

Should We Evaluate Febrile Young Infants Step-by-Step in the Emergency Department?

Paul L. Aronson, MD,^a Mark I. Neuman, MD, MPH^b

In this issue of *Pediatrics*, Gomez et al¹ present a new “Step-by-Step” algorithm for management of febrile young infants. Although bacteremia and bacterial meningitis, termed invasive bacterial infection (IBI),² occur in only 1% to 2% of febrile young infants,^{3,4} clinicians fear “missing” these infections due to potential for mortality and morbidity.^{5,6} It is longstanding practice that young febrile infants undergo a “sepsis workup,” often including lumbar puncture, and many are hospitalized to expectantly treat for bacterial infection.⁷ More than 2 decades ago, various criteria (Rochester,⁸ Philadelphia,⁹ and Boston¹⁰) were developed to identify febrile infants at low-risk of bacterial infection, the so-called “low-risk” criteria. Application of these criteria allows for a subset of infants >28 days of age to be safely discharged from the emergency department (ED), with or without antibiotics. However, previous studies evaluating the performance characteristics of these criteria included low numbers of infants with IBI, and varied approaches to define the subjective features of well appearance.¹¹

In the current study, Gomez et al¹ prospectively validated a “Step-by-Step” approach among >2000 febrile infants ≤90 days of age across 11 European pediatric EDs, of whom 4% had an IBI. This approach uses well appearance, age >21 days, leukocyturia, procalcitonin <0.5 ng/mL, C-reactive protein ≤20 mg/L, and absolute neutrophil count ≤10 000/mm³

in a stepwise fashion to identify febrile infants at high, intermediate, and low-risk of IBI. Unlike the Philadelphia and Boston criteria, the algorithm does not incorporate routine cerebrospinal fluid testing. This algorithm demonstrated a high sensitivity (92%) and negative predictive value (99.3%) for IBI in young febrile infants, although 7 infants (0.7%) classified as low-risk had an IBI, none with bacterial meningitis.

In practice, the Step-by-Step approach is similar to the Rochester criteria, in which reassuring urine and blood testing may preclude performance of a lumbar puncture in the well-appearing infant. Although the reported sensitivity for IBI is higher with the Step-by-Step approach, the algorithm proposed primarily differs from the Rochester criteria in the identification of an intermediate-risk group. However, we suspect that most clinicians would treat the intermediate-risk group similarly to high-risk infants, as the 3.4% risk of IBI likely warrants performance of cerebrospinal fluid testing and expectant antimicrobial treatment.

Although this stepwise approach has high sensitivity to identify febrile infants with IBI, the real question is what risk is low enough to consider not performing lumbar puncture, withholding antibiotics, and discharging the infant from the ED? With a 0.7% risk of bacteremia among low-risk infants with the Step-by-Step approach, would most clinicians feel comfortable correctly classifying

FREE

Departments of ^aPediatrics and Emergency Medicine, Section of Pediatric Emergency Medicine, Yale School of Medicine, New Haven, Connecticut; and ^bDivision of Emergency Medicine, Department of Pediatrics, Boston Children's Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts

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

DOI: 10.1542/peds.2016-1579

Accepted for publication May 13, 2016

Address correspondence to Paul L. Aronson, MD, Section of Pediatric Emergency Medicine, Yale School of Medicine, 100 York St, Suite 1F, New Haven, CT 06511. E-mail: paul.aronson@yale.edu

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

Copyright © 2016 by the American Academy of Pediatrics

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

FUNDING: No external funding.

POTENTIAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST: The authors have indicated they have no potential conflicts of interest to disclose.

COMPANION PAPER: A companion to this article can be found online at www.pediatrics.org/cgi/doi/10.1542/peds.2015-4381.

To cite: Aronson PL and Neuman MI. Should We Evaluate Febrile Young Infants Step-by-Step in the Emergency Department?. *Pediatrics*. 2016;138(2):e20161579

143 febrile infants as low-risk at the expense of missing 1 infant with IBI?

To fully understand the context of how these findings should be incorporated into practice, we need to understand the implications of discharging a low-risk infant without antibiotics. Unfortunately, the data are lacking in this area, and in the Gomez et al¹ study, 5 of the 7 low-risk infants with IBI received parenteral antibiotics and were hospitalized. A large study of office-based pediatricians observed that among 63 febrile infants with IBI, 2 experienced a delayed diagnosis, 1 with bacteremia and 1 with bacterial meningitis. Both infants were ≤ 4 weeks of age and did well with close follow-up.¹² In the Rochester, Philadelphia, and Boston criteria studies, all of the low-risk infants diagnosed with IBI were either initially hospitalized and observed without antibiotics,^{8,9} or administered parenteral ceftriaxone and discharged from the ED.^{8,10} The risk of “missing” a low-risk infant with IBI using the Step-by-Step approach, without inpatient observation or expectant antibiotics, is largely unknown. Thus, clinicians need to consider the paucity of outcome data when deciding how best to apply this algorithm to febrile infants.

In this Step-by-Step study, among the 7 low-risk infants with IBI, 4 were 22 to 28 days old, an age group routinely hospitalized on expectant antibiotic therapy in the United States^{7,13} due to diminished performance of the low-risk criteria among infants <1 month of age.^{14,15} Among previously healthy, well-appearing febrile infants >28 days of age, this stepwise approach failed to identify 2 patients (0.2%) with IBI. In this older age range, approximately 500 low-risk febrile infants could potentially avoid lumbar puncture, antibiotics or hospitalization to identify 1 case of IBI. This may be a more tolerable

risk threshold for clinicians when determining whether to withhold antimicrobial therapy and discharge the infant from the ED.

The specificity of the Step-by-Step approach was low (47.0%), and only 6.7% of children classified as non-low-risk had an IBI, reflecting the low prevalence of IBI among febrile infants, and a management approach that maximizes sensitivity at the expense of specificity. The low specificity may result in lumbar puncture, hospitalization, and expectant antibiotic therapy for a substantial number of infants, along with potential for iatrogenic risks and parental stress and anxiety.^{16,17} Continuing to reassess the components of the Step-by-Step approach and a better understanding of the parents’ perspective are warranted to balance the risk and benefit of testing, treatment, and hospitalization in this patient population.

The Step-by-Step approach is a highly sensitive, prospectively validated management algorithm to identify IBI in febrile infants. Future studies demonstrating the safety of implementing this stepwise approach are warranted.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We thank Dr. Richard Bachur for his review of this commentary.

ABBREVIATIONS

ED: emergency department
IBI: invasive bacterial infection

REFERENCES

1. Gomez B, Mintegi S, Bressan S, et al Validation of the Step-by-Step approach in the management of young febrile infants. *Pediatrics*. 2016;138(2):e20154381

2. Gomez B, Bressan S, Mintegi S, et al. Diagnostic value of procalcitonin in well-appearing young febrile infants. *Pediatrics*. 2012;130(5):815–822
3. Greenhow TL, Hung YY, Herz AM. Changing epidemiology of bacteremia in infants aged 1 week to 3 months. *Pediatrics*. 2012;129(3). Available at: www.pediatrics.org/cgi/content/full/129/3/e590
4. Greenhow TL, Hung YY, Herz AM, Losada E, Pantell RH. The changing epidemiology of serious bacterial infections in young infants. *Pediatr Infect Dis J*. 2014;33(6):595–599
5. Libster R, Edwards KM, Levent F, et al. Long-term outcomes of group B streptococcal meningitis. *Pediatrics*. 2012;130(1). Available at: www.pediatrics.org/cgi/content/full/130/1/e8
6. Hamer DH, Darmstadt GL, Carlin JB, et al; Young Infants Clinical Signs Study Group. Etiology of bacteremia in young infants in six countries. *Pediatr Infect Dis J*. 2015;34(1):e1–e8
7. Aronson PL, Thurm C, Alpern ER, et al; Febrile Young Infant Research Collaborative. Variation in care of the febrile young infant <90 days in US pediatric emergency departments. *Pediatrics*. 2014;134(4):667–677
8. Jaskiewicz JA, McCarthy CA, Richardson AC, et al; Febrile Infant Collaborative Study Group. Febrile infants at low risk for serious bacterial infection—an appraisal of the Rochester criteria and implications for management. *Pediatrics*. 1994;94(3):390–396
9. Baker MD, Bell LM, Avner JR. Outpatient management without antibiotics of fever in selected infants. *N Engl J Med*. 1993;329(20):1437–1441
10. Baskin MN, O'Rourke EJ, Fleisher GR. Outpatient treatment of febrile infants 28 to 89 days of age with intramuscular administration of ceftriaxone. *J Pediatr*. 1992;120(1):22–27
11. Hui C, Neto G, Tsertsvadze A, et al. Diagnosis and management of febrile infants (0-3 months). *Evid Rep Technol Assess (Full Rep)*. 2012;(205):1–297
12. Pantell RH, Newman TB, Bernzweig J, et al. Management and outcomes of

care of fever in early infancy. *JAMA*. 2004;291(10):1203–1212

13. Aronson PL, Thurm C, Williams DJ, et al; Febrile Young Infant Research Collaborative. Association of clinical practice guidelines with emergency department management of febrile infants ≤ 56 days of age. *J Hosp Med*. 2015;10(6):358–365
14. Baker MD, Bell LM. Unpredictability of serious bacterial illness in febrile infants from birth to 1 month of age. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med*. 1999;153(5):508–511
15. Schwartz S, Raveh D, Toker O, Segal G, Godovitch N, Schlesinger Y. A week-by-week analysis of the low-risk criteria for serious bacterial infection in febrile neonates. *Arch Dis Child*. 2009;94(4):287–292
16. Paxton RD, Byington CL. An examination of the unintended consequences of the rule-out sepsis evaluation: a parental perspective. *Clin Pediatr (Phila)*. 2001;40(2):71–77
17. De S, Tong A, Isaacs D, Craig JC. Parental perspectives on evaluation and management of fever in young infants: an interview study. *Arch Dis Child*. 2014;99(8):717–723

Should We Evaluate Febrile Young Infants Step-by-Step in the Emergency Department?

Paul L. Aronson and Mark I. Neuman

Pediatrics 2016;138;

DOI: 10.1542/peds.2016-1579 originally published online July 5, 2016;

Updated Information & Services

including high resolution figures, can be found at:
<http://pediatrics.aappublications.org/content/138/2/e20161579>

References

This article cites 16 articles, 7 of which you can access for free at:
<http://pediatrics.aappublications.org/content/138/2/e20161579#BIBL>

Subspecialty Collections

This article, along with others on similar topics, appears in the following collection(s):
Emergency Medicine
http://www.aappublications.org/cgi/collection/emergency_medicine_sub
Infectious Disease
http://www.aappublications.org/cgi/collection/infectious_diseases_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

Should We Evaluate Febrile Young Infants Step-by-Step in the Emergency Department?

Paul L. Aronson and Mark I. Neuman

Pediatrics 2016;138;

DOI: 10.1542/peds.2016-1579 originally published online July 5, 2016;

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/138/2/e20161579>

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 © 2016 by the American Academy of Pediatrics. All rights reserved. Print ISSN: 1073-0397.

American Academy of Pediatrics

DEDICATED TO THE HEALTH OF ALL CHILDREN™

