

The Road to Universal Pulse-Oximetry Screening: Are We There Yet?

AUTHORS: Sandra Cuzzi, MD,^{a,b,c} and Elizabeth Bradshaw, MSN, RN^d

^aDivision of Hospital Medicine, Children's National Medical Center, Washington, DC; ^bDepartment of Pediatrics, Holy Cross Hospital, Silver Spring, Maryland; ^cDepartment of Pediatrics, George Washington University School of Medicine, Washington, DC; and ^dChildren's National Heart Institute, Children's National Medical Center, Washington, DC

ABBREVIATION

CCHD—critical congenital heart disease

Opinions expressed in these commentaries are those of the author and not necessarily those of the American Academy of Pediatrics or its Committees.

Dr Cuzzi was responsible for the drafting, revising, and submitting of the commentary and for coordinating communications for review of the commentary by the team; Ms Bradshaw reviewed and revised the commentary for important intellectual content and provided feedback.

www.pediatrics.org/cgi/doi/10.1542/peds.2011-2475

doi:10.1542/peds.2011-2475

Accepted for publication Aug 26, 2011

Address correspondence to Sandra Cuzzi, MD, Division of Hospitalist Medicine, Children's National Medical Center, 111 Michigan Ave NW, Washington, DC 20010. E-mail: scuzzi@childrensnational.org

PEDIATRICS (ISSN Numbers: Print, 0031-4005; Online, 1098-4275).

Copyright © 2011 by the American Academy of Pediatrics

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE: *The authors have indicated they have no financial relationships relevant to this article to disclose.*

COMPANION PAPER: A companion to this article can be found on page e1259 and online at www.pediatrics.org/cgi/doi/10.1542/peds.2011-1317.

FREE

Congenital heart disease is the most common birth defect and represents nearly 40% of all deaths caused by congenital anomalies.¹ Critical congenital heart disease (CCHD), which encompasses the more severe forms, is present in 2.5 to 3 in 1000 live births.² In general, prenatal ultrasound or physical examination alone can easily miss newborns with CCHD.^{3,4} Failure to diagnose CCHD early in life can result in high morbidity and mortality rates, because symptoms frequently present after closing of the pulmonary ductus arteriosus, after nursery discharge. Pulse-oximetry screening is a low-cost, painless, noninvasive test that increases the ability to identify newborns with CCHD before they clinically decompensate.⁵⁻⁸

In 2009 the American Heart Association and American Academy of Pediatrics published a scientific statement regarding the role of pulse oximetry in examining newborns for CCHD.⁹ Despite presenting strong support for this method, they stopped shy of recommending universal screening and called for further studies on implementation. In September 2010, the US Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) Secretary's Advisory Committee on Heritable Disorders in Newborns and Children recommended that CCHD be added to the uniform screening panel. However, the recommendation remains under consideration by Secretary of the HHS, in part because of implementation concerns.

Although no national mandates or endorsements for pulse-oximetry screening currently exist, some hospitals have chosen to develop and implement their own protocols using the best evidence available at the time. In addition, a few states have already introduced and passed legislation that promotes newborn screening for CCHD.

The report in this issue of *Pediatrics*¹⁰ is timely and clearly outlines strategies for implementing pulse-oximetry screening, promoting standardized protocol guidelines, and identifying the infrastructure necessary for success. Written by a workgroup that was specifically convened to address concerns by the Secretary's Advisory Committee on Heritable Disorders in Newborns and Children, this report has been endorsed by the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American College of Cardiology Foundation, and the American Heart Association Council for Cardiovascular Disease in the Young.

Concern has been expressed in the literature over false-positive results leading to unnecessary, costly evaluation and transfer. Rates have varied, in part, because researchers have used different definitions and screening protocols. In their report, Kemper et al¹⁰ define specific criteria and protocols that decrease false-positive results, such as screening after 24 hours of age and, if the results are positive, having screening performed a total of 3 times before being defined as a positive screen result. In their scientific statement, the American Heart Association and American Academy of Pediatrics

described low false-positive rates that averaged 0.035% in studies in which pulse oximetry was performed after 24 hours.

Once a newborn is identified with a positive screen result, diagnostic strategies call for a comprehensive evaluation for the etiology of hypoxia. Although the screening target is identification of CCHD, the authors also recognize the importance of identifying noncardiac secondary targets such as those of pulmonary and infectious origin. If none can be found, an echocardiogram should be performed and read by a pediatric cardiologist. Delivery strategies will need to address telemedicine or transfer to another institution for those nurseries that do not have echocardiography on site. Also, although a positive screen result might require transport to a regional center that is later deemed unnecessary, it is important to realize that suspicion of CCHD based on physical examination has a much higher false-positive rate and would lead to similar management.¹¹

Kemper et al¹⁰ conclude by discussing critical gaps that must be addressed before recommending universal pulse-oximetry screening. Public health agencies will be responsible for creating the necessary infrastructure and for maintaining quality assurance and surveillance. The report defines some of the areas that need development, particularly a national technical assistance center to coordinate implementation and evaluation.

The described infrastructure required to support implementation and compliance with screening guidelines is clearly necessary. However, not all hospitals should feel the need to wait until such infrastructure has been developed. Evidence-based toolkits are already available to facilitate implementation.¹² Materials include information to educate staff, health care providers, and families about the protocol, along with training materials for those responsible for screening. Using such a toolkit will be helpful in minimizing implementation cost and effort. Furthermore, each hospital will need to develop individualized screening

strategies that fit into its own care-delivery model. For example, when implementing pulse-oximetry screening at a large community hospital, we found that assigning a single certified nursing assistant to perform pulse-oximetry and newborn metabolic screening together after 24 hours of age improved consistency and efficiency without additional staff or significant cost (E. A. B., S. C., S. Kiernan, MD, N. Nagel, MD, J. A. Booker, MD, and G. R. Martin, MD, unpublished data, 2011).

There is clear evidence supporting pulse-oximetry screening to improve identification of newborns with CCHD. Successful implementation will depend on standardized screening criteria within hospitals and the public health system's commitment to support surveillance. However, while the infrastructure is being developed, hospitals should be on the front lines trying new strategies, using the well-defined screening criteria presented by Kemper et al¹⁰ in their report. We might still have a way to go, but we are well on our way to universal screening.

REFERENCES

1. Boneva RS, Botto LD, Moore CA, Yang Q, Correa A, Erickson JD. Mortality associated with congenital heart defects in the United States: trends and racial disparities, 1979–1997. *Circulation*. 2001;103(19):2376–2381
2. Hoffman JIE, Kaplan S. The incidence of congenital heart disease. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2002;39(12):1890–1900
3. Bull C; British Paediatric Cardiac Association. Current and potential impact of fetal diagnosis on prevalence and spectrum of serious congenital heart disease at term in the UK. *Lancet*. 1999;354(9186):1242–1247
4. Wren C, Richmond S, Donaldson L. Presentation of congenital heart disease in infancy: implications for routine examination. *Arch Dis Child Fetal Neonatal Ed*. 1999;80(1):F49–F53
5. Koppel RI, Druschel CM, Carter T, et al. Effectiveness of pulse oximetry screening for congenital heart disease in asymptomatic newborns. *Pediatrics*. 2003;111(3):451–455
6. Valmari P. Should pulse oximetry be used to screen for congenital heart disease? *Arch Dis Child Fetal Neonatal Ed*. 2007;92(3):F219–F224
7. Hoke TR, Donohue PK, Bawa PK, et al. Oxygen saturation as a screening test for critical congenital heart disease; a preliminary study. *Pediatr Cardiol*. 2002;23(4):403–409
8. Meberg A, Brugmann-Pieper S, Due R, et al. First day of life pulse oximetry screening to detect congenital heart defects. *J Pediatr*. 2008;152(6):761–765
9. Mahle WT, Newburger JW, Matherne GP, et al; American Heart Association Congenital Heart Defects Committee of the Council on Cardiovascular Disease in the Young, Council on Cardiovascular Nursing, and Interdisciplinary Council on Quality of Care and Outcomes Research; American Academy of Pediatrics, Section on Cardiology and Cardiac Surgery, Committee on Fetus and Newborn. Role of pulse oximetry in examining newborns for congenital heart disease: a scientific statement from the American Heart Association and American Academy of Pediatrics. *Pediatrics*. 2009;124(2):823–836
10. Kemper AR, Mahle WT, Martin GR, et al. Strategies for implementing screening for critical congenital heart disease. *Pediatrics*. 2011;128(5). Available at: www.pediatrics.org/cgi/content/full/128/5/e1259
11. Hoffman JI. It is time for routine neonatal screening by pulse oximetry. *Neonatology*. 2011;99(1):1–9
12. Children's National Medical Center. *Congenital Heart Disease Screening Program Toolkit: A Toolkit for Implementing Screening*. Washington, DC: Children's National Medical Center; 2009

The Road to Universal Pulse-Oximetry Screening: Are We There Yet?
Sandra Cuzzi and Elizabeth Bradshaw
Pediatrics 2011;128:e1271
DOI: 10.1542/peds.2011-2475 originally published online October 10, 2011;

Updated Information & Services

including high resolution figures, can be found at:
<http://pediatrics.aappublications.org/content/128/5/e1271>

References

This article cites 10 articles, 5 of which you can access for free at:
<http://pediatrics.aappublications.org/content/128/5/e1271#BIBL>

Subspecialty Collections

This article, along with others on similar topics, appears in the following collection(s):
Fetus/Newborn Infant
http://www.aappublications.org/cgi/collection/fetus:newborn_infant_sub

Permissions & Licensing

Information about reproducing this article in parts (figures, tables) or in its entirety can be found online at:
<http://www.aappublications.org/site/misc/Permissions.xhtml>

Reprints

Information about ordering reprints can be found online:
<http://www.aappublications.org/site/misc/reprints.xhtml>

American Academy of Pediatrics

DEDICATED TO THE HEALTH OF ALL CHILDREN™



PEDIATRICS®

OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF PEDIATRICS

The Road to Universal Pulse-Oximetry Screening: Are We There Yet?

Sandra Cuzzi and Elizabeth Bradshaw

Pediatrics 2011;128:e1271

DOI: 10.1542/peds.2011-2475 originally published online October 10, 2011;

The online version of this article, along with updated information and services, is located on the World Wide Web at:

<http://pediatrics.aappublications.org/content/128/5/e1271>

Pediatrics is the official journal of the American Academy of Pediatrics. A monthly publication, it has been published continuously since 1948. Pediatrics is owned, published, and trademarked by the American Academy of Pediatrics, 141 Northwest Point Boulevard, Elk Grove Village, Illinois, 60007. Copyright © 2011 by the American Academy of Pediatrics. All rights reserved. Print ISSN: 1073-0397.

American Academy of Pediatrics

DEDICATED TO THE HEALTH OF ALL CHILDREN™

