

Clinical Variability in Neonatology: Context Matters

Luigi Gagliardi, MD, MSc

In their article in this issue of *Pediatrics*, Helenius et al¹ remind us of the variations that exist across countries in the care that children receive. By analyzing data from the International Network for Evaluating Outcomes of Neonates, the authors found significant differences in the standardized survival ratios among neonates born at 24 to 29 weeks' gestation in 11 high-income western countries and regions, ranging from 1.10 in the best-performing country to 0.88 in the worst-performing country. Interestingly, the rank order of the standardized ratio for survival was similar at each week of gestational age, suggesting that the factors that drive the observed differences are systematic.

This survey is largely area-based, although, for some large nations (eg, Japan, the United Kingdom, and Spain), the coverage is far from complete. Therefore, the exact figures for a given country might be different from those reported in this article, but compared with data from the United States (from the *Eunice Kennedy Shriver* National Institute of Child Health and Human Development Research Network² and the Vermont Oxford Network³), the survival rates in the International Network for Evaluating Outcomes of Neonates study are remarkably similar; at each gestational week, the maximum difference among the 3 networks is 2%.

These results are not unexpected. Variations in care and outcomes are ubiquitous and are hardly explained solely by differences in case mix. The importance of studying such variations

is found in trying to elucidate the causes by uncovering patterns and mechanisms for these variations and, ultimately, by developing interventions leading to improvement. Observational studies like this one can help generate hypotheses and can reveal points for further study.⁴

One of the challenges in sorting out causes of variation in this study and others is that the researchers' choices regarding study design often determine what is found and what remains in the background. By rolling up many risk factors into a country as the exposure variable, the authors implicitly focus on countless economic, organizational, cultural, and social differences that cannot be separated in this analysis, which include differences in the gross national product, maternal age at delivery, organization of perinatal regionalization and transport, and number of multiple births, to name but a few of the items listed by the authors in this and another recent study.^{1,5} Moreover, even within nations, there are inequalities that affect health (including social class and socioeconomic status, geographical area, and ethnicity),⁶ despite the presence of a national health system. For instance, the neonatal mortality rates in the most deprived areas of England are more than twice as high as those in the least deprived areas, according to 1 report.⁷ A significant ethnic disparity in quality of care has been demonstrated in California NICUs.⁸ In Italy, a clear North-South gradient for neonatal mortality is apparent.⁹ Although Helenius et al¹ do not provide any estimate of the within-country variability, the authors

Pediatrics and Neonatology Division, Women's and Children's Health Department, Ospedale Versilia, Azienda Unità Sanitaria Locale Toscana Nord-Ovest, Viareggio, Italy

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

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2017-2808>

Accepted for publication Sep 26, 2017

Address correspondence to Luigi Gagliardi, MD, MSc, Pediatrics and Neonatology Division, Women's and Children's Health Department, Ospedale Versilia, Via Aurelia 335, 55043 Lido di Camaiore, Italy. E-mail: l.gagliardi@neonatalnet.org

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

Copyright © 2017 by the American Academy of Pediatrics

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE: The author has indicated he has no financial relationships relevant to this article to disclose.

FUNDING: No external funding.

POTENTIAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST: The author has indicated he has no potential conflict of interest to disclose.

COMPANION PAPER: A companion to this article can be found online at www.pediatrics.org/cgi/doi/10.1542/peds.2017-1264.

To cite: Gagliardi L. Clinical Variability in Neonatology: Context Matters. *Pediatrics*. 2017;140(6):e20172808

of other studies suggest that it is substantial.¹⁰

Given the wide-ranging sources of variability, where do we go from here? Tackling variations in socioeconomic status is clearly beyond the reach of a practicing clinician. Nevertheless, the community of neonatologists and obstetricians can play a role in reducing this variability. We share a common culture in which we strive to give each new life the best start possible and in which we are firmly committed to increasing the adoption of evidence-based interventions, a goal still not achieved.^{1,5,11} By using this approach, we focus on biological similarities between human beings, which should guarantee that treatments have the same effect everywhere, and we downplay the differences caused by social, economic, cultural, and organizational factors that affect generalizability.¹² However, implementation must be tailored to the unique circumstances within each practice site. Even the effectiveness of a strong evidence-based intervention, such as antenatal steroid prophylaxis, depends on context, as is clear from the negative results of a recent trial in low- and middle-income countries.¹³

The task is therefore to understand how to blend evidence-based interventions and local context, that is, to understand how to go “glocal.” Collecting and analyzing data on outcomes and comparing the results with a benchmark or with peer countries, as has been done in this study, is the first step, and it can begin to reveal where we should focus our efforts. Comparisons between countries may also reveal differences in procedures that can be related to outcomes. How to best meet the challenge of quality improvement is still not clear.¹⁴ The field of quality improvement mainly follows precepts taken from the industry,¹⁵ and further research is needed on this topic.

With their results, the authors of a simulation study,¹⁶ who intriguingly borrow from classic evolutionary biology,¹⁷ indicate that investigating and implementing better practices arising from local comparisons might be more effective than uniformly applying standard interventions from large-scale studies.¹⁶

The problem of reducing variability, implementing effective treatments, and continually improving the quality of care still needs to be solved. This study by Helenius et al¹ is welcome because its authors focus our attention beyond the individual clinical features of each neonate, reminding us of the importance of our attitude regarding local and global comparisons.

REFERENCES

1. Helenius K, Sjörs G, Shah, PS, et al. Survival in very preterm infants: an international comparison of 10 national neonatal networks. *Pediatrics*. 2017;140(6):e 20171264
2. Stoll BJ, Hansen NI, Bell EF, et al; Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development Neonatal Research Network. Trends in care practices, morbidity, and mortality of extremely preterm neonates, 1993-2012. *JAMA*. 2015;314(10):1039–1051
3. Vermont Oxford Network. VON: Vermont Oxford Network. Available at: <https://nightingale.vtoxford.org>. Accessed August 1, 2017
4. Patel RM, Rysavy MA. Global variation in neonatal intensive care: does it matter? *J Pediatr*. 2016;177:6–7
5. Kelly LE, Shah PS, Håkansson S, et al. Perinatal health services organization for preterm births: a multinational comparison. *J Perinatol*. 2017;37(7):762–768
6. Marmot M. *The Health Gap: The Challenge of an Unequal World*. London, United Kingdom: Bloomsbury Publishing; 2015
7. Smith LK, Manktelow BN, Draper ES, Springett A, Field DJ. Nature of socioeconomic inequalities in neonatal mortality: population based study. *BMJ*. 2010;341:c6654
8. Profit J, Gould JB, Bennett M, et al. Racial/ethnic disparity in NICU quality of care delivery. *Pediatrics*. 2017;140(3):e20170918
9. Corchia C, Orlando SM. Level of activity of neonatal intensive care units and mortality among very preterm infants: a nationwide study in Italy. *J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med*. 2012;25(12):2739–2745
10. Horbar JD, Edwards EM, Greenberg LT, et al. Variation in performance of neonatal intensive care units in the United States. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2017;171(3):e164396
11. Zeitlin J, Manktelow BN, Piedvache A, et al; EPICE Research Group. Use of evidence based practices to improve survival without severe morbidity for very preterm infants: results from the EPICE population based cohort. *BMJ*. 2016;354:i2976
12. Rothwell PM. External validity of randomised controlled trials: “to whom do the results of this trial apply?”. *Lancet*. 2005;365(9453):82–93
13. Althabe F, Belizán JM, McClure EM, et al. A population-based, multifaceted strategy to implement antenatal corticosteroid treatment versus standard care for the reduction of neonatal mortality due to preterm birth in low-income and middle-income countries: the ACT cluster-randomised trial. *Lancet*. 2015;385(9968):629–639
14. Schouten LM, Hulscher ME, van Everdingen JJ, Huijsman R, Grol RP. Evidence for the impact of quality improvement collaboratives: systematic review. *BMJ*. 2008;336(7659):1491–1494
15. Plsek PE. Quality improvement methods in clinical medicine. *Pediatrics*. 1999;103(1 Suppl E):203–214
16. Eppstein MJ, Horbar JD, Buzas JS, Kauffman SA. Searching the clinical fitness landscape. *PLoS One*. 2012;7(11):e49901
17. Wright S. The roles of mutation, inbreeding, crossbreeding, and selection in evolution. In: *Proceedings of the Sixth International Congress of Genetics*; August 1932; Ithaca, NY

Clinical Variability in Neonatology: Context Matters

Luigi Gagliardi

Pediatrics 2017;140;

DOI: 10.1542/peds.2017-2808 originally published online November 21, 2017;

Updated Information & Services

including high resolution figures, can be found at:
<http://pediatrics.aappublications.org/content/140/6/e20172808>

References

This article cites 14 articles, 6 of which you can access for free at:
<http://pediatrics.aappublications.org/content/140/6/e20172808#BIBL>

Subspecialty Collections

This article, along with others on similar topics, appears in the following collection(s):
Evidence-Based Medicine
http://www.aappublications.org/cgi/collection/evidence-based_medicine_sub
Fetus/Newborn Infant
http://www.aappublications.org/cgi/collection/fetus:newborn_infant_sub
Neonatology
http://www.aappublications.org/cgi/collection/neonatology_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

Clinical Variability in Neonatology: Context Matters

Luigi Gagliardi

Pediatrics 2017;140;

DOI: 10.1542/peds.2017-2808 originally published online November 21, 2017;

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/140/6/e20172808>

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 © 2017 by the American Academy of Pediatrics. All rights reserved. Print ISSN: 1073-0397.

American Academy of Pediatrics

DEDICATED TO THE HEALTH OF ALL CHILDREN™

