based on recent research,
10 rather than expert consensus,[22 23 46-48] it should be validated prospectively in a new,
11 similar paediatric population to ensure generalizability.
12
13

14
15 To make our algorithm as applicable as possible, we deliberately selected features that
16 require very little clinical expertise. A prospective validation in which the clinical assessment
17 is performed by junior doctors and nurses should confirm whether diagnostic accuracy is
18 maintained.
19
20
21

22
23 Further research should also evaluate the cost-effectiveness of applying our algorithm in
24 terms of healthcare expenditures (e.g. avoidable admissions, costs per test and quality
25 control of the POC devices).
26
27

28
29 Other biomarkers (e.g. procalcitonin) might be valuable as well and novel technologies, such
30 as wearables for vital signs measurements, will substantially change the focus of future
31 research.
32
33

34
35 Although identifying SIs in children is crucial, improving rational prescribing of antibiotics is
36 also important. Balancing these complementary outcomes in the design of future studies, will
37 hopefully improve overall management of sick children.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

CONTRIBUTORSHIP STATEMENT

JV, ML, ADS, AVDB, FB conceived the study. JV, ML, TDB supervised data collection, performed data follow up and data cleaning. JV performed the analyses, which were discussed with ML, ADS, BA, BS, DB, AVDB, and FB. JV drafted this report and ML, TDB, ADS, BA, BS, DB, AVDB and FB co-drafted and commented on the final version. All authors had full access to all of the data (including statistical reports and tables) in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis. JV affirms that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study being reported; that no important aspects of the study have been omitted. All authors have read and approved the final manuscript.

COMPETING INTERESTS

None declared.

FUNDING

This study was funded by the National Institute for Health and Disability Insurance (RIZIV, Belgium) under reference CGV n° 2012/235 and the Research Foundation Flanders (FWO) under reference n° G067509N. AVDB was funded by the NIHR Diagnostic Evidence Co-operative Oxford and BS by the NIHR Diagnostic Evidence Co-operative Leeds. DMAB is a recipient of a senior clinical investigator fellowship from the Research Foundation Flanders (FWO).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank all participating paediatricians. We would like to thank Frederick Albert, Greet Delvou and Annelien Poppe for daily follow-up during the study. And last but not least, we would like to thank all children and parents who took part in this study.

ABBREVIATIONS

SI: serious infection; POC: point-of-care; CRP: C-reactive protein; AUC: Area under the Receiver-Operating-Characteristics curve; CI: 95% confidence intervals; CART: Classification and Regression Tree analysis; LR+, positive likelihood ratio; LR-, negative likelihood ratio; PPV: positive predictive value; NPV: negative predictive value

REFERENCES

1. Gill PJ, Goldacre MJ, Mant D, et al. Increase in emergency admissions to hospital for children aged under 15 in England, 1999-2010: national database analysis. *Arch. Dis. Child.* 2013;**98**(5):328-34
2. Van den Bruel A, Haj-Hassan T, Thompson M, Buntinx F, Mant D. Diagnostic value of clinical features at presentation to identify serious infection in children in developed countries: a systematic review. *Lancet* 2010;**375**:834 - 45
3. Thompson MJ, Ninis N, Perera R, et al. Clinical recognition of meningococcal disease in children and adolescents. *Lancet* 2006;**367**(9508):397-403
4. Abio A, Neal KR, Beck CR. An epidemiological review of changes in meningococcal biology during the last 100 years. *Pathogens and global health* 2013;**107**(7):373-80
5. Pace D, Pollard AJ. Meningococcal disease: clinical presentation and sequelae. *Vaccine* 2012;**30** Suppl 2:B3-9
6. Rosenstein NE, Perkins BA, Stephens DS, Popovic T, Hughes JM. Meningococcal disease. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 2001;**344**(18):1378-88
7. Fleming DM, Smith GE, Charlton JR, Charlton J, Nicoll A. Impact of infections on primary care--greater than expected. *Commun. Dis. Public Health* 2002;**5**(1):7-12
8. Sands R, Shanmugavadivel D, Stephenson T, Wood D. Medical problems presenting to paediatric emergency departments: 10 years on. *Emerg. Med. J.* 2012;**29**(5):379-82
9. Purdy S, Griffin T, Salisbury C, Sharp D. Ambulatory care sensitive conditions: terminology and disease coding need to be more specific to aid policy makers and clinicians. *Public Health* 2009;**123**(2):169-73
10. Hasegawa K, Tsugawa Y, Cohen A, Camargo CA, Jr. Infectious Disease-related Emergency Department Visits Among Children in the US. *Pediatr. Infect. Dis. J.* 2015;**34**(7):681-5
11. Verbakel JY, MacFaul R, Aertgeerts B, Buntinx F, Thompson M. Sepsis and Meningitis in Hospitalized Children: Performance of Clinical Signs and Their Prediction Rules in a Case-Control Study. *Pediatr. Emerg. Care* 2014;**30**(6):373-80
12. Van den Bruel A, Thompson M. Research into practice: acutely ill children. *Br. J. Gen. Pract.* 2014;**64**:311 - 13
13. Verbakel JY, Van den Bruel A, Thompson M, et al. How well do clinical prediction rules perform in identifying serious infections in acutely ill children across an international network of ambulatory care datasets? *BMC Med.* 2013;**11**:10
14. Verbakel JY, Lemiengre MB, De Burghgraeve T, et al. Validating a decision tree for serious infection: diagnostic accuracy in acutely ill children in ambulatory care. *BMJ Open* 2015;**5**(8):e008657
15. Van den Bruel A, Aertgeerts B, Bruyninckx R, Aerts M, Buntinx F. Signs and symptoms for diagnosis of serious infections in children: a prospective study in primary care. *Br. J. Gen. Pract.* 2007;**57**:538 - 46
16. Van den Bruel A, Thompson M, Haj-Hassan T, et al. Diagnostic value of laboratory tests in identifying serious infections in febrile children: systematic review. *BMJ* 2011;**342**:d3082
17. Verbakel JY, Lemiengre MB, De Burghgraeve T, et al. Should all acutely ill children in primary care be tested with point-of-care CRP: a cluster randomised trial. *BMC Med.* 2016;**14**(1):131
18. Minnaard MC, van de Pol AC, Broekhuizen BD, et al. Analytical performance, agreement and user-friendliness of five C-reactive protein point-of-care tests. *Scand. J. Clin. Lab. Invest.* 2013;**73**(8):627-34
19. Verbakel JY, Aertgeerts B, Lemiengre MB, De Sutter A, Bullens DM, Buntinx F. Analytical accuracy and user-friendliness of the Afinion point-of-care CRP test. *J. Clin. Pathol.* 2014;**67**:83 - 86
20. Verbakel JY, Lemiengre MB, De Burghgraeve T, et al. Diagnosing serious infections in acutely ill children in ambulatory care (ERNIE 2 study protocol part A): diagnostic accuracy of a Clinical Decision Tree and added value of a Point-of-Care C-reactive protein Test and Oxygen Saturation. *BMC Pediatr.* 2014;**14**:207
21. Kerkhof E, Lakhanpaul M, Ray S, et al. The predictive value of the NICE "Red Traffic Lights" in acutely ill children. *PLoS ONE* 2014;**9**:e90847
22. McCarthy P, Sharpe M, Spiesel S, et al. Observation scales to identify serious illness in febrile children. *Pediatrics* 1982;**70**:802 - 09
23. NICE. National Institute for Clinical Excellence: Feverish illness in children - assessment and initial management in children younger than 5 years. London: National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence 2007
24. Craig JV, Lancaster GA, Taylor S, Williamson PR, Smyth RL. Infrared ear thermometry compared with rectal thermometry in children: a systematic review. *Lancet* 2002;**360**(9333):603-9
25. Craig JV, Lancaster GA, Williamson PR, Smyth RL. Temperature measured at the axilla compared with rectum in children and young people: systematic review. *BMJ* 2000;**320**(7243):1174-8
26. Craig J, Williams G, Jones M, et al. The accuracy of clinical symptoms and signs for the diagnosis of serious bacterial infection in young febrile children: prospective cohort study of 15 781 febrile illnesses. *BMJ* 2010;**340**:c1594
27. Brent A, Lakhanpaul M, Thompson M, et al. Risk score to stratify children with suspected serious bacterial infection: observational cohort study. *Arch. Dis. Child.* 2011;**96**:361 - 67
28. Chu H, Cole S. Sample size calculation using exact methods in diagnostic test studies. *J. Clin. Epidemiol.* 2007;**60**:1201 - 02
29. Van den Bruel A, Thompson M, Buntinx F, Mant D. Clinicians' gut feeling about serious infections in children: observational study. *BMJ* 2012;**345**:e6144
30. SAS Institute Inc. *JMP® 12 Specialized Models*. Cary, NC: SAS Institute Inc., 2015.
31. Lewis RJ, Street WC. An introduction to Classification and Regression Tree (CART) analysis. Annual Meeting of the Society for Academic Emergency Medicine. San Francisco, 2000.
32. Kottner JA, Buntinx F. *The evidence base of clinical diagnosis : theory and methods of diagnostic research*. 2nd ed. Oxford ; Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell Pub./BMJ Books, 2009.

33. NICE. Pneumonia: Diagnosis and Management of Community- and Hospital-Acquired Pneumonia in Adults. London: National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence 2014
34. Bressan S, Gomez B, Mintegi S, et al. Diagnostic performance of the lab-score in predicting severe and invasive bacterial infections in well-appearing young febrile infants. *Pediatr. Infect. Dis. J.* 2012;**31**(12):1239-44
35. Galetto-Lacour A, Zamora SA, Andreola B, et al. Validation of a laboratory risk index score for the identification of severe bacterial infection in children with fever without source. *Arch. Dis. Child.* 2010;**95**(12):968-73
36. Lacour AG, Zamora SA, Gervais A. A score identifying serious bacterial infections in children with fever without source. *Pediatr. Infect. Dis. J.* 2008;**27**(7):654-6
37. Nijman RG, Vergouwe Y, Thompson M, et al. Clinical prediction model to aid emergency doctors managing febrile children at risk of serious bacterial infections: diagnostic study. *BMJ* 2013;**346**:f1706
38. Vorwerk C, Manias K, Davies F, Coats TJ. Prediction of severe bacterial infection in children with an emergency department diagnosis of infection. *Emerg. Med. J.* 2011;**28**(11):948-51
39. Nijman RG, Moll HA, Vergouwe Y, de Rijke YB, Oostenbrink R. C-Reactive Protein Bedside Testing in Febrile Children Lowers Length of Stay at the Emergency Department. *Pediatr. Emerg. Care* 2015;**31**(9):633-9
40. Pulliam P, Attia M, Cronan K. C-reactive protein in febrile children 1 to 36 months of age with clinically undetectable serious bacterial infection. *Pediatrics* 2001;**108**:1275 - 79
41. Bleeker S, Derksen-Lubsen G, Grobbee D, Donders A, Moons K, Moll H. Validating and updating a prediction rule for serious bacterial infection in patients with fever without source. *Acta Paediatr.* 2007;**96**:100 - 04
42. Roukema J, Steyerberg E, van der Lei J, Moll H. Randomized trial of a clinical decision support system: impact on the management of children with fever without apparent source. *J. Am. Med. Inform. Assoc.* 2008;**15**:107 - 13
43. Irwin AD, Grant A, Williams R, et al. Predicting Risk of Serious Bacterial Infections in Febrile Children in the Emergency Department. *Pediatrics* 2017;**140**(2)
44. Aabenhus R, Jensen JU, Jorgensen KJ, Hrobjartsson A, Bjerrum L. Biomarkers as point-of-care tests to guide prescription of antibiotics in patients with acute respiratory infections in primary care. *Cochrane Database Syst. Rev.* 2014;**11**:CD010130
45. Verheij T, Hopstaken RM, Prins JM, et al. NHG-Standaard Acut hoesten. *Huisarts & Wetenschap* 2011;**54**(2):86-92
46. American Academy of Pediatrics, American College of Emergency Physicians. *APLS : the pediatric emergency medicine resource*. 5th ed. Burlington, MA: Jones & Bartlett Learning, 2012.
47. Baker M, Avner J, Bell L. Failure of infant observation scales in detecting serious illness in febrile, 4- to 8-week-old infants. *Pediatrics* 1990;**85**:1040 - 43
48. Berger MY, Albeda FW, Dijkstra RH, et al. NHG-Standaard Kinderen met koorts - Tweede Herziening. *Huisarts Wet* 2008;**51**:287 - 96

Table 1: Baseline characteristics for children with or without a serious infection

	serious infection (n=272)	non-serious infection (n=5245)
median age in years (IQR)	1.7 (0.8-4.2)	1.5 (0.8-3)
boys (%)	143 (52.6%)	2808 (53.5%)
final outcome (admission >24h with)		
sepsis	10	-
meningitis	17	-
appendicitis	14	-
pneumonia	155	-
osteomyelitis	0	-
cellulitis	3	-
bacterial gastro-enteritis	21	-
complicated urinary tract infection	52	-
non-serious infection	-	5245
median POC CRP level (IQR)	48 (17-115)	11 (4-29)

POC CRP: point-of-care C-reactive protein test; IQR: interquartile range

Table 2: Accuracy of point-of-care CRP at different thresholds to diagnose serious infection

POC CRP threshold	sensitivity (95% CI)	specificity (95% CI)	Likelihood ratio (95% CI)		Predictive value (95% CI)	
			negative	positive	negative	positive
≥ 5 mg/L	90.8 (86.6-94.0)	33.4 (32.0-34.7)	0.3 (0.2-0.4)	1.4 (1.3-1.4)	98.5 (97.7-99.0)	7.1 (6.3-8.0)
≥ 20 mg/L	73.1 (67.2-78.4)	63.9 (62.5-65.2)	0.4 (0.3-0.5)	2.0 (1.9-2.2)	97.7 (97.1-98.2)	10.2 (8.9-11.7)
≥ 80 mg/L	35.0 (29.2-41.1)	94.8 (94.1-95.4)	0.7 (0.6-0.8)	6.7 (5.5-8.2)	96.3 (95.7-96.8)	27.3 (22.6-32.5)
≥ 200 mg/L	9.6 (6.3-13.9)	99.7 (99.5-99.9)	0.9 (0.9-0.9)	37.1 (18.9-37.1)	95.2 (94.5-95.7)	67.6 (50.2-82.0)

All diagnostic characteristics are given in percentage with their respective 95% confidence intervals in brackets; POC CRP: point-of-care C-reactive protein test; LR: likelihood ratio; PV: predictive value.

Table 3: Sensitivity analyses of algorithm

outcome	sensitivity (95% CI)	specificity (95% CI)	NPV (95% CI)	PPV (95% CI)	LR- (95% CI)	LR+ (95% CI)
any serious infection (n=272) in all children (n = 5517)	97.1 (94.3-98.7)	38.1 (36.8-39.5)	99.6 (99.2-99.8)	7.5 (6.7-8.5)	0.1 (0.0-0.2)	1.6 (1.5-1.6)
any serious infection (n=210) in children seen only once (n=3942)	97.1 (93.9-98.9)	35.4 (33.9-37.0)	99.5 (99.0-99.8)	7.8 (6.8-8.9)	0.1 (0.0-0.2)	1.5 (1.5-1.6)
any serious infection (n=174) in children < 3 years (n=4128)	96.0 (91.9-98.4)	40.8 (39.3-42.3)	99.6 (99.1-99.8)	6.7 (5.7-7.7)	0.1 (0.0-0.2)	1.6 (1.6-1.7)
any serious infection (n=75) in children at paediatric outpatient clinic (n=2895)	98.7 (92.8-100.0)	37.3 (35.5-39.1)	99.6 (99.5-100.0)	6.5 (5.2-7.8)	0.0 (0.0-0.3)	1.6 (1.5-1.6)
any serious infection (n=197) in children at ED (n=2622)	96.4 (92.8-98.6)	38.3 (36.3-40.2)	99.3 (98.5-99.7)	7.8 (6.5-8.9)	0.1 (0.0-0.2)	1.6 (1.5-1.6)

All diagnostic characteristics are given in percentage with their respective 95% confidence intervals in brackets; LR: likelihood ratio; PV: predictive value; ED: emergency department.

FIGURES & SUPPLEMENTARY FILES

Figure 1: Flowchart of recruited illness episodes in acutely ill children

GP: general practitioner; CRP: point-of-care C-reactive protein testing

Figure 2: Algorithm

POC CRP: point-of-care C-reactive protein testing; number of all illness episodes (n=5517) and number of serious infections (n=272) given in each classification group.

Figure 3: Suggested interpretation of algorithm

CRP: point-of-care C-reactive protein testing; O2 sat: oxygen saturation; t°: temperature; sec: seconds; n/N: number of serious infections / number of children testing “no to all” or “yes to any”; %: percentage of all children within this category

Reading guide: (I) Perform POC CRP on all children, (II) depending on CRP level (<20; 20-75; >75 mg/L), (III) check additional signs and symptoms and (IV) if the child scores “yes to any”, have the child reviewed by a consultant paediatrician, if “no to all”, apply appropriate safety netting.

Online Supplementary File 1: Clinical features scored by participating physicians

*: illness is different from previous illnesses according to parents; +: clinician concern: subjective feeling of the physician that something was out of the ordinary

Online Supplementary File 2: Baseline characteristics for children seen at paediatric outpatient clinic and emergency department

SI: serious infection; POC CRP: point-of-care C-reactive protein test; IQR: interquartile range

Online Supplementary File 3: bivariable analyses of clinical features to identify serious infections

LR+: positive likelihood ratio; LR-: negative likelihood ratio; PPV: positive predictive value; NPV: negative predictive value; 95%CI: 95% confidence intervals

Online Supplementary File 4: predictors of algorithm

POC CRP: point-of-care C-reactive protein test




Figure 1: Flowchart of recruited illness episodes in acutely ill children (GP: general practitioner; CRP: point-of-care C-reactive protein testing)

131x145mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Figure 2: Algorithm (POC CRP: point-of-care C-reactive protein testing; number of all illness episodes (n=5517) and number of serious infections (n=272) given in each classification group)

281x172mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Figure 3: Suggested interpretation of algorithm (CRP: point-of-care C-reactive protein testing; O2 sat: oxygen saturation; t°: temperature; sec: seconds; n/N: number of serious infections / number of children testing "no to all" or "yes to any"; %: percentage of all children within this category%)

Reading guide: (I) Perform POC CRP on all children, (II) depending on CRP level (<20; 20-75; >75 mg/L), (III) check additional signs and symptoms and (IV) if the child scores "yes to any", have the child reviewed by a consultant paediatrician, if "no to all", apply appropriate safety netting)

288x144mm (300 x 300 DPI)

Online Supplementary File 1: Clinical features scored by participating physicians

type	variable	values	% missing
general	sex	boy/girl	0.0%
	age in years	number of years	0.0%
history taking	presenting complaints	string variable	1.1%
	illness is different from previous illnesses*	no/yes	4.4%
	child is less active	no/yes	3.1%
	child is sleepy	no/yes	3.6%
	child is hard to wake up	no/yes	3.9%
	child cries a lot	no/yes	3.4%
	child has abnormal behaviour	no/yes	3.8%
	child's speech is inconsistent	no/yes	4.2%
	fever present?	no/yes	7.3%
	duration of fever	number of days	19.9%
	fever not improved with antipyretics	no/yes	21.8%
	diarrhoea	no/yes	2.5%
	bloody diarrhoea	no/yes	5.2%
	stomach ache	no/yes	4.6%
	vomiting	no/yes	3.5%
	persistent vomiting	no/yes	6.1%
	bile-stained vomiting	no/yes	6.7%
	does your child have reduced intake?	no/yes	3.2%
	does your child pee less?	no/yes	3.9%
	short of breath	no/yes	4.5%
	coughing	no/yes	2.3%
	headache	no/yes	3.6%
	neck pain	no/yes	3.7%
observation	clinician concern+	no/yes	4.3%
	clinical impression child is seriously ill	no/yes	3.8%
	child is irritable	no/yes	3.6%
	child is drowsy	no/yes	3.6%
	child had reduced consciousness	no/yes	3.5%
	child is inconsolable	no/yes	3.6%
	child is moaning	no/yes	3.5%
	child has nasal flaring	no/yes	3.6%
	chest wall retractions	no/yes	3.5%
	child laughs less	no/yes	3.6%
clinical examination	highest temperature (measured or reported)	temperature in °C	3.2%
	pus on tonsils	no/yes	4.5%
	signs of acute otitis media	no/yes	5.0%
	bilateral otitis media	no/yes	5.0%
	discharging ears	no/yes	5.0%
	extensive adenopathy	no/yes	4.3%
	redness and or swelling of face	no/yes	4.3%
	purulent conjunctivae	no/yes	4.2%
	bilateral purulent conjunctivae	no/yes	4.4%
	dyspnoea	no/yes	4.0%
	crackling	no/yes	4.3%
	reduced breathing sounds	no/yes	4.5%
	rhonchi	no/yes	3.5%
	cyanosis	no/yes	4.4%
	peritoneal irritation	no/yes	7.7%
	petechial rash	no/yes	4.4%
	meningeal irritation	no/yes	4.5%
	reduced peripheral circulation	no/yes	4.3%
	pale	no/yes	4.4%
	skin turgor	no/yes	4.4%
	fontanelle tension	normal/bulged/sunken	4.6%
	swollen limb, non-weight bearing extremity	no/yes	29.2%
	breathing rate	times per min	31.4%
	heart rate	times per min	30.4%
	oxygen saturation	percentage	29.9%
	capillary refill	number of seconds	26.1%
diagnosis	working diagnosis	string variable	2.2%
management	extra tests?	no/yes	11.6%
	admitted to hospital?	no/yes	0.0%

*: illness is different from previous illnesses according to parents; +: clinician concern: subjective feeling of the physician that something was out of the ordinary

Online Supplementary File 2: Baseline characteristics for children seen at paediatric outpatient clinics and emergency departments

	children seen at paediatric outpatient clinics (n=2895)	children seen at emergency departments (n=2622)
median age in years (IQR)	1.5 (0.8-2.7)	1.7 (0.8-3.6)
boys (%)	1541 (53.2%)	1410 (53.8%)
final outcome of SI (% prevalence):		
= admission >24h with any of the following:		
sepsis	3 (4.0%)	7 (3.6%)
meningitis	1 (1.3%)	16 (8.1%)
appendicitis	1 (1.3%)	13 (6.6%)
pneumonia	51 (68.0%)	104 (52.8%)
osteomyelitis	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
cellulitis	0 (0.0%)	3 (1.5%)
bacterial gastro-enteritis	4 (5.3%)	17 (8.6%)
complicated urinary tract infection	15 (20.0%)	37 (18.8%)
median POC CRP level (IQR)	14 (4-32)	11 (4-30)

SI: serious infection; POC CRP: point-of-care C-reactive protein test; IQR: interquartile range

Online Supplementary File 3: Bivariable analyses of clinical features to identify serious infections

type	variable	sensitivity	95% CI	specificity	95% CI	LR+	95% CI	LR-	95% CI	PPV	95% CI	NPV	95% CI
history taking	illness is different from previous illnesses	1.6	0.4 4.0	98.9	98.6 99.2	1.4	0.5 3.9	1.0	1.0 1.0	6.8	1.9 16.5	95.2	94.6 95.8
	child is less active	0.4	0.0 2.1	99.7	99.6 99.9	1.5	0.2 11.3	1.0	1.0 1.0	7.1	0.2 33.9	95.1	94.5 95.6
	child is sleepy	0.4	0.0 2.1	99.7	99.6 99.9	1.5	0.2 11.4	1.0	1.0 1.0	7.1	0.2 33.9	95.1	94.5 95.7
	child is hard to wake up	0.4	0.0 2.1	99.8	99.6 99.9	2.0	0.3 15.2	1.0	1.0 1.0	9.1	0.2 41.3	95.1	94.5 95.7
	child cries a lot	0.0	0.0 1.4	99.8	99.6 99.9	0.9	0.1 15.6	1.0	1.0 1.0	0.0	0.0 30.8	95.1	94.4 95.6
	child has abnormal behaviour	1.9	0.6 4.5	99.6	99.4 99.7	4.6	1.8 12.2	1.0	1.0 1.0	19.2	6.6 39.4	95.3	94.6 95.8
	child's speech is inconsistent	4.7	2.5 8.1	97.1	96.6 97.5	1.6	0.9 2.9	1.0	1.0 1.0	7.6	4.0 12.8	95.3	94.6 95.8
	fever duration ≥ 1 day	98.7	96.3 99.7	0.6	0.4 0.9	1.0	1.0 1.0	2.3	0.8 6.9	5.2	4.6 5.9	90.0	73.5 97.9
	fever does not improve with antipyretics	19.0	14.1 24.8	89.7	88.7 90.7	1.9	1.4 2.5	0.9	0.9 1.0	9.7	7.1 12.9	95.0	94.2 95.7
	diarrhoea	26.8	21.5 32.6	79.0	77.9 80.1	1.3	1.0 1.6	0.9	0.9 1.0	6.1	4.8 7.7	95.5	94.8 96.1
	bloody diarrhoea	2.0	0.7 4.6	99.6	99.4 99.8	5.5	2.1 14.7	1.0	1.0 1.0	21.7	7.5 43.7	95.3	94.7 95.8
	stomach ache	22.5	17.3 28.3	86.9	85.9 87.8	1.7	1.3 2.2	0.9	0.8 1.0	7.8	5.9 10.1	95.8	95.1 96.3
	vomiting	28.4	23.0 34.2	78.1	76.9 79.2	1.3	1.1 1.6	0.9	0.8 1.0	6.3	5.0 7.8	95.5	94.8 96.1
	persistent vomiting	8.9	5.7 13.2	96.1	95.5 96.6	2.3	1.5 3.5	0.9	0.9 1.0	10.3	6.6 15.2	95.5	94.8 96.0
	bile-stained vomiting	4.5	2.2 7.8	98.9	98.6 99.2	4.1	2.2 7.8	1.0	0.9 1.0	17.2	8.9 28.7	95.3	94.7 95.9
	child has reduced intake	64.1	58.0 69.9	54.3	52.9 55.7	1.4	1.3 1.5	0.7	0.6 0.8	6.8	5.8 7.8	96.7	96.0 97.3
	child pees less	22.4	17.4 28.1	86.9	86.0 87.8	1.7	1.4 2.2	0.9	0.8 1.0	7.9	6.0 10.2	95.7	95.1 96.3
	short of breath	24.7	19.6 30.4	84.8	83.7 85.8	1.6	1.3 2.0	0.9	0.8 1.0	7.8	6.1 9.9	95.6	94.9 96.2
	coughing	61.5	55.4 67.4	42.5	41.1 43.9	1.1	1.0 1.2	0.9	0.8 1.1	5.3	4.5 6.1	95.5	94.6 96.3
	headache	8.1	5.0 12.4	93.3	92.5 94.0	1.2	0.8 1.9	1.0	0.9 1.0	5.7	3.4 8.7	95.3	94.7 95.9
	neck pain	4.2	2.0 7.6	98.3	97.9 98.6	2.5	1.3 4.7	1.0	0.9 1.0	11.0	5.4 19.3	95.4	94.8 96.0
observation	clinician concern	43.2	37.0 49.5	86.8	85.9 87.8	3.3	2.8 3.8	0.7	0.6 0.7	14.5	12.1 17.2	96.7	96.2 97.2
	clinical impression child is seriously ill	30.6	25.0 36.6	93.2	92.5 93.9	4.5	3.7 5.6	0.7	0.7 0.8	18.7	15.1 22.8	96.3	95.8 96.9
	child is irritable	17.0	12.6 22.1	91.0	90.2 91.8	1.9	1.4 2.5	0.9	0.9 1.0	8.8	6.5 11.7	95.5	94.9 96.1
	child is drowsy	9.7	6.4 14.0	96.5	95.9 97.0	2.7	1.8 4.1	0.9	0.9 1.0	12.3	8.1 17.6	95.4	94.8 96.0
	child had reduced consciousness	0.4	0.0 2.2	99.6	99.4 99.8	1.0	0.1 7.7	1.0	1.0 1.0	5.0	0.1 24.9	95.2	94.6 95.7
	child is inconsolable	9.7	6.4 14.0	95.3	94.7 95.8	2.1	1.4 3.0	0.9	0.9 1.0	9.5	6.2 13.7	95.4	94.8 95.9
	child is moaning	12.5	8.7 17.1	98.2	97.8 98.5	6.8	4.6 9.9	0.9	0.9 0.9	25.6	18.2 34.2	95.7	95.1 96.2
	child has nasal flaring	10.1	6.7 14.5	97.7	97.2 98.1	4.3	2.9 6.5	0.9	0.9 1.0	18.1	12.1 25.3	95.5	94.9 96.1
	chestwall retractions	11.7	8.0 16.2	95.0	94.4 95.6	2.4	1.7 3.4	0.9	0.9 1.0	10.7	7.3 14.9	95.5	94.9 96.0
	child laughs less	28.9	23.4 34.9	89.6	88.8 90.5	2.8	2.3 3.4	0.8	0.7 0.9	12.4	9.9 15.3	96.1	95.5 96.7
clinical examination	temperature ≥ 40.0°C (measured or reported)	44.1	38.0 50.5	73.1	71.8 74.4	1.6	1.4 1.9	0.8	0.7 0.9	8.5	7.0 10.1	95.9	95.2 96.5
	pus on tonsils	2.0	0.6 4.5	94.2	93.5 94.9	0.3	0.1 0.8	1.0	1.0 1.1	1.7	0.6 3.9	95.0	94.3 95.6
	signs of acute otitis media	12.3	8.5 16.9	85.0	84.0 86.0	0.8	0.6 1.2	1.0	1.0 1.1	4.0	2.7 5.6	95.0	94.4 95.7
	bilateral otitis media	6.7	4.0 10.5	93.9	93.2 94.6	1.1	0.7 1.8	1.0	1.0 1.0	5.3	3.1 8.4	95.2	94.5 95.8
	discharging ears	2.8	1.1 5.7	98.2	97.8 98.6	1.6	0.7 3.4	1.0	1.0 1.0	7.5	3.1 14.7	95.3	94.6 95.8
	extensive cervical adenopathy	2.3	0.9 5.0	97.1	96.6 97.6	0.8	0.4 1.8	1.0	1.0 1.0	4.0	1.5 8.5	95.1	94.5 95.7
	redness and or swelling of face	5.1	2.7 8.5	97.1	96.6 97.6	1.8	1.0 3.1	1.0	1.0 1.0	8.2	4.5 13.7	95.2	94.6 95.8
	purulent conjunctivae	3.9	1.9 7.0	96.4	95.9 96.9	1.1	0.6 2.0	1.0	1.0 1.0	5.3	2.6 9.5	95.1	94.5 95.7
	bilateral purulent conjunctivae	0.8	0.1 2.8	97.8	97.4 98.2	0.4	0.1 1.4	1.0	1.0 1.0	1.8	0.2 6.3	95.1	94.4 95.6
	dyspnea	20.9	16.1 26.4	91.8	91.0 92.5	2.6	2.0 3.3	0.9	0.8 0.9	11.6	8.8 14.8	95.8	95.2 96.3
	crackling	19.7	15.0 25.1	90.7	89.8 91.5	2.1	1.6 2.7	0.9	0.8 0.9	9.8	7.4 12.7	95.6	95.0 96.2
	reduced breathing sounds	12.1	8.3 16.7	97.1	96.6 97.6	4.2	2.9 6.1	0.9	0.9 0.9	17.8	12.4 24.3	95.6	95.0 96.1
	rhonchi	31.0	25.5 37.0	73.8	72.5 75.0	1.2	1.0 1.4	0.9	0.9 1.0	5.8	4.6 7.1	95.4	94.7 96.0
	cyanosis	1.6	0.4 3.9	99.8	99.6 99.9	6.5	2.1 19.9	1.0	1.0 1.0	25.0	7.3 52.4	95.2	94.6 95.7
	peritoneal irritation	4.1	2.0 7.4	99.6	99.4 99.8	11.7	5.4 25.2	1.0	0.9 1.0	37.0	19.4 57.6	95.4	94.8 95.9
	petechial rash	2.7	1.1 5.5	98.5	98.2 98.9	1.8	0.9 4.0	1.0	1.0 1.0	8.8	3.6 17.2	95.1	94.5 95.7
	meningeal irritation	3.9	1.9 7.0	99.7	99.5 99.8	13.8	6.2 30.8	1.0	0.9 1.0	41.7	22.1 63.4	95.2	94.6 95.8
	reduced peripheral circulation	7.3	4.5 11.2	98.4	98.0 98.7	4.5	2.8 7.3	0.9	0.9 1.0	19.0	11.8 28.1	95.3	94.7 95.9
	pale skin	18.1	13.6 23.3	95.0	94.3 95.6	3.6	2.7 4.8	0.9	0.8 0.9	15.7	11.8 20.3	95.7	95.1 96.3
	abnormal skin turgor	1.5	0.4 3.9	99.4	99.2 99.6	2.8	1.0 7.8	1.0	1.0 1.0	12.5	3.5 29.0	95.1	94.5 95.7
	abnormal fontanel tension	0.9	0.1 3.1	99.9	99.8 100.0	13.7	2.3 81.7	1.0	1.0 1.0	40.0	5.3 85.3	95.4	94.8 96.0
	swollen limb or non weight bearing extremity	0.5	0.0 2.9	98.9	98.3 99.2	0.5	0.1 3.5	1.0	1.0 1.0	2.4	0.1 12.9	95.1	94.3 95.7
	breathing rate ≥ 50/min	23.3	14.8 33.6	90.0	88.3 91.6	2.3	1.5 3.5	0.9	0.8 1.0	13.5	8.5 20.1	94.6	93.2 95.8
	heart rate ≥ 150/min	35.4	25.9 45.8	79.9	77.6 82.0	1.8	1.3 2.4	0.8	0.7 0.9	11.0	7.8 15.1	94.6	93.1 95.8
	oxygen saturation ≤ 95%	29.2	20.8 38.9	88.9	87.0 90.6	2.6	1.9 3.7	0.8	0.7 0.9	18.2	12.7 24.9	93.7	92.1 95.0
	capillary refill ≥ 3 seconds	20.1	14.1 27.3	91.6	90.4 92.7	2.4	1.7 3.4	0.9	0.8 0.9	13.6	9.4 18.7	94.6	93.6 95.5

Online Supplementary File 4: predictors of clinical prediction rule

clinical prediction rule	number of splits	likelihood-ratio chi-square	portion of contribution to the fit
POC CRP	2	270.82	0.6579
belly ache	1	20.21	0.0491
illness different from previous illnesses	1	19.04	0.0463
grunting	1	18.49	0.0449
age < 6 months	1	14.64	0.0356
fever not improving with antipyretics	1	11.79	0.0286
oxygen saturation < 95%	1	10.97	0.0267
cries a lot	1	9.49	0.0231
temperature > 39.5°C	1	8.69	0.0211
capillary refill > 2 seconds	1	5.82	0.0141
breathing rate > 50/minute	1	4.13	0.0100
reduced intake	1	3.98	0.0097
drowsy	1	3.12	0.0076
petechial rash	1	2.63	0.0064
duration of fever < 1 day	1	2.59	0.0063
neck pain	1	1.99	0.0048
inconsolable	1	1.48	0.0036
vomiting	1	0.97	0.0024
pale skin	1	0.79	0.0019

POC CRP: point-of-care C-reactive protein test