








BMJ Open Design and rationale of the Post-Intensive Care Syndrome – paediatrics (PICS-p) Longitudinal Cohort Study

Martha A Q Curley ^{1,2}, R Scott Watson ^{3,4}, Elizabeth Y Killien ^{3,4},
 Laura Beth Kalvas ¹, Mallory A Perry-Eaddy ^{5,6}, Amy M Cassidy,¹
 Erica B Miller,⁴ Mritika Talukder,¹ Joseph C Manning ^{7,8}, Neethi P Pinto,²
 Janet E Rennick ^{9,10}, Gillian Colville ¹¹, Lisa A Asaro ¹², David Wypij ^{12,13}

To cite: Curley MAQ, Watson RS, Killien EY, *et al.* Design and rationale of the Post-Intensive Care Syndrome – paediatrics (PICS-p) Longitudinal Cohort Study. *BMJ Open* 2024;0:e084445. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2024-084445

► Prepublication history and additional supplemental material for this paper are available online. To view these files, please visit the journal online (<https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2024-084445>).

MAQC and RSW are joint first authors.

Received 18 January 2024
 Accepted 31 January 2024



© Author(s) (or their employer(s)) 2024. Re-use permitted under CC BY-NC. No commercial re-use. See rights and permissions. Published by BMJ.

For numbered affiliations see end of article.

Correspondence to

Dr Martha A Q Curley;
curley@nursing.upenn.edu

ABSTRACT

Introduction As paediatric intensive care unit (PICU) mortality declines, there is growing recognition of the morbidity experienced by children surviving critical illness and their families. A comprehensive understanding of the adverse physical, cognitive, emotional and social sequelae common to PICU survivors is limited, however, and the trajectory of recovery and risk factors for morbidity remain unknown.

Methods and analysis The Post-Intensive Care Syndrome – paediatrics Longitudinal Cohort Study will evaluate child and family outcomes over 2 years following PICU discharge and identify child and clinical factors associated with impaired outcomes. We will enrol 750 children from 30 US PICUs during their first PICU hospitalisation, including 500 case participants experiencing ≥ 3 days of intensive care that include critical care therapies (eg, mechanical ventilation, vasoactive infusions) and 250 age-matched, sex-matched and medical complexity-matched control participants experiencing a single night in the PICU with no intensive care therapies. Children, parents and siblings will complete surveys about health-related quality of life, physical function, cognitive status, emotional health and peer and family relationships at multiple time points from baseline recall through 2 years post-PICU discharge. We will compare outcomes and recovery trajectories of case participants to control participants, identify risk factors associated with poor outcomes and determine the emotional and social health consequences of paediatric critical illness on parents and siblings.

Ethics and dissemination This study has received ethical approval from the University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board (protocol #843844). Our overall objective is to characterise the ongoing impact of paediatric critical illness to guide development of interventions that optimise outcomes among children surviving critical illness and their families. Findings will be presented at key disciplinary meetings and in peer-reviewed publications at fixed data points. Published manuscripts will be added to our public study website to ensure findings are available to families, clinicians and researchers.

Trials registration number NCT04967365.

INTRODUCTION

Survival following paediatric critical illness has improved substantially over the past several decades, with mortality now $< 3\%$ of all

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

- ⇒ The Post-Intensive Care Syndrome – paediatrics (PICS-p) Longitudinal Cohort Study will comprehensively characterise post-paediatric intensive care unit (PICU) recovery in children and their families to facilitate the development of targeted interventions that prevent or mitigate adverse outcomes.
- ⇒ By comparing critically ill children receiving ≥ 3 days of intensive care to control participants who spend a single night in the PICU without intensive care therapies, we will better understand the contribution of critical illness itself to adverse outcomes while also exploring whether there are common sequelae in all children or families who experience the PICU environment regardless of illness severity or exposure duration.
- ⇒ While exclusion of children with prior intensive care unit admissions limits generalisability, this will allow us to explore the phenomenon of PICS-p from its onset and capture the development of chronic critical illness.
- ⇒ Although parent proxy-report and self-report of pre-PICU baseline may be affected by recall bias, anchoring assessment of change on pre-illness baseline will allow us to characterise the magnitude and direction of change for each measure and explore factors associated with both decline and improvement.
- ⇒ While enrolment is limited to families in the USA who speak English or Spanish, we will evaluate for differences in recruitment, retention and outcomes by race, ethnicity, language, social influencers of health and geography to understand how these factors may affect generalisability across populations.

paediatric intensive care unit (PICU) admissions.^{1–4} As PICU mortality declines, there is increasing recognition of the morbidity experienced by children surviving critical illness and their families.^{5–8} Impairments in health-related quality of life (HRQL), overall health, physical function, neurocognition, emotional health and social development and relationships have been identified in PICU survivors.^{9–17} Families of these children

also experience deficits in mental health, quality of life and family cohesion.^{18–22}

Despite increasing attention to survivor outcomes, a comprehensive understanding of PICU morbidity and the trajectory of recovery among PICU survivors remains limited. Most existing studies have focused on narrow patient populations, examined isolated outcome domains or assessed recovery at a single time point,²³ limiting our understanding of common morbidities facing the PICU population and how different sequelae intersect with each other. With studies rarely considering the impact of children's pre-existing health status or clinical factors on outcomes, it is difficult to identify the extent to which different elements of critical illness and PICU admission contribute to post-PICU morbidity.

In adult survivors of critical illness, increasing awareness of new morbidities across multiple health domains led to the development of the concept of post-intensive care syndrome (PICS).²⁴ Post-intensive care syndrome in paediatrics (PICS-p) built on this framework integrating the child's pre-illness baseline, the PICU experience for the child and family, ongoing child and family development and varying trajectories of recovery that can potentially span decades.⁷ Applicability of the PICS-p conceptual framework to the actual patient experience requires validation. Targeting interventions to address PICU morbidity requires an understanding of the risk factors, the health domains most impacted and the recovery trajectory among children and families who share the PICU experience.

In this study, Post-Intensive Care Syndrome – paediatrics Longitudinal Cohort Study, we will address these knowledge gaps by evaluating child and family outcomes over 2 years following PICU discharge to characterise trajectories of recovery and identify risk factors associated with impaired outcomes in multiple health domains. We will enrol 750 children during their first PICU hospitalisation, including 500 'case' participants exposed to intensive care therapies and ≥ 3 days of intensive care and 250 'control' participants experiencing one night in the PICU with no intensive care therapies. Outcomes in multiple health domains for children, parents and siblings for 2 years following PICU discharge will be compared between case and control participants. This work will elucidate the ongoing impact of paediatric critical illness and guide future interventions to optimise outcomes.

METHODS AND ANALYSIS

Study purpose and objectives

The PICS-p study will address three objectives:

1. Determine the physical, cognitive, emotional and social health outcomes and trajectory of recovery in a population of children post-critical illness.
Hypothesis: PICU survivors will experience a common set of physical, cognitive, emotional and social problems after critical illness and will demonstrate variable

trajectories of recovery in the first 2 years post-critical illness.

2. Determine the baseline health, presenting problem and PICU factors associated with impaired physical, cognitive, emotional and social outcomes among PICU survivors.
Hypothesis: Subgroups of PICU survivors will exhibit varying levels of recovery in their physical, cognitive, emotional and social health.
3. Determine the emotional and social health outcomes of parents and siblings of PICU survivors.
Hypothesis: Families, including parents and siblings, will experience emotional and social health consequences of having a child or sibling who survived paediatric critical illness.

Study design

PICS-p is a prospective, multicentre, longitudinal cohort study that will enrol 750 children during their first PICU hospitalisation at 1 of 30 participating US sites to evaluate child and family outcomes in the 2 years following PICU discharge. The study cohort will be comprised of 500 case participants who experience ≥ 3 intensive care days that include at least one critical care therapy (box 1) and 250 control participants who experience a single night in the PICU with no intensive care therapies.

We will collect information about the child's baseline health status and PICU course. Child and family outcomes will then be measured at PICU discharge and at 2 weeks, 6 weeks and 3, 6, 12, 18 and 24 months after PICU discharge. After the 24-month follow-up period, a subset of parents will be selected for qualitative interviews regarding their experiences participating in this study, their perceptions about post-PICU recovery, as well as their preferences for post-PICU follow-up care. PICS-p study recruitment ran between July 2021 and November 2023. Data collection is anticipated to continue until January 2026.

Participants

Case/control participants

Inclusion criteria are purposely broad in scope (box 2). Exclusion criteria preclude enrolment of children not anticipated to survive 1 year after PICU hospitalisation and children in foster care and/or suspected of being maltreated. Control participants will be frequency matched to cases on a 2:1 case to control ratio based on age group (1–12 months, 13–23 months, 2–4 years, 5–7 years, 8–12 years and 13–15 years, as categorised in the Paediatric Quality of Life Inventory (PedsQL) Generic Core Scales²⁵ and Infant Scales²⁶), sex and medical complexity (complex chronic disease, non-complex chronic disease, no chronic disease²⁷). Each participating site will enrol approximately 20 case and 10 control participants over a 2-year enrolment period. To capture seasonal variation in PICU admission diagnoses, each site will screen and enrol consecutive eligible children up to a prespecified target on a quarterly basis. The Data Coordinating Center (DCC) will monitor case participant characteristics and

Box 1 Criteria for intensive care therapies

Examples of therapies and monitoring that are typically provided only in the paediatric intensive care unit. Examples are not subject to local practice patterns.

Multisystem

⇒ Extracorporeal life support (any type).

Respiratory

⇒ New tracheostomy.

⇒ Invasive mechanical ventilation.

⇒ Non-invasive mechanical ventilation (NIV): ≥48 hours of continuous positive airway pressure ≥5 cm H₂O or bilevel positive airway pressure.

⇒ Paediatric acute respiratory distress syndrome or other acute lung disease: NIV plus PaO₂/FiO₂ ratio <300 or SpO₂/FiO₂ ratio <264 for at least 4 hours.

⇒ Status asthmaticus: NIV plus ≥48 hours of continuous bronchodilator therapy (eg, albuterol, terbutaline or magnesium infusion).

Cardiovascular

⇒ Continuous infusion of titratable medications (eg, vasopressors/inotropes/antihypertensives/pulmonary vasodilators).

⇒ Cardioversion/defibrillation.

⇒ Cardiac pacing (any type).

⇒ Ventricular assist device.

Neurological

⇒ Continuous electroencephalogram monitoring for status epilepticus.

⇒ Intracranial pressure monitoring and treatment for intracranial hypertension.

⇒ Continuous vasopressin infusion.

Renal

⇒ Acute renal replacement therapies (eg, haemodialysis, continuous renal replacement therapy).

Haematological

⇒ Erythrocytapheresis/red blood cell exchange.

⇒ Plasmapheresis/plasma exchange.

⇒ Leukapheresis.

Hepatic

⇒ Extracorporeal hepatic support.

Surgical

⇒ Postoperative solid organ transplant.

instruct sites to enrol a prespecified number and type (eg, specific age group or medical complexity) of control participants in the final two quarters.

Family participants

At least one eligible parent/legal guardian who is the child's primary care provider must be willing to participate. If two parents are willing, parents will self-select who will serve as the primary parent for the proxy-report surveys; the second parent may complete a separate set of self-report surveys independently. A subset of case and control parents who complete the 2-year data collection time point will be systematically selected for qualitative interviews. This will include parents of children of differing age and medical complexity. Interviews will continue until thematic saturation has been reached.

Up to two cognitively capable siblings (Paediatric Cerebral Performance Category (PCPC) <3)²⁸ aged 8–15 years who live with the patient at least 50% of the time and have

Box 2 Post-intensive care syndrome in paediatrics inclusion and exclusion criteria

Eligibility criteria

Inclusion criteria

⇒ First intensive care unit (ICU) admission, including paediatric subspecialty ICU (eg, cardiac) and/or neonatal ICU.

⇒ Age ≥4 weeks (and ≥44 weeks corrected gestational age) and <16 years at PICU admission.

⇒ PICU length of stay:

⇒ **Case participants:** ≥3 days (ie, covers ≥3 nights from 00:00 to 07:00) with at least one intensive care therapy for organ dysfunction (eg, invasive mechanical ventilation, vasopressors/inotropes; see box 1 for full list).

⇒ **Control participants:** One overnight stay (ie, covers one 00:00 to 07:00 period) with no intensive care therapies for organ dysfunction.*

⇒ Anticipated discharge to home, directly or indirectly following stay in another facility (eg, rehabilitation).

Exclusion criteria

⇒ Does not live with at least one parent/legal guardian.

⇒ Life expectancy not anticipated to be more than 1 year (eg, active do-not-resuscitate order, palliative care team involvement for end-of-life symptom management).

⇒ Anticipated discharge into foster care, ward of the state or known or suspected child maltreatment.

PICU, paediatric intensive care unit.

*Postoperative patients extubated prior to parental presence in the PICU can be considered.

not been previously hospitalised in an ICU will be invited to complete sibling surveys. If more than two siblings are eligible, the two siblings with the next birthdays after the patient's birthday, regardless of year, will be invited to participate.

Study sites and recruitment

Each participating site is a member of the Paediatric Acute Lung Injury and Sepsis Investigator (PALISI) Network. Research staff at each site will screen their PICUs daily for eligible patients and enrol consecutive case and control participants each quarter. Parents/legal guardians will be approached for consent within 72 hours of PICU discharge. Children who have reached the age of assent (≥8 years), have not received sedation/pain medications for 72 hours and have PCPC <3 will be deemed cognitively capable and asked to provide assent. Adolescents who would reach their 18th birthday during the 2-year longitudinal follow-up (≥16 years at PICU admission) will not be enrolled. Eligible siblings will provide written assent while visiting the hospital or verbal assent by phone followed by an electronic assent if visits are not planned or, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, permitted.

Data collection and follow-up

Site research staff will collect demographic and clinical data through family interview prior to hospital discharge and data extraction from the electronic medical record.

These data include baseline medical history, developmental history, academic history, social influencers of health (ie, Child Opportunity Index²⁹), household factors, health insurance type, presenting diagnosis, illness severity as measured by the Paediatric Risk of Mortality IV score³⁰ and hospital course factors (eg, duration of mechanical ventilation, PICU and hospital length of stay, organ dysfunction). Using provided contact information, parents will be sent electronic surveys to report their child's and family's status prior to PICU hospitalisation and a separate set of surveys to report their status at the time of PICU discharge. Assented patients and siblings will be sent surveys starting at 2 weeks post-PICU discharge.

After PICU discharge, data collection will be managed centrally by the Clinical Coordinating Center (CCC) and DCC. Surveys are primarily web-based using the electronic data capture platform REDCap (Research Electronic Data Capture) Cloud,³¹ which distributes surveys through individual, secure email links. Prior to each follow-up time point, participants will receive an email to complete surveys with a completion window. Dependent on parent preference, email or text reminders will be sent or reminder phone calls will be made for surveys not completed within the time window. Participants will be instructed to report their status for the prior 7 days for first three sampling periods (2 weeks, 6 weeks and 3 months post-PICU discharge) and for the prior month for later sampling periods (6, 12, 18 and 24 months).

Participants with limited internet access or other extenuating circumstances will be given the opportunity to complete surveys by mail or telephone interview. If a child does not have a personal email address or is <13 years old, survey links will be sent to parents with instructions to share the link with their child. Each survey starts by asking the relationship of the respondent to the patient and the patient's (or sibling's) age. If a child is still hospitalised or is rehospitalised during the data collection period, data collection will be paused until the child returns home and will resume per the schedule based on the index PICU discharge date.

End-of-study interviews are anticipated to take at least 30 min and will be conducted by the study investigators or a trained study team member. At the beginning of the interview, the interviewer will obtain the parent's consent to record the interview. The interview guide was developed by the co-investigator team in consultation with the parent advisory group.

Spanish-speaking families will complete validated Spanish versions of all assessment instruments by mail or telephone interview with a Spanish-speaking research team member. If a Spanish-speaking family is selected for an end-of-study interview, the interview guide will be translated into Spanish and the interview will be completed with the assistance of a Spanish-speaking research team member.

Outcome measures

The primary outcome is HRQL for case and control participants as measured by the PedsQL V.4.0 Generic Core Scales²⁵ or Infant Scales²⁶ (table 1). The Generic Core Scales assess physical, emotional, social and school functioning in children 2–17 years. The Infant Scales assess physical functioning and symptoms and emotional, social and cognitive functioning in children <2 years. Both sets of instruments demonstrate validity and reliability,^{32–34} have been widely used in PICU populations³⁵ and discriminate between healthy children and those with a wide range of acute and chronic health conditions.^{36–38}

Secondary outcomes for case and control participants include measures of fatigue,³³ cognitive and functional status,^{33 39–43} pain,^{44 45} sleep disturbance,^{46 47} growth and development,⁴⁸ emotional and behavioural health,^{49 50} post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) symptoms^{51 52} and hope⁵³ (table 1). Secondary outcomes for parents include family functioning,⁵⁴ resilience,⁵⁵ anxiety^{56–58} depression,⁵⁸ sleep disturbance,⁵⁹ PTSD symptoms⁶⁰ and post-traumatic growth.⁶¹ Secondary outcomes for siblings include quality of life,²⁵ participation in caregiving activities,⁶² emotional and behavioural health^{49 50} and hope.⁵³

All outcomes will be measured at least three times over the 2-year follow-up period (table 2), except for resilience (measured at baseline and 18 months) and post-traumatic growth (measured at 12 months). See online supplemental file 1 for a full description of all survey measures. In addition, parent-completed surveys include questions about medical history after the index PICU discharge (eg, medical providers and prescribed medications) and missed school and work, as well as free-text fields asking about major life events occurring during the follow-up period (eg, move, divorce) and services and resources that are wanted but not being received.

The wording of the PedsQL V.4.0 Generic Core, Infant, Multidimensional Fatigue and Cognitive Functioning scales; PCPC and Paediatric Overall Performance Category; and Functional Status Scale (with owner permission) were modified in response to parent advisory group and participant feedback regarding the need for patient-centred and family-centred language. Text changes are noted in online supplemental files 1,2.

Analysis plan

The DCC will perform all statistical analyses for the PICS-p study. Descriptive statistics for demographic information, medical history, presenting illness, hospital course and all child, parent and sibling survey measures will be calculated, including means, SD, medians and IQRs for continuous variables and frequency counts and percentages for categorical variables. Data will be examined for skewness, outliers and systematic missing data. Transformations will be undertaken as needed.

To explore PICU survivors' health outcomes and trajectory of recovery, we will compare the outcome measures of case versus control participants using t-tests and linear regression adjusting for matching factors (age group, sex,

Table 1 Measures, participant burden and association with PICS-p framework

Measure	Age group (years)	Number of items	Time required (minutes)	PICS-p domain assessed*
Parent proxy-report for child				
PedsQL V.4.0 Generic Core or Infant Scales				P, C, E, S
Teen	13–17	23	<4	
Child	8–12	23	<4	
Young child	5–7	23	<4	
Toddler	2–4	21	<4	
Infant (13–24 months)	1–2	45	<10	
Infant (1–12 months)	0–1	36	<7	
PedsQL Multidimensional Fatigue Scale V.3.0		18	<4	P, C
Teen	13–17			
Child	8–12			
Young child	5–7			
Toddler	2–4			
PedsQL Cognitive Functioning Scale		6	<2	C
Teen	13–17			
Child	8–12			
Young child	5–7			
Toddler	2–4			
Survey of Well-being of Young Children – milestones only	0–5	10	2	P, C, S
Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ)		25	4	E, S
Teen/child	11–17			
Child/young child	4–10			
Toddler	2–4			
Young Child PTSD Screen – Revised PICU	3–17	6	2	E
Functional Status Scale	0–17	6	2–5	P
Paediatric Cerebral Performance Category	0–17	1	1	C
Paediatric Overall Performance Category	0–17	1	1	P
Parent proxy-report for family				
PedsQL Family Impact Module V.2.0	–	36	5	P, C, E, S
Parent self-report				
Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale-10	–	10	3	E, S
State-Trait Anxiety Inventory-40	–	40	10	E
State-Trait Anxiety Inventory-6	–	6	2	E
Patient Health Questionnaire-4	–	4	2	E
PROMIS Sleep Disturbance – Short Form 4a and Sleep-Related Impairment – Short Form 4a	–	8	3	P, E
PTSD Checklist for DSM-5	–	20	6	E
Post-traumatic Growth Inventory – Short Form	–	10	4	E
Patient self-report				
PedsQL V.4.0 Generic Core Scales		23	<4	P, C, E, S
Teen	13–17			
Child	8–12			
PedsQL Multidimensional Fatigue Scale V.3.0		18	<4	P, C
Teen	13–17			

Continued

**Table 1** Continued

Measure	Age group (years)	Number of items	Time required (minutes)	PICS-p domain assessed*
Child	8–12			
PedsQL Cognitive Functioning Scale		6	<2	C
Teen	13–17			
Child	8–12			
PedsQL Paediatric Pain Questionnaire	8–17	2	1	P
PROMIS Paediatric Pain Interference – Short Form 8a (only if reporting pain in past week/month)	8–17	8	<2	P
PROMIS Paediatric Sleep Disturbance – Short Form 4a and Paediatric Sleep-Related Impairment – Short Form 4a	8–17	8	3	P, E
SDQ teen/child	11–17	25	4	E, S
Child PTSD Symptom Scale for DSM-5	8–17	27	10	E
Children's Hope Scale (CHS)	8–17	6	3	E
Sibling self-report				
PedsQL V.4.0 Generic Core Scales		23	<4	P, C, E, S
Teen	13–17			
Child	8–12			
Multidimensional Assessment of Caring Activities	8–17	18	2–4	S
SDQ teen/child	11–17	25	4	E, S
CHS	8–17	6	3	E

*P=physical health; C=cognitive health, E=emotional health, S=social health.
 DSM-5, Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 5th edition; PedsQL, Pediatric Quality of Life Inventory; PICS-p, paediatric post-intensive care syndrome; PICU, paediatric intensive care unit; PROMIS, Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System; PTSD, post-traumatic stress disorder.

medical complexity). We will compare patients' outcomes to HRQL data from the general and chronically ill populations using t-tests. For consistency across age groups, parent proxy-report scores will be used in primary analyses. To explore response consistency, parent proxy-report and patient self-report will be compared in a separate analysis. For longitudinal data, we will assess correlations between time points using Pearson correlations and will use mixed linear regression models with random subject effects to analyse trajectories over time. We will use graphical analyses to display health outcome trajectories.

To identify factors associated with impaired health outcomes among PICU survivors, we will use Pearson correlations for continuous covariates and t-tests or analysis of variance for categorical covariates. We will use multiple linear or logistic regression modelling with variable selection techniques to adjust for baseline factors or confounding patient variables. We will compare patient versus sibling outcomes using paired t-tests, and we will compare patient, parent and sibling emotional and social health outcomes to published means using t-tests.

We will use mixed effects and generalised estimating equations models to explore whether adjustment for sex, race/ethnicity or site affects study inferences. If there are differences in baseline or PICU factors or early PedsQL

measurements between participants with and without 1-year and 2-year data, multiple imputation methods and sensitivity analyses will be used to account for missing data due to attrition. Finally, classification and regression trees with recursive partitioning, principal component analysis, factor analysis and machine learning methods will be explored to help describe subgroups of patients with similar trajectories of outcome.

Audio data from end-of-study interviews will be transcribed verbatim, reviewed and pseudo-anonymised prior to formal thematic analysis.⁶³ NVivo V.12 software will facilitate qualitative data analysis. Codes will be collated and collapsed into subthemes and subsequent themes. The emerging findings will be periodically reviewed by the principal investigators and co-investigators to allow for the data analysis to be refined, enhancing the rigour.

Statistical power

Assuming 20% attrition, 2-year outcomes will be available for 400 case and 200 control participants. With these sample sizes, we will have >80% power to detect the minimum clinically significant difference of 4.5 points (0.283 SD)³⁶ for the primary outcome, PedsQL total score, between cases and controls. We will have 80% power to detect moderate differences (0.29 SD) between

Table 2 Schedule of survey completion

Measures	Baseline*/ PICU discharge	Post-PICU discharged										
		Short-term					Long-term					
		2 weeks	6 weeks	3 months	6 months	24 months	2 weeks	6 weeks	3 months	6 months	24 months	
Parents												
PedsQL V.4.0 Generic Core or Infant Scales	X/-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
PedsQL Multidimensional Fatigue Scale V.3.0	X/-	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
PedsQL Cognitive Functioning Scale	X/-		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Survey of Well-being of Young Children	X/-											
Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ)	X/-											
Young Child PTSD Screen – Revised PICU				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Functional Status Scale	X/X											
Paediatric Cerebral Performance Category	X/X											
Paediatric Overall Performance Category	X/X											
PedsQL Family Impact Module V.2.0		X										
Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale-10	X/-											
State-Trait Anxiety Inventory-40	X/-											
State-Trait Anxiety Inventory-6				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Patient Health Questionnaire-4	-/X											
PROMIS Sleep Disturbance – Short Form 4a and Sleep-Related Impairment – Short Form 4a	X/-	X										
PTSD Checklist for DSM-5				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Post-traumatic Growth Inventory – Short Form												
Patients												
PedsQL V.4.0 Generic Core Scales		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
PedsQL Multidimensional Fatigue Scale V.3.0		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
PedsQL Cognitive Functioning Scale												
PedsQL Paediatric Pain Questionnaire	X/X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
PROMIS Paediatric Pain Interference – Short Form 8a (only if reporting pain in past week/month)	X/X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
PROMIS Paediatric Sleep Disturbance – Short Form 4a and Paediatric Sleep-Related Impairment – Short Form 4a												
SDQ												

Continued



Table 2 Continued

Measures	Post-PICU discharge†									
	Baseline*/ PICU discharge					Long-term				
	2 weeks	6 weeks	3 months	6 months	12 months	18 months	24 months			
Child PTSD Symptom Scale for DSM-5			X	X	X	X	X			
Children's Hope Scale (CHS)			X	X	X	X	X			
Siblings										
PedsQL V.4.0 Generic Core Scales		X	X	X	X	X	X			
Multidimensional Assessment of Caring Activities	X§/-	X								
SDQ				X	X	X	X			
CHS			X	X	X	X	X			

*For the baseline/pre-PICU surveys, respondents are asked about the time period before the child's critical illness.
†Respondents asked about the prior 7 days for the short-term sampling periods and the prior one month for the long-term sampling periods.
‡Patients who self-report are asked about their pain before going to the hospital and at PICU discharge during their 2-week survey.
§Siblings are asked about the time period before their brother or sister's critical illness during their first survey, typically collected two weeks post-PICU discharge after assent is obtained.
DSM-5, Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 5th edition; PedsQL, Paediatric Quality of Life Inventory; PICU, paediatric intensive care unit; PROMIS, Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System; PTSD, post-traumatic stress disorder.

two case groups with different exposures or the case group with 200 matched siblings (0.29 SD). For multiple linear regression modelling on 400 cases using a two-sided 0.05-level test and assuming 5–10 covariates with an R^2 value of 0.10–0.30, we will have 80% power to detect a new predictor variable that improves R^2 by 0.017.

Patient and public involvement

A co-investigator team that collectively provides expertise in physical and functional health outcomes, child and family psychological evaluation, sibling support and biostatistics were integral in developing the study design, meets biannually with the study principal investigators to provide feedback and will assist with data interpretation. A parent advisory group comprised of parents who have had a child previously admitted to the PICU provided feedback on survey and interview guide development, will assist with ongoing problem-solving and will provide feedback on data interpretation at the end of the study.

Ethics and dissemination

Ethical review

Adhering to the National Institutes of Health (NIH) mandate for multisite research studies, the University of Pennsylvania (PENN) institutional review board (IRB) serves as the IRB of record or reviewing single IRB for this study (protocol #843844). PENN conducts the ethical review for all sites under a reliance agreement. This study has been externally peer-reviewed and awarded funding from the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD; R01HD098269; MPIs Curley and Watson) and is coordinated by PENN and Seattle Children's Research Institute. The grant for this study was initially submitted for NICHD review on 31 May 2018 and resubmitted on 4 March 2019. Funding began on 1 July 2020. The study has been registered on ClinicalTrials.gov.

Quality assurance and control plans

Cohort retention procedures are based on investigator experience^{14 17 64} and published strategies to maximise retention in longitudinal outcome studies.^{65 66} Retention strategies include establishing rapport with families through contact at regular intervals of at least every 3 months by mail or email based on family preference (eg, quarterly family newsletters), centralised follow-up management by the CCC and flexibility in accommodating family schedules facilitated by the bicoastal research team to account for time zone differences. To maintain rapport, families receive family-oriented, study-branded tokens of appreciation (eg, fidget spinner, pop-its) at their 12-month study milestone. Participants are reimbursed for their time, and a public study website (after-picu.com) is used to enhance study enthusiasm and provide families with PICS-p education, study information and procedures for securely updating contact information.

Follow-up surveys will be reviewed at regular intervals to monitor for potential mandated-reporting events (eg,

child maltreatment). Free-text fields are monitored for mention of harm to self or child.

Data management plan

Each site will maintain an enrolment log linking each patient to a unique study number. All contact information and clinical and survey data will be entered into the REDCap Cloud database developed and maintained by the DCC at Boston Children's Hospital. Only the study principal investigators, DCC and CCC teams have access to individually identifiable private information. The DCC regularly monitors the completeness, accuracy and consistency of the study database and produces regular reports on enrolment, data quality and completeness of participant follow-up. Qualitative data will be housed in a password-protected secure research drive accessible only to the principal investigators and their designee.

Dissemination

Children surviving critical illness are at risk for a broad spectrum of adverse sequelae including physical deconditioning, cognitive deficits, post-traumatic stress and impaired social development and family dynamics. The PICS-p conceptual framework describes this constellation of morbidities that may be uniquely experienced by children and families who survive paediatric critical illness.⁷ The framework incorporates the influence of baseline health, socio-demographic characteristics, maturation and psychosocial development on a child's lifetime health trajectory and recognises the interdependence of the child and family. The PICS-p Longitudinal Cohort Study will test the applicability of this framework for critically ill children across the USA and comprehensively characterise post-PICU recovery to facilitate development of targeted interventions that prevent or mitigate adverse outcomes. Qualitative data on the post-PICU experience and parent preferences for post-PICU follow-up is separate but complementary to the quantitative survey data and will provide directions for future interventions.

The PICS-p study design includes several unique innovations. By comparing critically ill children undergoing ≥ 3 days of intensive care to control participants who spend a single night in the PICU without intensive care therapies, we will better understand the contribution of critical illness itself to adverse outcomes while also exploring whether there are common sequelae in all children or families who experience the PICU environment regardless of illness severity or exposure duration. If children or families experience emotional and social health consequences independent of the child's illness severity, as has been described,^{10 67} efforts to reduce anxiety and trauma associated with a PICU stay may benefit all children and families exposed to the PICU environment. Conversely, if children exposed to multiple days of intensive care experience a common set of problems not experienced by control participants, this will support the concept of a syndrome of associated morbidities arising from the combined effects of severe illness and resulting therapies.

Future mitigation approaches would focus on reducing the adverse impact of specific therapies and optimising recovery across subpopulations of the most critically ill children. In addition, measures of hope and resiliency will allow evaluation of family strengths affected by the PICU experience.

Although exclusion of children with prior ICU admissions will limit generalisability of study findings, it will allow us to explore the phenomenon of PICS-p from its onset and capture the development of chronic critical illness.⁶⁸ Chronic critical illness and PICS may share common pathophysiological mechanisms in adults,⁶⁹ but the relationship between new post-PICU morbidities and recurrent PICU admission has not been elucidated in children. The frequent follow-up assessment time points and 2-year study observation period provide opportunities to estimate the incidence of chronic critical illness development, explore how different domains of morbidity and recurrent PICU admission intersect and identify periods of vulnerability to high healthcare resource use during which children and families may benefit from increased support.

Outcome measures in the PICS-p Longitudinal Cohort Study were selected for alignment with the PICS-p conceptual model,⁷ psychometric properties, ease of use, availability in Spanish, potential for child self-report and parent proxy-report, previous use in the PICU population²³ and consistency with the adult PICS literature.^{70 71} Measures also align with the Paediatric Critical Care Core Outcome Set⁷² and Core Outcome Measurement Set⁷³ developed by the PALISI and Collaborative Paediatric Critical Care Research networks with multidisciplinary stakeholder involvement from clinicians, researchers and families. Consistency between the domains and measures used in PICS-p and those recommended for use by the paediatric critical care community will facilitate comparison and integration of findings with future PICU outcomes research. As some instruments were designed for clinician use, text was revised when needed to improve inclusivity and patient-centredness and family-centredness of the chosen measures.

Measurement of outcomes across multiple time points will characterise trajectories of change for each phenomenon of interest and critical periods of vulnerability in each health domain to identify opportunities for focused interventions. We are implementing an evidence-based multimodal approach to optimise cohort retention and minimise loss to follow-up,^{65 66 74-77} with an emphasis on longitudinal engagement with children and families. In addition to improving cohort retention, development of a culture of survivorship and engagement may have important implications for the health of PICU survivors and their families. Studies of childhood cancer survivors suggest that survivors who are engaged in follow-up care may have improved outcomes.⁷⁸

Central to our ability to accurately assess trajectories of recovery is inclusion of recall estimates of children's baseline status prior to PICU admission. While most PICU

outcome studies compare follow-up scores to population means,²³ this approach does not capture clinically meaningful change for many children. The general paediatric populations on which instrument norms are based may have important differences from children experiencing critical illness who have a high prevalence of chronic health conditions^{4 79 80} and baseline HRQL or functional status scores below population averages.³⁸ Comparison of post-PICU scores to population means may overestimate decline for participants whose baseline scores were low and underestimate decline for participants with baseline scores significantly above the population mean.⁸¹ There is also a poorly characterised subset of children who experience improvement in health status following critical illness.^{82–84} Although parent proxy-report and self-report of pre-PICU baseline may be affected by recall bias, anchoring assessment of change on pre-illness baseline will allow us to characterise the magnitude and direction of change for each measure and explore factors associated with both decline and improvement.

Finally, using the robust patient and clinical data collected in a geographically diverse sample recruited from 30 PICUs across the USA, we will characterise subgroups of children with unique risks for poor long-term outcomes. Identification of risk factors will stimulate development of targeted interventions focused on prehospital, in-hospital and post-discharge factors for high-risk patient groups. Identification of risk factors involving specific intensive care therapies or medications will inform interventional trials that avoid or minimise exposure to those factors to reduce patient morbidity. While enrolment is limited to families in the USA who speak English or Spanish, we will evaluate for differences in recruitment, retention and outcomes by race, ethnicity, language, social influencers of health and geography to understand how these factors may influence generalisability across populations. Data from PICS-p will allow for cross-national comparison to other ongoing studies in the field.^{85–87}

Research is urgently needed to better understand morbidity among survivors of paediatric critical illness and identify strategies to optimise long-term outcomes.^{88–90} The PICS-p Longitudinal Cohort Study will systematically and comprehensively determine the physical, cognitive, emotional and social health outcomes experienced following paediatric critical illness, identify periods of vulnerability in each health domain over 2 years following PICU discharge and inform interventions to reduce morbidity and optimise recovery among children surviving critical illness and their families.

Our dissemination strategy will be multifaceted to ensure findings are reported in a timely manner to clinicians, researchers and families. We will produce incremental publications (eg, 3-month, 6-month, 1-year, 2-year outcomes) as knowledge unfolds. We will target high-quality, peer-reviewed journals for publication. As manuscripts are published, they will be added to our public study website along with a brief plain language

summary. Findings will be reported on ClinicalTrials.gov and presented at local, national and international meetings to increase understanding of the morbidities experienced by survivors of paediatric critical illness and their families. As per NIH policy, a de-identified data set and all data-related documentation necessary to use study data will be provided to the NICHD Data and Sharing Hub no later than 3 years after the final follow-up interview or 2 years after the primary paper has been published, whichever comes first.

Author affiliations

¹School of Nursing, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA

²The Children's Hospital of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA

³University of Washington School of Medicine, Seattle, Washington, USA

⁴Seattle Children's Research Institute, Seattle, Washington, USA

⁵School of Nursing, University of Connecticut, Storrs, Connecticut, USA

⁶School of Medicine, University of Connecticut, Farmington, Connecticut, USA

⁷School of Healthcare, University of Leicester, Leicester, UK

⁸Nottingham Children's Hospital, Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust, Nottingham, UK

⁹McGill University Health Centre, Montreal Children's Hospital, Montreal, Québec, Canada

¹⁰Ingram School of Nursing, McGill University, Montreal, Québec, Canada

¹¹St George's University of London, London, UK

¹²Boston Children's Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts, USA

¹³Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Harvard University, Boston, Massachusetts, USA

Twitter Mallory A Perry-Eaddy @MalloryPerryRN, Joseph C Manning @josephcmanning and Janet E Rennick @janet_rennick

Contributors All authors have made substantial contributions to the design of the work (MAQC, RSW, EYK, AMC, JCM, NP, JER, GC, LAA, DW) or the acquisition, analysis or interpretation of data for the work (MAQC, RSW, LBK, MAP-E, AMC, EBM, MT, LAA, DW); AND drafting the work or reviewing it critically for important intellectual content (all authors); AND final approval of the version to be published (all authors); AND agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved (all authors). LAA and DW are co-last authors.

Funding This work is supported by the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (R01HD098269, MAQC and RSW; K23HD100566, EYK) and National Institute of Nursing Research (F32NR020579, LBK). The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health.

Competing interests None declared.

Patient and public involvement Patients and/or the public were involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans of this research. Refer to the Methods section for further details.

Patient consent for publication Not applicable.

Provenance and peer review Not commissioned; peer reviewed for ethical and funding approval prior to submission.

Supplemental material This content has been supplied by the author(s). It has not been vetted by BMJ Publishing Group Limited (BMJ) and may not have been peer-reviewed. Any opinions or recommendations discussed are solely those of the author(s) and are not endorsed by BMJ. BMJ disclaims all liability and responsibility arising from any reliance placed on the content. Where the content includes any translated material, BMJ does not warrant the accuracy and reliability of the translations (including but not limited to local regulations, clinical guidelines, terminology, drug names and drug dosages), and is not responsible for any error and/or omissions arising from translation and adaptation or otherwise.

Open access This is an open access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution Non Commercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is

properly cited, appropriate credit is given, any changes made indicated, and the use is non-commercial. See: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>.

ORCID iDs

Martha A Q Curley <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5228-6694>
 R Scott Watson <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2581-7186>
 Elizabeth Y Killien <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1193-5464>
 Laura Beth Kalvas <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9458-514X>
 Mallory A Perry-Eaddy <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5754-7857>
 Joseph C Manning <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6077-4169>
 Janet E Rennick <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2566-1695>
 Gillian Colville <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8530-2822>
 Lisa A Asaro <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5736-0304>
 David Wypij <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8367-8711>

REFERENCES

- 1 Tilford JM, Roberson PK, Lensing S, *et al*. Differences in pediatric ICU mortality risk over time. *Crit Care Med* 1998;26:1737–43.
- 2 Namachivayam P, Shann F, Shekerdemian L, *et al*. Three decades of pediatric intensive care: Who was admitted, what happened in intensive care, and what happened afterward. *Pediatr Crit Care Med* 2010;11:549–55.
- 3 Burns JP, Sellers DE, Meyer EC, *et al*. Epidemiology of death in the PICU at five U.S. teaching hospitals*. *Crit Care Med* 2014;42:2101–8.
- 4 Killien EY, Keller MR, Watson RS, *et al*. Epidemiology of Intensive Care Admissions for Children in the US From 2001 to 2019. *JAMA Pediatr* 2023;177:506–15.
- 5 Pollack MM, Holubkov R, Funai T, *et al*. Pediatric intensive care outcomes: development of new morbidities during pediatric critical care. *Pediatr Crit Care Med* 2014;15:821–7.
- 6 Rennick JE, Childerhose JE. Redefining success in the PICU: new patient populations shift targets of care. *Pediatrics* 2015;135:e289–91.
- 7 Manning JC, Pinto NP, Rennick JE, *et al*. Conceptualizing Post Intensive Care Syndrome in Children—The PICS-p Framework. *Pediatr Crit Care Med* 2018;19:298–300.
- 8 Watson RS, Choong K, Colville G, *et al*. Life after Critical Illness in Children—Toward an Understanding of Pediatric Post-intensive Care Syndrome. *J Pediatr* 2018;198:16–24.
- 9 Mestrovic J, Kardum G, Sustic A, *et al*. Neurodevelopmental disabilities and quality of life after intensive care treatment. *J Paediatr Child Health* 2007;43:673–6.
- 10 Nelson LP, Gold JL. Posttraumatic stress disorder in children and their parents following admission to the pediatric intensive care unit: a review. *Pediatr Crit Care Med* 2012;13:338–47.
- 11 Ebrahim S, Singh S, Hutchison JS, *et al*. Adaptive behavior, functional outcomes, and quality of life outcomes of children requiring urgent ICU admission. *Pediatr Crit Care Med* 2013;14:10–8.
- 12 Als LC, Picouto MD, Hau S-M, *et al*. Mental and physical well-being following admission to pediatric intensive care. *Pediatr Crit Care Med* 2015;16:e141–9.
- 13 Choong K, Fraser D, Al-Harbi S, *et al*. Functional Recovery in Critically Ill Children, the “WeeCover” Multicenter Study. *Pediatr Crit Care Med* 2018;19:145–54.
- 14 Watson RS, Asaro LA, Hertzog JH, *et al*. Long-Term Outcomes after Protocolized Sedation versus Usual Care in Ventilated Pediatric Patients. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2018;197:1457–67.
- 15 Hordijk J, Verbruggen S, Vanhorebeek I, *et al*. Health-related quality of life of children and their parents 2 years after critical illness: pre-planned follow-up of the PEPaNIC international, randomized, controlled trial. *Crit Care* 2020;24:347.
- 16 Zimmerman JJ, Banks R, Berg RA, *et al*. Trajectory of Mortality and Health-Related Quality of Life Morbidity Following Community-Acquired Pediatric Septic Shock. *Crit Care Med* 2020;48:329–37.
- 17 Watson RS, Beers SR, Asaro LA, *et al*. Association of Acute Respiratory Failure in Early Childhood With Long-term Neurocognitive Outcomes. *JAMA* 2022;327:836.
- 18 Colville G, Pierce C. Patterns of post-traumatic stress symptoms in families after paediatric intensive care. *Intensive Care Med* 2012;38:1523–31.
- 19 Yagiela LM, Carlton EF, Meert KL, *et al*. Parent Medical Traumatic Stress and Associated Family Outcomes After Pediatric Critical Illness: A Systematic Review. *Pediatr Crit Care Med* 2019;20:759–68.
- 20 Murphy LK, Palermo TM, Meert KL, *et al*. Longitudinal Trajectories of Caregiver Distress and Family Functioning After Community-Acquired Pediatric Septic Shock. *Pediatr Crit Care Med* 2020;21:787–96.
- 21 O’Meara A, Akande M, Yagiela L, *et al*. Family Outcomes After the Pediatric Intensive Care Unit: A Scoping Review. *J Intensive Care Med* 2022;37:1179–98.
- 22 Erçin-Swearinger H, Lindhorst T, Curtis JR, *et al*. Acute and Posttraumatic Stress in Family Members of Children With a Prolonged Stay in a PICU: Secondary Analysis of a Randomized Trial. *Pediatr Crit Care Med* 2022;23:306–14.
- 23 Maddux AB, Pinto N, Fink EL, *et al*. Postdischarge Outcome Domains in Pediatric Critical Care and the Instruments Used to Evaluate Them: A Scoping Review. *Crit Care Med* 2020;48:e1313–21.
- 24 Needham DM, Davidson J, Cohen H, *et al*. Improving long-term outcomes after discharge from intensive care unit: report from a stakeholders’ conference. *Crit Care Med* 2012;40:502–9.
- 25 Varni JW, Seid M, Kurtin PS. PedsQL 4.0: reliability and validity of the Pediatric Quality of Life Inventory version 4.0 generic core scales in healthy and patient populations. *Med Care* 2001;39:800–12.
- 26 Varni JW, Limbers CA, Neighbors K, *et al*. The PedsQL™ Infant Scales: feasibility, internal consistency reliability, and validity in healthy and ill infants. *Qual Life Res* 2011;20:45–55.
- 27 Simon TD, Cawthon ML, Stanford S, *et al*. Pediatric Medical Complexity Algorithm: A New Method to Stratify Children by Medical Complexity. *Pediatrics* 2014;133:e1647–54.
- 28 Fiser DH. Assessing the outcome of pediatric intensive care. *J Pediatr* 1992;121:68–74.
- 29 Noelke C, McArdle N, Baek M, *et al*. Child Opportunity Index 2.0 Technical Documentation, Available: https://www.diversitydatakids.org/sites/default/files/2020-02/ddk_coi2.0_technical_documentation_20200212.pdf
- 30 Pollack MM, Holubkov R, Funai T, *et al*. The Pediatric Risk of Mortality Score: Update 2015. *Pediatr Crit Care Med* 2016;17:2–9.
- 31 REDCap Cloud. 2023. Available: <https://www.redcapcloud.com/>
- 32 Varni JW, Seid M, Knight TS, *et al*. The PedsQL 4.0 Generic Core Scales: sensitivity, responsiveness, and impact on clinical decision-making. *J Behav Med* 2002;25:175–93.
- 33 Varni JW, Burwinkle TM, Katz ER, *et al*. The PedsQL in pediatric cancer: reliability and validity of the Pediatric Quality of Life Inventory Generic Core Scales, Multidimensional Fatigue Scale, and Cancer Module. *Cancer* 2002;94:2090–106.
- 34 Aspesberro F, Fesinmeyer MD, Zhou C, *et al*. Construct Validity and Responsiveness of the Pediatric Quality of Life Inventory 4.0 Generic Core Scales and Infant Scales in the PICU. *Pediatr Crit Care Med* 2016;17:e272–9.
- 35 Killien EY, Loftis LL, Clark JD, *et al*. Health-related quality of life outcome measures for children surviving critical care: a scoping review. *Qual Life Res* 2021;30:3383–94.
- 36 Varni JW, Burwinkle TM, Seid M, *et al*. The PedsQL 4.0 as a pediatric population health measure: feasibility, reliability, and validity. *Ambul Pediatr* 2003;3:329–41.
- 37 Varni JW, Limbers CA, Burwinkle TM. Parent proxy-report of their children’s health-related quality of life: an analysis of 13,878 parents’ reliability and validity across age subgroups using the PedsQL 4.0 Generic Core Scales. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2007;5:2.
- 38 Varni JW, Limbers CA, Burwinkle TM. Impaired health-related quality of life in children and adolescents with chronic conditions: a comparative analysis of 10 disease clusters and 33 disease categories/severities utilizing the PedsQL 4.0 Generic Core Scales. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2007;5:43.
- 39 Varni JW, Limbers CA, Sorensen LG, *et al*. PedsQL Cognitive Functioning Scale in pediatric liver transplant recipients: feasibility, reliability, and validity. *Qual Life Res* 2011;20:913–21.
- 40 Aspesberro F, Mangione-Smith R, Zimmerman JJ. Health-related quality of life following pediatric critical illness. *Intensive Care Med* 2015;41:1235–46.
- 41 Pollack MM, Holubkov R, Glass P, *et al*. Functional Status Scale: new pediatric outcome measure. *Pediatrics* 2009;124:e18–28.
- 42 Fiser DH, Long N, Roberson PK, *et al*. Relationship of pediatric overall performance category and pediatric cerebral performance category scores at pediatric intensive care unit discharge with outcome measures collected at hospital discharge and 1- and 6-month follow-up assessments. *Crit Care Med* 2000;28:2616–20.
- 43 Fiser DH, Tilford JM, Roberson PK. Relationship of illness severity and length of stay to functional outcomes in the pediatric intensive care unit: a multi-institutional study. *Crit Care Med* 2000;28:1173–9.
- 44 Sherman SA, Eisen S, Burwinkle TM, *et al*. The PedsQL Present Functioning Visual Analogue Scales: preliminary reliability and validity. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2006;4:75.
- 45 Varni JW, Stucky BD, Thissen D, *et al*. PROMIS Pediatric Pain Interference Scale: an item response theory analysis of the pediatric pain item bank. *J Pain* 2010;11:1109–19.

- 46 Forrest CB, Meltzer LJ, Marcus CL, *et al.* Development and validation of the PROMIS Pediatric Sleep Disturbance and Sleep-Related Impairment item banks. *Sleep* 2018;41.
- 47 Bevans KB, Meltzer LJ, De La Motte A, *et al.* Qualitative Development and Content Validation of the PROMIS Pediatric Sleep Health Items. *Behav Sleep Med* 2019;17:657–71.
- 48 Perrin C, Visco K, Mattern K. *The Survey of Well-Being of Young Children (SWYC) User's Manual, Version 1.01*. Boston, MA: Tufts Medical Center, 2016.
- 49 Goodman R. The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire: a research note. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry* 1997;38:581–6.
- 50 Goodman R. Psychometric properties of the strengths and difficulties questionnaire. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 2001;40:1337–45.
- 51 Foa EB, Asnaani A, Zang Y, *et al.* Psychometrics of the Child PTSD Symptom Scale for DSM-5 for Trauma-Exposed Children and Adolescents. *J Clin Child Adolesc Psychol* 2018;47:38–46.
- 52 Scheeringa MS. Development of a Brief Screen for Symptoms of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder in Young Children: The Young Child PTSD Screen. *J Dev Behav Pediatr* 2019;40:105–11.
- 53 Snyder CR, Hoza B, Pelham WE, *et al.* The development and validation of the Children's Hope Scale. *J Pediatr Psychol* 1997;22:399–421.
- 54 Varni JW, Sherman SA, Burwinkle TM, *et al.* The PedsQL Family Impact Module: preliminary reliability and validity. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2004;2:55.
- 55 Campbell-Sills L, Stein MB. Psychometric analysis and refinement of the Connor-davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC): Validation of a 10-item measure of resilience. *J Trauma Stress* 2007;20:1019–28.
- 56 Marteau TM, Bekker H. The development of a six-item short-form of the state scale of the Spielberger State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI). *Br J Clin Psychol* 1992;31:301–6.
- 57 Spielberger CD, Gorsuch R, Lushene R, *et al.* *Manual for the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1983.
- 58 Löwe B, Wahl I, Rose M, *et al.* A 4-item measure of depression and anxiety: validation and standardization of the Patient Health Questionnaire-4 (PHQ-4) in the general population. *J Affect Disord* 2010;122:86–95.
- 59 Yu L, Buysse DJ, Germain A. Development of short forms from the PROMIS. *Behav Sleep Med* 2011;10:6–24.
- 60 Weathers FW, Litz BT, Keane TM, *et al.* The PTSD checklist for DSM-5 (PCL-5) – standard. 2013. Available: <https://www.ptsd.va.gov/professional/assessment/adult-sr/ptsd-checklist.asp>
- 61 Kaur N, Porter B, LeardMann CA, *et al.* Evaluation of a modified version of the Posttraumatic Growth Inventory-Short Form. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2017;17:69.
- 62 Joseph S, Becker S, Becker F, *et al.* Assessment of caring and its effects in young people: development of the Multidimensional Assessment of Caring Activities Checklist (MACA-YC18) and the Positive and Negative Outcomes of Caring Questionnaire (PANOC-YC20) for young carers. *Child Care Health Dev* 2009;35:510–20.
- 63 Clarke V, Braun V. Encyclopedia of critical psychology. In: Teo T, ed. *Thematic analysis*. New York, NY: Springer, 2014: 1947–52.
- 64 Watson RS, Asaro LA, Hutchins L, *et al.* Risk Factors for Functional Decline and Impaired Quality of Life after Pediatric Respiratory Failure. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2019;200:900–9.
- 65 Abshire M, Dinglas VD, Cajita MIA, *et al.* Participant retention practices in longitudinal clinical research studies with high retention rates. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2017;17:30.
- 66 Robinson KA, Dinglas VD, Sukrithan V, *et al.* Updated systematic review identifies substantial number of retention strategies: using more strategies retains more study participants. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2015;68:1481–7.
- 67 Killien EY, Zimmerman JJ, Di Gennaro JL, *et al.* Association of Illness Severity With Family Outcomes Following Pediatric Septic Shock. *Crit Care Explor* 2022;4:e0716.
- 68 Zorko DJ, McNally JD, Rochweg B, *et al.* Defining Pediatric Chronic Critical Illness: A Scoping Review. *Pediatr Crit Care Med* 2023;24:e91–103.
- 69 Voiriot G, Oualha M, Pierre A, *et al.* Chronic critical illness and post-intensive care syndrome: from pathophysiology to clinical challenges. *Ann Intensive Care* 2022;12:58.
- 70 Needham DM, Sepulveda KA, Dinglas VD, *et al.* Core Outcome Measures for Clinical Research in Acute Respiratory Failure Survivors. An International Modified Delphi Consensus Study. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2017;196:1122–30.
- 71 Turnbull AE, Rabiee A, Davis WE, *et al.* Outcome Measurement in ICU Survivorship Research From 1970 to 2013: A Scoping Review of 425 Publications. *Crit Care Med* 2016;44:1267–77.
- 72 Fink EL, Maddux AB, Pinto N, *et al.* A Core Outcome Set for Pediatric Critical Care. *Crit Care Med* 2020;48:1819–28.
- 73 Pinto NP, Maddux AB, Dervan LA, *et al.* A Core Outcome Measurement Set for Pediatric Critical Care. *Pediatr Crit Care Med* 2022;23:893–907.
- 74 Brueton VC, Tierney JF, Stenning S, *et al.* Strategies to improve retention in randomised trials: a Cochrane systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ Open* 2014;4:e003821.
- 75 Edwards PJ, Roberts I, Clarke MJ, *et al.* Methods to increase response to postal and electronic questionnaires. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2009;2009:MR000008.
- 76 Pulham RA, Wray J, Feinstein Y, *et al.* Feasibility and Acceptability of Methods to Collect Follow-Up Information From Parents 12 Months After Their Child's Emergency Admission to Pediatric Intensive Care. *Pediatr Crit Care Med* 2019;20:e199–207.
- 77 Gildea MR, Moler FW, Page K, *et al.* Methods Used to Maximize Follow-Up: Lessons Learned From The Therapeutic Hypothermia After Pediatric Cardiac Arrest Trials. *Pediatr Crit Care Med* 2020;21:4–11.
- 78 Signorelli C, Wakefield CE, Fardell JE, *et al.* The impact of long-term follow-up care for childhood cancer survivors: A systematic review. *Crit Rev Oncol Hematol* 2017;114:131–8.
- 79 Chan T, Rodean J, Richardson T, *et al.* Pediatric Critical Care Resource Use by Children with Medical Complexity. *J Pediatr* 2016;177:197–203.
- 80 Edwards JD, Houtrow AJ, Vasilevskis EE, *et al.* Chronic conditions among children admitted to U.S. pediatric intensive care units: their prevalence and impact on risk for mortality and prolonged length of stay*. *Crit Care Med* 2012;40:2196–203.
- 81 Killien EY, Watson RS, Zimmerman JJ. Inherent value of baseline measures when assessing the trajectory of health-related quality of life among children surviving critical illness. *Intensive Care Med* 2018;44:1979–81.
- 82 Pinto NP, Berg RA, Zuppa AF, *et al.* Improvement in Health-Related Quality of Life After Community Acquired Pediatric Septic Shock. *Front Pediatr* 2021;9:675374.
- 83 Cunha F, Almeida-Santos L, Teixeira-Pinto A, *et al.* Health-related quality of life of pediatric intensive care survivors. *J Pediatr (Rio J)* 2012;88:25–32.
- 84 Heneghan JA, Reeder RW, Dean JM, *et al.* Characteristics and Outcomes of Critical Illness in Children With Feeding and Respiratory Technology Dependence. *Pediatr Crit Care Med* 2019;20:417–25.
- 85 Manning JC, Latour JM, Curley MAQ, *et al.* Study protocol for a multicentre longitudinal mixed methods study to explore the Outcomes of ChildrEn and fAmilies in the first year after paediatric Intensive Care: the OCEANIC study. *BMJ Open* 2020;10:e038974.
- 86 Rahmaty Z, Manning JC, Perez M-H, *et al.* Post Intensive Care Syndrome in Swiss Paediatric survivors and their Families (PICSS-PF): a national, multicentre, longitudinal study protocol. *BMJ Open* 2023;13:e076023.
- 87 Poh P-F, Lee JH, Manning JC, *et al.* Singapore's health outcomes after critical illness in kids: A study protocol exploring health outcomes of families 6 months after critical illness. *J Adv Nurs* 2021;77:3531–41.
- 88 Heneghan JA, Pollack MM. Morbidity: Changing the Outcome Paradigm for Pediatric Critical Care. *Pediatr Clin North Am* 2017;64:1147–65.
- 89 Peters MJ, Argent A, Festa M, *et al.* The intensive care medicine clinical research agenda in paediatrics. *Intensive Care Med* 2017;43:1210–24.
- 90 Tamburro RF, Jenkins TL, Kochanek PM. Strategic Planning for Research in Pediatric Critical Care. *Pediatr Crit Care Med* 2016;17:e539–42.

PICS-P PROTOCOL PAPER

SUPPLEMENTARY FILES

SUPPLEMENTARY FILE 1: DESCRIPTION OF SURVEY MEASURES	2
Primary Outcome	2
Secondary Outcomes	3
Parent Proxy-Report for Child.....	3
Parent Proxy-Report for Family	4
Parent Self-Report	4
Patient Self-Report.....	6
Sibling Self-Report	7
SUPPLEMENTARY FILE 2: FUNCTIONAL STATUS SCALE – PARENT PROXY- REPORT	8
REFERENCES	12

PICS-P PROTOCOL PAPER

SUPPLEMENTARY FILE 1: DESCRIPTION OF SURVEY MEASURES

Primary Outcome

- **PedsQL (Pediatric Quality of Life Inventory) 4.0 Generic Core(1) or Infant Scales(2)**

PedsQL 4.0 Generic Core Scales for children ≥ 2 years using **parent proxy-report**: 21-23 items, depending on age, with 4 domains including physical, emotional, social, and school functioning. Respondent indicates how much of a problem each item has been over the recall period on a scale of 0 = "Never a problem" to 4 = "Almost always a problem." Items are reverse scored, averaged, and transformed to a scale of 0-100. Higher scores indicate fewer problems. In addition to individual scale scores, the total score (primary outcome; mean of 4 scale scores), physical health summary score (physical functioning scale score), and psychosocial health summary score (mean of emotional, social, and school functioning items) are calculated.

PedsQL Infant Scales for children < 2 years using parent proxy-report: 36-45 items, depending on age, with 5 domains including physical functioning, physical symptoms, emotional functioning, social functioning, and cognitive functioning.

Both sets of instruments demonstrate validity and reliability,(3-5) have been widely used in PICU populations,(6) can be completed in 5-7 minutes,(5) and discriminate between healthy children and those with acute and chronic health conditions.(7-9) Norms based on large community samples exist for U.S. children, including 9,467 healthy children,(7) 3,652 children with a chronic health condition,(8) condition-specific results for $> 2,500$ children with 10 different chronic conditions (e.g., asthma, cancer, cerebral palsy, end-stage renal disease),(9) and $> 5,000$ children and young adults with diabetes.(10)

APPROVED ADAPTATION FOR PICS-p: For each question, a "Does not apply to my child" option was added. If selected, an open text box is provided so that parents can explain why one or more of the items does not apply to their child.

PICS-P PROTOCOL PAPER

Secondary Outcomes**Parent Proxy-Report for Child**

- **PedsQL Multidimensional Fatigue Scale Version 3.0(4)**
18-item scale encompassing 3 domains: general fatigue, sleep/rest fatigue, and cognitive fatigue. Respondent indicates how much of a problem each item has been during the recall period. Child self-report is available for ages 8-12 and 13-17 years and parent proxy-report is available for ages 2-4, 5-7, 8-12, and 13-17 years. Items for each form are identical, differing in developmentally appropriate language. Format, instructions, Likert response scale, and scoring method are identical to the PedsQL 4.0 Generic Core Scales, with higher scores indicating fewer fatigue symptoms.
APPROVED ADAPTATION FOR PICS-p: For each question, a “Does not apply to my child” option was added. If selected, an open text box is provided so that parents can explain why one or more of the items does not apply to their child.
 - **PedsQL Cognitive Functioning Scale(11)**
6-item scale assessing cognitive functioning. Respondent indicates how much of a problem each item has been during the recall period. Child self-report is available for ages 8-12 and 13-17 years, and parent proxy-report is available for ages 2-4, 5-7, 8-12, and 13-17 years. Items for each form are identical, differing in developmentally appropriate language. The format, Likert response scale, and scoring method are identical to the PedsQL 4.0 Generic Core Scales, with higher scores indicating fewer cognitive problems.
APPROVED ADAPTATION FOR PICS-p: For each question, a “Does not apply to my child” option was added. If selected, an open text box is provided so that parents can explain why one or more of the items does not apply to their child.
 - **Survey of Well-being of Young Children (SWYC)(12)**
10-item developmental screening tool for children <5 years, with 12 versions depending on age. Developmental milestones questions include indicators of fine and gross motor, language, social, and cognitive development. Parents often describe behaviors that approximate a milestone before their child manifests the full behavior. To reflect this, the three response options are 0 = “Not yet,” 1 = “Somewhat,” and 2 = “Very much.” Validity has been assessed via comparison with the Ages & Stages Questionnaire, 3rd Edition (ASQ-3)(13) and previous diagnoses of developmental delay per parent report.
 - **Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ)(14, 15)**
25-item behavioral screening tool used to evaluate emotional symptoms, conduct problems, hyperactivity/inattention, peer relationship problems, and prosocial behavior. Quantifies low, medium, and high risk of emotional, behavioral, hyperactivity, and concentration disorders, or any disorder.
 - **Young Child PTSD Screen – Revised PICU (YCPS^{R-PICU})(16, 17)**
6-item instrument that quickly screens for PTSD in children 3 years and older. This screener incorporates DSM-5(18) criteria and is the only known short screener for very young children (<6 years). A 3-point Likert scale is utilized to assess each item, where 0 = “No,” 1 = “A little,” and 2 = “A lot.” The YCPS has demonstrated 100% positive and negative predictive value as a PTSD screener. A positive YCPS includes 2 items endorsed within the screener. We are using a modified version of the YCPS, the Young Child PTSD Screen – Revised PICU (YCPS^{R-PICU}), which situates the PICU stay as the traumatic event.
-

PICS-P PROTOCOL PAPER

-
- **Functional Status Scale (FSS)**(19, 20)
Valid and reliable assessment method developed and validated by the Collaborative Pediatric Critical Care Research Network (CPCCRN) to quantify functional status. The FSS includes 6 domains: mental status, sensory functioning, communication, motor function, feeding, and respiratory. Domain scores range from 1 = “Normal” to 5 = “Very severe dysfunction” with total scores ranging from 6-30. It was selected due to ease of administration, granularity, and objectivity of assessment compared to other available methods and has been used in other outcome studies including in over 10,000 patients in the CPCCRN Trichotomous Outcomes In Pediatric Critical Care (TOPICC) study. (19, 21)
APPROVED ADAPTATION FOR PICS-p: The word “normal” was removed and changed to phrases such as “like other children of a similar age.” See Supplementary File 2.
 - **Pediatric Cerebral Performance Category (PCPC) and Pediatric Overall Performance Category (POPC)**(22-24)
Quantifies short-term cognitive impairment and functional morbidity. The POPC scale is dependent on the PCPC scale. Scores range from 1-6 for both scales with 1 = “No disability,” 2 = “Mild disability,” up to 6 = “Brain death.” Studies of patients with scores 1-4 (No disability to Severe disability) at PICU discharge, hospital discharge, and 1- and 6-month follow-up show association with performance on neurocognitive and developmental testing.(22-25)
APPROVED ADAPTATION FOR PICS-p: The word “normal” was removed and changed to “on target for age.” The word “disability” was removed and changed to “impairment.” The words “conscious,” “coma,” and “brain death” were changed to words such as “awake,” “unaware,” and “unresponsive.”
-

Parent Proxy-Report for Family

- **PedsQL Family Impact Module (FIM) Version 2.0**(26)
36-item scale that measures the impact of pediatric health conditions on family functioning. It includes 8 dimensions (physical, emotional, social, and cognitive functioning; communication; worry; daily activities; family relationships). The Parent Health-Related Quality of Life Summary Score is computed as the sum of the physical, emotional, social, and cognitive functioning scale scores and the Family Functioning Summary Score is the sum of the daily activities and family relationships scale scores.
-

Parent Self-Report

- **The Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC-10)**(27)
10-item measure that quantifies the level of self-perceived resilience, defined as the ability to bounce back after an adverse event. Items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale (0-4), with higher scores reflecting greater resiliency. This scale has efficient measurement (e.g., low burden, short completion time) and excellent psychometric properties.
-

PICS-P PROTOCOL PAPER

-
- **State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI-40)**
The Spielberger STAI Form Y(28) is a well-established self-report scale comprised of 2 independent scales each consisting of 20-items – state and trait anxiety scales. Each scale uses a sixth grade reading level. State anxiety is transient anxiety directly related to an adverse situation. Trait anxiety is an individual’s anxiety level as defined by their inherent characteristics experienced on a daily basis, not reliant on an event (i.e., the PICU admission) and includes items such as “I worry too much over something that really doesn’t matter.” Each item is assessed on a 4-point Likert scale, from 1 = “Almost never” to 4 = “Almost always.” Scores range from 20-80 with higher scores indicating higher state or trait anxiety.
 - **State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI-6)(29)**
6-item questionnaire that assesses the symptoms of anxiety. It is a short version of the Spielberger State Anxiety Scale.
 - **Patient Health Questionnaire-4 (PHQ-4)(30)**
Brief, 4-item measure of depression and anxiety. Scores are strongly associated with multiple domains of functional impairment; the anxiety and depression subscales make unique overall contributions to the PHQ-4, both in terms of factorial and criterion validity. Results indicate that anxiety has a substantial independent effect on functioning, even more so when present with depression.
 - **PROMIS Sleep Disturbance – Short Form 4a and Sleep-Related Impairment – Short Form 4a (31)**
8-item measure that assess qualitative aspects of sleep and wake function to gauge the severity of sleep-wake problems in those with and without diagnosed sleep disorders. The sleep disturbance scale considers sleep patterns, while the sleep-related impairment form considers effects of sleep disturbance on daytime function. Short forms were developed based on computerized adaptive simulations and clinical judgement from content experts and demonstrate both validity and reliability. Each question is scored on a 5-point Likert scale. Raw scores range from 4-20 with lower scores indicating more sleep disturbance or sleep-related impairment.
 - **PTSD Checklist for DSM-5 (PCL-5)(32)**
20-item measure that assesses the presence and severity of PTSD symptoms. The items correspond with DSM-5(21) criteria for PTSD. It can be used to screen individuals for PTSD, quantify and monitor symptoms over time, and assist in making a provisional or temporary diagnosis of PTSD. This measure is valid and reliable, useful in quantifying PTSD symptom severity, and sensitive to change over time.(33, 34) Severity can be determined by adding scores of each item together to determine a total score (range 0-80). A total score ≥ 33 is a reasonable value for provisional PTSD diagnosis and suggests the patient needs further assessment to confirm the PTSD diagnosis.
 - **Posttraumatic Growth Inventory – Short Form (PTGI-SF)(35)**
10-item measure used to assess posttraumatic growth, or positive psychological change after a traumatic event. It is a reliable measure that compares psychological well-being of an individual pre- and post-trauma (i.e., PICU hospitalization). Higher scores correlate to greater posttraumatic growth. It is useful for determining how successful individuals are in strengthening their sense of self, sense of others, and the meaning of events when coping with the aftermath of trauma.
-

PICS-P PROTOCOL PAPER

Patient Self-Report

- **PedsQL 4.0 Generic Core(1)**
Described above.
- **PedsQL Multidimensional Fatigue Scale Version 3.0(4)**
Described above.
- **PedsQL Cognitive Functioning Scale(11)**
Described above.
- **PedsQL Pediatric Pain Questionnaire(36)**
Respondents identify a point on a 100 mm line that best shows their current pain level and the worst pain experienced during the recall period. Anchors include “No hurting, no discomfort, or no pain” and “Hurting a whole lot, very uncomfortable, severe pain.”
- **PROMIS Pediatric Pain Interference(37)**
8-item scale assessing consequences of pain on relevant aspects of one’s life, including the extent to which pain hinders engagement with social, cognitive, emotional, physical, and recreational activities. Respondents are asked to evaluate each item’s burden during the recall period. A 5-point Likert scale is utilized to assess each item, from 1 = “Never” to 5 = “Almost always.”
- **PROMIS Pediatric Sleep Disturbance – Short Form 4a and Pediatric Sleep-Related Impairment – Short Form 4a (38, 39)**
8-item measure that assess qualitative aspects of sleep and wake function to gauge the severity of sleep-wake problems in those with and without diagnosed sleep disorders. The sleep disturbance scale considers sleep patterns, while the sleep-related impairment form considers effects of sleep disturbance on daytime function. Questions were developed by panel of clinical experts, children, and parents. The measures correlate with existing measures of pediatric sleep health, demonstrate increased sleep disturbance and sleep-related impairment in those with diagnosed sleep disorders, and are reliable. Each question is scored on a 5-point Likert scale. Raw scores range from 4-20 with lower scores indicating more sleep disturbance or sleep-related impairment.
- **Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ)(14, 15)**
Described above.
- **The Child PTSD Symptom Scale for DSM-5 Self-Report (CPSS-5 SR)(40)**
27-item screening tool modified to include DSM-5 criteria.(21) Twenty items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale of frequency and severity, from 0 = “Not at all” to 4 = “Almost always (6 or more time a week).” An additional 7 items, rated binarily (yes/no), assess impairment of endorsed symptoms on daily functioning such as “Fun things you want to do.” Children are asked to use one-month recall to answer questions. This scale is valid and reliable with good test-retest reliability.
- **Children’s Hope Scale (CHS)(41)**
Brief, 6-item measure of children’s perceptions that their goals can be met. This scale has been extensively validated in healthy and ill children and young people, aged 8-17 years. This scale has shown good internal consistency and test-retest reliability.

PICS-P PROTOCOL PAPER

Sibling Self-Report

- **PedsQL 4.0 Generic Core**(1)
Described above.
- **Multidimensional Assessment of Caring Activities (MACA-YC18)**(42)
18-item measure that provides a score of the total amount of caring activity undertaken by a young person, as well as 6 subscale scores for domestic tasks, household management, personal care, emotional care, sibling care, and financial/practical care. Higher scores indicate greater levels of caring activity.(42, 43)
- **Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ)**(14, 15)
Described above.
- **Children's Hope Scale (CHS)**(41)
Described above.

Definition of abbreviations: DSM-5, Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 5th Edition; PICU, pediatric intensive care unit; PTSD, post-traumatic stress disorder.

PICS-P PROTOCOL PAPER

SUPPLEMENTARY FILE 2: FUNCTIONAL STATUS SCALE – PARENT PROXY-REPORT

Adapted with permission from Murray M. Pollack, MD (personal communication to MAQ Curley on November 8, 2023) to allow for parent proxy-reporting.

Baseline: The following questions ask about your child's status in 6 areas. For each area, select one answer that best describes your child's status before their current illness that brought them to the intensive care unit. Please compare your child with other children of a similar age, not to your child's status in the past.

PICU Discharge: The following questions ask about your child's status in 6 areas. For each area, select one answer that best describes your child's status TODAY (around the time of your child's PICU discharge). Please compare your child with other children of a similar age, not to your child's status in the past or anticipated future status.

Post-PICU Discharge: The following questions ask about your child's status in 6 areas. For each area, select one answer that best describes your child's status TODAY. Please compare your child with other children of a similar age, not to your child's status in the past or anticipated future status.

What is your child's level of awareness, alertness, mood, and thinking ability?
(select one)

- 1) My child sleeps at usual expected times (nighttime, naps) and is alert when awake, like other children of the same age.
- 2) My child is unusually sleepy most of the day but can be woken up by touch, movement, or speech. Sometimes my child is difficult to wake up. After being woken by touch, movement, or speech, my child is alert and reacts similarly to other children of the same age.
- 3) When awake, my child is not alert and is instead sluggish, inactive, slow, very tired, sometimes almost lifeless, or seems "half asleep." Because of not being alert, my child has trouble answering questions or responding to directions in a way that I expect.
- 4) My child is mostly "asleep," not responding to other people or very difficult to wake up. My child requires very strong touch or a very loud voice to be woken up. My child is very slow to respond like I would expect for a child of a similar age even after being aroused or woken up.
- 5) My child is not conscious. My child does not respond in a way to touch, movement, or speech like I would expect of a similar aged child and is unaware of the surrounding environment. Although I may understand my child's needs, my child does not follow my directions or communicate in a way I think other children would.

PICS-P PROTOCOL PAPER

99) None of the above are appropriate.

If selected, open text box appears: If none of these categories seem appropriate, please describe your child's mental status.

How are your child's hearing, vision, and ability to respond to touch? (select one)

- 1) My child's hearing, vision, and reaction to touch are like other children of a similar age. My child has fine or acceptable vision in both eyes, either without glasses or using glasses. My child hears like other children of a similar age in both ears either without hearing aids or using hearing aids.
- 2) Although I am not certain, my child may be blind in one or both eyes. Although I am not certain, my child may be deaf in one or both ears.
- 3) My child is blind in at least one eye OR deaf in at least one ear.
- 4) My child is blind in at least one eye AND also deaf in at least one ear.
- 5) My child does not respond to touch or feel pain like other children of a similar age or my child does not sense pain or touch at all. When sensing touch or pain, my child does not know what is happening.

99) None of the above are appropriate.

If selected, open text box appears: If none of these categories seem appropriate, please describe your child's hearing and vision.

How does your child communicate with you and others? (select one)

- 1) My child communicates like other children of a similar age. My child communicates using speech or making verbal noises, making facial expressions, or using hand gestures.
- 2) My child communicates with others less frequently and with less intensity than other children of a similar age. Although not exactly like I expect of children of a similar age, my child's communication is not severely impaired. For example, my child may whimper or cry with a soiled diaper, but not as much as other children of the same age. Similarly, my child may be irritable or cry when hungry but not as much as other children of a similar age.
- 3) My child does not seek attention like children of a similar age. My child does not try to get attention when uncomfortable or upset. For example, with a soiled diaper, my child may cry or whimper very little. Similarly, my child will not try to get attention by crying or doing other things. Sometimes it is hard to tell when my child is in pain. My child does not seem to need to be held or comforted.

PICS-P PROTOCOL PAPER

- 4) My child does not react to things causing discomfort by trying to attract attention or asking for help. For example, my child will not cry with a soiled diaper. Similarly, my child may not seek attention when in pain. My child does not need to be held or comforted.
- 5) My child does not communicate by gestures, facial expressions, or vocalization.
- 99) None of the above are appropriate.
If selected, open text box appears: If none of these categories seem appropriate, please describe how your child communicates.

How do your child's arms and legs function? (select one)

- 1) My child's arms, legs, hands, and feet function like other children of the same age.
- 2) One of my child's arms, legs, hands, or feet does not function as expected of children of a similar age but function could improve over time. Reasons that function is different may include the presence of a cast, paralysis, amputation, or any condition preventing function that I expect.
- 3) Two or more of my child's arms, legs, hands, or feet do not function as expected of children of a similar age but function could improve over time. Reasons that function is different may include the presence of a cast, paralysis, amputation, or any condition preventing function that I expect.
- 4) My child's head flops around more than other children of a similar age. My child cannot hold their head up like other children of a similar age when being held, sitting upright, or being pulled from laying down to sitting.
- 5) All my child's limbs are either stiff or paralyzed. With stimulus, my child sometimes gets a stiff body posture with arms and feet stretched out or arms folded onto the chest or belly. My child is paralyzed.
- 99) None of the above are appropriate.
If selected, open text box appears: If none of these categories seem appropriate, please describe how your child's arms and legs function.

How does your child get nutrition? (select one)

- 1) My child eats like other children of the same age.
- 2) My child can eat but needs some help, devices, or formulas that other children of a similar age do not need. Reasons may include problems of the mouth, hands or arms, or conditions preventing function that I expect. My child may need special nipples, special bottles, special formulas, or thickened foods.

PICS-P PROTOCOL PAPER

- 3) My child takes some food by mouth but also gets some nutrition by using a feeding tube. These tubes could be inserted from the mouth or nose and go into the stomach or small bowel. These tubes can also go directly through the belly wall into the stomach. These tubes are called OG, OJ, OD, NG, NJ, ND, GT, or GJ tubes.
- 4) My child gets some daily nutrition intravenously. My child also gets some nutrition each day either by mouth or by tube feedings.
- 5) All of my child's nutrition is given intravenously without any food by mouth or tube.
- 99) None of the above are appropriate.
If selected, open text box appears: If none of these categories seem appropriate, please describe the way your child gets nutrition.

Does your child need help with breathing or need oxygen? (select one)

- 1) My child does not need or use oxygen or any device for breathing.
- 2) My child uses extra oxygen through a tube during the day either by nose or mouth. These tubes are connected to an oxygen tank or to a device that concentrates oxygen from the air. Even if not needing extra oxygen, my child sometimes may require the use of a suction machine to clear their airway.
- 3) My child has a tracheostomy. A tracheostomy is a tube in the neck that allows oxygen to be given directly into the airway and lungs. My child may get extra oxygen or humidity through the tracheostomy.
- 4) My child uses a device to support breathing during part of the day or just at night. These devices include a continuous positive airway pressure device (called CPAP), a bi-level positive airway pressure device (BiPAP), or a ventilator.
- 5) My child requires either a bi-level positive airway pressure device (BiPAP) or a ventilator all day and night (24 hours per day, 7 days per week).
- 99) None of the above are appropriate.
If selected, open text box appears: If none of these categories seem appropriate, please describe your child's breathing.

PICS-P PROTOCOL PAPER

REFERENCES

1. Varni JW, Seid M, Kurtin PS. PedsQL 4.0: reliability and validity of the Pediatric Quality of Life Inventory Version 4.0 Generic Core Scales in healthy and patient populations. *Med Care*. 2001;39(8):800-12. doi: 10.1097/00005650-200108000-00006
2. Varni JW, Limbers CA, Neighbors K, et al. The PedsQL Infant Scales: feasibility, internal consistency reliability, and validity in healthy and ill infants. *Qual Life Res*. 2011;20(1):45-55. doi: 10.1007/s11136-010-9730-5.
3. Varni JW, Seid M, Knight TS, et al. The PedsQL 4.0 Generic Core Scales: sensitivity, responsiveness, and impact on clinical decision-making. *J Behav Med*. 2002;25(2):175-93. doi: 10.1023/A:1014836921812.
4. Varni JW, Burwinkle TM, Katz ER, et al. The PedsQL in pediatric cancer: reliability and validity of the Pediatric Quality of Life Inventory Generic Core Scales, Multidimensional Fatigue Scale, and Cancer Module. *Cancer*. 2002;94(7):2090-106. doi: 10.1002/cncr.10428.
5. Aspesberro F, Fesinmeyer MD, Zhou C, et al. Construct validity and responsiveness of the Pediatric Quality of Life Inventory 4.0 Generic Core Scales and Infant Scales in the PICU. *Pediatr Crit Care Med*. 2016;17(6):e272-9. doi: 10.1097/PCC.0000000000000727.
6. Killien EY, Loftis LL, Clark JD, et al. Health-related quality of life outcome measures for children surviving critical care: a scoping review. *Qual Life Res*. 2021;30(12):3383-94. doi: 10.1007/s11136-021-02928-9.

PICS-P PROTOCOL PAPER

7. Varni JW, Burwinkle TM, Seid M, Skarr D. The PedsQL 4.0 as a pediatric population health measure: feasibility, reliability, and validity. *Ambul Pediatr*. 2003;3(6):329-41. doi: 10.1367/1539-4409(2003)003<0329:tpaapp>2.0.co;2.
8. Varni JW, Limbers CA, Burwinkle TM. Parent proxy-report of their children's health-related quality of life: an analysis of 13,878 parents' reliability and validity across age subgroups using the PedsQL 4.0 Generic Core Scales. *Health Qual Life Outcomes*. 2007;5:2. doi: 10.1186/1477-7525-5-2.
9. Varni JW, Limbers CA, Burwinkle TM. Impaired health-related quality of life in children and adolescents with chronic conditions: a comparative analysis of 10 disease clusters and 33 disease categories/severities utilizing the PedsQL 4.0 Generic Core Scales. *Health Qual Life Outcomes*. 2007;5:43. doi: 10.1186/1477-7525-5-43.
10. Hilliard ME, Lawrence JM, Modi AC, et al. Identification of minimal clinically important difference scores of the PedsQL in children, adolescents, and young adults with type 1 and type 2 diabetes. *Diabetes Care*;36(7):1891-7. doi: 10.2337/dc12-1708
11. Varni JW, Limbers CA, Sorensen LG, et al. PedsQL™ Cognitive Functioning Scale in pediatric liver transplant recipients: feasibility, reliability, and validity. *Qual Life Res*. 2011;20(6):913-21. doi: 10.1007/s11136-010-9823-1.
12. Perrin C, Visco K, Mattern K. The Survey of Well-Being of Young Children (SWYC) User's Manual, Version 1.01. Boston, MA: Tufts Medical Center, 2016.
13. Squires J, Bricker, D. Ages & Stages Questionnaires, Third Edition (ASQ-3). Baltimore, MD: Brookes Publishing, 2009.

PICS-P PROTOCOL PAPER

14. Goodman R. Psychometric properties of the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 2001;40(11):1337-45. doi: 10.1097/00004583-200111000-00015.
15. Goodman R. The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire: a research note. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry*. 1997;38(5):581-6. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.1997.tb01545.x.
16. Scheeringa MS. Development of a brief screen for symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder in young children: the Young Child PTSD Screen. *J Dev Behav Pediatr*. 2019;40(2):105-11. doi: 10.1097/DBP.0000000000000639.
17. Scheeringa M. Young Child PTSD Screen Tulane University: New Orleans, LA, 2019.
18. American Psychiatric Association. *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*. 5th ed. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association, 2013.
19. Aspesberro F, Mangione-Smith R, Zimmerman JJ. Health-related quality of life following pediatric critical illness. *Intensive Care Med*. 2015;41(7):1235-46. doi: 10.1007/s00134-015-3780-7.
20. Pollack MM, Holubkov R, Glass P, et al. Functional Status Scale: New pediatric outcome measure. *Pediatrics*. 2009;124(1):e18-28. doi: 10.1542/peds.2008-1987.
21. Pollack MM, Holubkov R, Funai T, et al. Simultaneous prediction of new morbidity, mortality, and survival without new morbidity from pediatric intensive care: a new paradigm for outcomes assessment. *Crit Care Med*. 2015;43(8):1699-709. doi: 10.1097/CCM.0000000000001081.
22. Fiser DH, Long N, Roberson PK, et al. Relationship of Pediatric Overall Performance Category and Pediatric Cerebral Performance Category scores at

PICS-P PROTOCOL PAPER

- pediatric intensive care unit discharge with outcome measures collected at hospital discharge and 1- and 6-month follow-up assessments. *Crit Care Med.* 2000;28(7):2616-20. doi: 10.1097/00003246-200007000-00072.
23. Fiser DH, Tilford JM, Roberson PK. Relationship of illness severity and length of stay to functional outcomes in the pediatric intensive care unit: a multi-institutional study. *Crit Care Med.* 2000;28(4):1173-9. doi: 10.1097/00003246-200004000-00043.
24. Fiser DH. Assessing the outcome of pediatric intensive care. *J Pediatr.* 1992;121(1):68-74. doi: 10.1016/s0022-3476(05)82544-2.
25. Fuchs S, Lewis RJ. Tools for the measurement of outcome after minor head injury in children: summary from the Ambulatory Pediatric Association/EMSC Outcomes Research Conference. *Acad Emerg Med.* 2003;10(4):368-75. doi: 10.1111/j.1553-2712.2003.tb01351.x.
26. Varni JW, Sherman SA, Burwinkle TM, et al. The PedsQL Family Impact Module: preliminary reliability and validity. *Health Qual Life Outcomes.* 2004;2:55. doi: 10.1186/1477-7525-2-55.
27. Campbell-Sills L, Stein MB. Psychometric analysis and refinement of the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC): validation of a 10-item measure of resilience. *J Trauma Stress.* 2007;20(6):1019-28. doi: 10.1002/jts.20271.
28. Spielberger CD, Gorsuch R, Lushene, R, et al. *Manual for the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory.* Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1983.
29. Marteau TM, Bekker H. The development of a six-item short-form of the state scale of the Spielberger State—Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI). *Br J Clin Psychol.* 1992;31(3):301-6. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8260.1992.tb00997.x.

PICS-P PROTOCOL PAPER

30. Löwe B, Wahl I, Rose M, et al. A 4-item measure of depression and anxiety: validation and standardization of the Patient Health Questionnaire-4 (PHQ-4) in the general population. *J Affect Disord*. 2010;122(1-2):86-95. doi: 10.1016/j.jad.2009.06.019.
31. Yu L, Buysse DJ, Germain A, et al. Development of short forms from the PROMIS™ Sleep Disturbance and Sleep-Related Impairment item banks. *Behav Sleep Med*. 2011;10(1):6-24. doi: 10.1080/15402002.2012.636266.
32. Weathers FW, Litz BT, Keane TM, et al. The PTSD Checklist for DSM-5 (PCL-5) – Standard. <https://www.ptsd.va.gov/professional/assessment/adult-sr/ptsd-checklist.asp>2013.
33. Blevins CA, Weathers FW, Davis MT, et al. The posttraumatic stress disorder checklist for DSM-5. *J Trauma Stress*. 2015;28:489-98. doi: 10.1002/jts.22059.
34. Bovin MJ, Marx BP, Weathers FW, et al. Psychometric properties of the PTSD Checklist for Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders-Fifth Edition (PCL-5) in veterans. *Psychol Assess*. 2016;28(11):1379-91. doi: 10.1037/pas0000254.
35. Kaur N, Porter B, LeardMann CA, et al. Evaluation of a modified version of the Posttraumatic Growth Inventory-Short Form. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2017;17(1):69. doi: 10.1186/s12874-017-0344-2.
36. Sherman SA, Eisen S, Burwinkle TM, Varni JW. The PedsQL™ Present Functioning Visual Analogue Scales: preliminary reliability and validity. *Health Qual Life Outcomes*. 2006;4(1):75. doi: 10.1186/1477-7525-4-75.

PICS-P PROTOCOL PAPER

37. Varni JW, Stucky BD, Thissen D, et al. PROMIS Pediatric Pain Interference Scale: an Item Response Theory analysis of the Pediatric Pain item bank. *J Pain*. 2010;11(11):1109-19. doi: 10.1016/j.jpain.2010.02.005.
38. Bevans KB, Meltzer LJ, De La Motte A, et al. Qualitative development and content validation of the PROMIS pediatric sleep health items. *Behav Sleep Med*. 2019;17(5):657-71. doi: 10.1080/15402002.2018.1461102.
39. Forrest CB, Meltzer LJ, Marcus CL, et al. Development and validation of the PROMIS Pediatric Sleep Disturbance and Sleep-Related Impairment item banks. *Sleep*. 2018;41(6). doi: 10.1093/sleep/zsy054.
40. Foa EB, Asnaani A, Zang Y, et al. Psychometrics of the Child PTSD Symptom Scale for DSM-5 for trauma-exposed children and adolescents. *J Clin Child Adolesc Psychol*. 2018;47(1):38-46. doi: 10.1080/15374416.2017.1350962.
41. Snyder CR, Hoza B, Pelham WE, et al. The development and validation of the Children's Hope Scale. *J Pediatr Psychol*. 1997;22(3):399-421. doi: 10.1093/jpepsy/22.3.399.
42. Joseph S, Becker F, Becker S. Manual for Measures of Caring Activities and Outcomes for Children and Young People. Nottingham: The Princess Royal Trust for Carers in association with Young Carers International Research and Evaluation, School of Sociology and Social Policy, The University of Nottingham; 2009.
43. Joseph S, Becker S, Becker F, Regel S. Assessment of caring and its effects in young people: development of the Multidimensional Assessment of Caring Activities Checklist (MACA-YC18) and the Positive and Negative Outcomes of Caring

PICS-P PROTOCOL PAPER

Questionnaire (PANOC-YC20) for young carers. *Child Care Health Dev.*

2009;35(4):510-20. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2214.2009.00959.x.