International Research Journal of Education and Technology

Peer Reviewed Journal, ISSN 2581-7795

Impact Factor 5.007

Hemodynamic Monitoring and Early Warning Scores: Strengthening Clinical Judgment in Critical Care Nursing.

Jerlin Priya Lovelin Auguskani,Assistant Professor ,Nursing Department

University College of Al-Darb,Jazan University ,Jazan, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Abstract

Hemodynamic instability and delayed recognition of clinical deterioration continue to contribute significantly to morbidity and mortality in hospitalized patients. Early Warning Scores (EWS), including the National Early Warning Score 2 (NEWS2) and Modified Early Warning Score (MEWS), were developed to standardize detection of physiological deterioration and facilitate timely escalation. Simultaneously, hemodynamic monitoring—ranging from noninvasive blood pressure measurements to advanced invasive arterial and cardiac output monitoring—provides detailed physiologic insight essential for diagnosing and managing circulatory compromise. Contemporary evidence suggests that while EWS enhance risk stratification, their predictive performance varies across patient populations and clinical contexts (Goodacre et al., 2025; Mhd Yunin et al., 2025). Updated international guidelines emphasize integrating structured hemodynamic assessment with clinical reasoning for optimal management of shock and instability (Monnet et al., 2025). Emerging digital and artificial intelligence (AI)-enhanced early warning systems further refine detection but introduce operational challenges (Edelson et al., 2024; Ko et al., 2023). This article synthesizes current evidence (2022–2026) to propose a nursing-centered integrative framework combining hemodynamic monitoring and EWS to strengthen clinical judgment, improve escalation practices, and enhance patient outcomes in critical care and high-acuity settings.

Keywords: Hemodynamic monitoring, NEWS2, MEWS, Clinical deterioration, Critical care nursing, Shock, Rapid response systems, Clinical judgment

Introduction

Recognition of patient deterioration remains a central patient safety priority in acute and critical care environments. Physiological instability often manifests hours before catastrophic events such as cardiac arrest or multi-organ failure. Early Warning Scores (EWS) were developed to standardize bedside assessment and facilitate early intervention. The National Early Warning Score 2 (NEWS2), widely implemented across healthcare systems, uses weighted scoring of respiratory rate, oxygen saturation, systolic blood pressure, heart rate, temperature, and level of consciousness (Royal College of Physicians, 2023).

Although NEWS2 improves communication and escalation consistency, evidence indicates variability in predictive accuracy. Goodacre et al. (2025) found that certain patients requiring urgent treatment presented with relatively low NEWS2 scores, highlighting limitations when used as a standalone tool. Similarly, Mhd Yunin et al. (2025) reported that NEWS2 demonstrates prognostic value but requires contextual clinical interpretation.

Parallel to EWS development, advances in hemodynamic monitoring have transformed critical care. Updated ESICM guidelines emphasize structured hemodynamic assessment and monitoring strategies in managing circulatory shock (Monnet et al., 2025). For critical care nurses, integration of EWS with detailed hemodynamic assessment strengthens clinical judgment and supports timely, targeted intervention.

Hemodynamic Monitoring: Foundations and Contemporary Practice

Physiological Principles

Hemodynamic monitoring is grounded in the fundamental objective of ensuring adequate tissue perfusion and oxygen delivery to maintain cellular metabolism. Cardiovascular performance is determined by the interplay between preload, afterload, contractility, and heart rate. Cardiac output (CO), calculated as stroke volume multiplied by heart rate, remains a central determinant of systemic oxygen delivery (DO_2). However, adequate blood pressure alone does not guarantee sufficient microcirculatory perfusion. Therefore, assessment must extend beyond macrocirculatory parameters to include indicators of tissue oxygenation such as serum lactate, capillary refill time, skin perfusion, mental status changes, and urine output (Monnet et al., 2025).

Oxygen delivery depends on cardiac output and arterial oxygen content, which is influenced by hemoglobin concentration and arterial oxygen saturation. In states of circulatory shock, compensatory mechanisms initially preserve blood pressure despite declining perfusion. Tachycardia, peripheral vasoconstriction, and redistribution of blood flow may mask early hypoperfusion. Consequently, reliance solely on systolic blood pressure can delay recognition of shock states. Contemporary guidelines strongly advocate a multimodal assessment integrating clinical examination, laboratory markers, and hemodynamic data to obtain a comprehensive physiologic profile (Monnet et al., 2025).

Dynamic parameters such as pulse pressure variation (PPV) and stroke volume variation (SVV) are increasingly emphasized over static measures in predicting fluid responsiveness. These indices evaluate changes in stroke volume during mechanical ventilation and are more reliable indicators of preload responsiveness compared to isolated CVP values (Kulkarni et al., 2022). Thus, hemodynamic monitoring is shifting from pressure-based interpretation to flow- and perfusion-oriented evaluation.

Invasive Hemodynamic Monitoring

Invasive monitoring techniques provide high-resolution physiologic data in critically ill patients. Arterial catheterization enables continuous real-time blood pressure monitoring and frequent arterial blood sampling. This is particularly essential in patients receiving vasoactive infusions, experiencing rapid hemodynamic fluctuations, or requiring tight blood pressure targets. However, accurate interpretation depends on proper system setup. Transducer leveling at the phlebostatic axis, zero calibration, recognition of overdamping or underdamping, and waveform analysis are crucial nursing responsibilities (McEachron et al., 2025).

Arterial waveform morphology offers additional diagnostic insights. For example, a narrowed pulse pressure may indicate hypovolemia, whereas a widened pulse pressure may be seen in distributive shock. Dicrotic notch changes may reflect alterations in systemic vascular resistance. Skilled waveform analysis therefore enhances clinical reasoning beyond numeric values alone.

Advanced invasive modalities include pulmonary artery catheterization (PAC), which measures pulmonary artery pressures, pulmonary capillary wedge pressure (PCWP), mixed venous oxygen saturation (SvO_2), and cardiac output. Although PAC use has declined due to invasiveness and variable outcome benefits, it remains valuable in selected cardiogenic shock and complex heart failure cases (Baldetti, 2025). In cardiogenic shock, invasive monitoring assists in differentiating left- versus right-sided failure, optimizing inotrope therapy, and guiding mechanical circulatory support decisions.

Central venous pressure monitoring, historically used to guide fluid therapy, is now interpreted cautiously. Evidence demonstrates that CVP alone is a poor predictor of fluid responsiveness (Kulkarni et al., 2022). Instead, clinicians are encouraged to assess fluid responsiveness dynamically through passive leg raise tests, fluid challenges with stroke volume measurement, and echocardiographic evaluation (Monnet et al., 2025).

Invasive monitoring also carries risks, including infection, thrombosis, bleeding, and vascular injury. Therefore, nurses must balance clinical benefit against potential complications and adhere strictly to aseptic protocols and catheter maintenance bundles.

Noninvasive Monitoring

Noninvasive hemodynamic monitoring technologies are expanding rapidly and are increasingly applied beyond traditional ICU settings, including emergency departments and step-down units. These modalities aim to provide cardiac output estimation and perfusion assessment without the risks associated with invasive catheterization.

Bioreactance and bioimpedance devices estimate stroke volume and cardiac output by analyzing thoracic electrical signal changes during cardiac cycles. These systems are attractive for rapid bedside assessment, particularly in patients where invasive access is contraindicated. However, accuracy may be affected by arrhythmias, obesity, pleural effusion, or mechanical ventilation parameters (Beltrame et al., 2025).

Focused cardiac ultrasound (FoCUS) and bedside echocardiography have become essential noninvasive tools for rapid hemodynamic evaluation. Echocardiographic assessment allows visualization of ventricular function, volume status, pericardial effusion, and valvular abnormalities. When integrated into clinical protocols, echocardiography enhances early shock differentiation and targeted intervention (Monnet et al., 2025). Training programs increasingly equip critical care nurses and advanced practice nurses with basic ultrasound interpretation skills under interdisciplinary supervision.

Plethysmography-derived variability indices, such as the pleth variability index (PVI), also assist in predicting fluid responsiveness in mechanically ventilated patients. However, reliability decreases in spontaneously breathing individuals and those with arrhythmias (Beltrame et al., 2025).

Importantly, noninvasive modalities should complement—not replace—clinical assessment. Device readings must be interpreted within the broader clinical picture, including physical examination findings, laboratory values, and patient trajectory. Overreliance on automated outputs without contextual reasoning may lead to inappropriate interventions.

Integrative Perspective

The contemporary paradigm of hemodynamic monitoring emphasizes integration. Rather than viewing parameters in isolation, clinicians are encouraged to synthesize blood pressure trends, cardiac output data, perfusion markers, and response to interventions into a coherent physiological narrative. International guidelines reinforce the importance of individualized hemodynamic targets based on patient phenotype and dynamic response (Monnet et al., 2025).

For critical care nurses, this integration strengthens clinical judgment. Mastery of invasive and noninvasive modalities, coupled with a solid understanding of cardiovascular physiology, enhances early recognition of instability and supports precise therapeutic titration. As technology evolves, ongoing competency development remains essential to ensure safe and effective utilization of hemodynamic monitoring tools.

Early Warning Scores in Clinical Practice

Utility of NEWS2 and MEWS

Early Warning Scores standardize detection of deterioration and trigger graded escalation pathways. NEWS2 has demonstrated mortality risk stratification capability across diverse populations (Mhd Yunin et al., 2025). MEWS similarly supports prediction of adverse events in ward and ICU settings (Tan et al., 2022).

Predictive Performance and Limitations

Despite broad adoption, EWS are imperfect predictors. Goodacre et al. (2025) demonstrated that NEWS2 may underperform in detecting certain time-critical emergencies. Chen et al. (2025) reported that predictive performance varies over time, reinforcing the importance of trend analysis rather than single-score reliance.

In ICU populations, MEWS has been associated with readmission risk, particularly when integrated with rapid response systems (Tien et al., 2025). However, predictive accuracy remains context-dependent.

Digital and Artificial Intelligence Enhancements

Digitization of EWS improves documentation accuracy and monitoring frequency. Wong et al. (2024) found that digital EWS systems were associated with improved vital-sign observation compliance.

AI-enhanced systems offer improved predictive modeling. Ko et al. (2023) developed a deep-learning-based early warning model demonstrating enhanced sensitivity for deterioration prediction. However, implementation challenges include alert fatigue and workflow integration issues (Edelson et al., 2024).

Integrating Hemodynamic Monitoring and EWS: A Clinical Judgment Framework

The integration of Early Warning Scores (EWS) with hemodynamic monitoring represents a structured approach to strengthening clinical judgment in critical care nursing. While EWS serve as standardized screening tools for deterioration, hemodynamic assessment provides physiologic specificity. Effective integration requires disciplined measurement, contextual interpretation, rapid phenotyping, and timely escalation.

Measurement Accuracy

Accurate vital-sign measurement forms the foundation of any early warning system. Errors in respiratory rate counting, inappropriate blood pressure cuff sizing, or failure to recognize arterial line waveform artifacts can significantly alter EWS classification and subsequent escalation decisions (McEachron et al., 2025). Respiratory rate, often the earliest marker of deterioration, is frequently estimated rather than measured precisely, leading to under-recognition of early instability.

Similarly, automated oscillometric blood pressure devices may yield inaccurate readings in patients with arrhythmias, vasoconstriction, or severe hypotension. In such cases, confirmatory manual measurement or arterial line assessment is essential. Nurses must therefore verify abnormal values before escalation and reassess after intervention to ensure that trends reflect true physiologic change rather than measurement error.

Beyond numeric verification, contextual accuracy is equally important. Oxygen saturation readings, for example, must be interpreted alongside oxygen delivery method and fraction of inspired oxygen (FiO_2). A patient with stable SpO_2 on high-flow oxygen may be physiologically more unstable than a patient with similar saturation on room air. Thus, measurement accuracy extends beyond data collection to thoughtful interpretation.

Trend-Based Interpretation

Clinical deterioration is rarely abrupt; it evolves over time. Chen et al. (2025) emphasize the temporal dynamics of NEWS2 performance, demonstrating that predictive validity improves when trends are analyzed rather than relying solely on isolated scores. A rising NEWS2 from 3 to 6 over several hours may signal progressive deterioration even if individual parameters remain within borderline ranges.

Trend-based interpretation requires nurses to integrate serial measurements with patient context. Gradual tachycardia combined with narrowing pulse pressure may indicate evolving hypovolemia. Increasing oxygen requirements with stable blood pressure may signal impending respiratory failure. Subtle alterations in mentation can reflect early hypoperfusion before overt hypotension develops.

Electronic health records and digital EWS platforms support graphical trend visualization, enhancing clinical insight. However, technology cannot substitute for critical thinking. Nurses must continuously ask: *Is the patient improving, stable, or deteriorating?* and *Does the physiologic trajectory align with the underlying diagnosis?*

Hemodynamic Phenotyping

When EWS values escalate, rapid hemodynamic phenotyping becomes essential. Early identification of shock type facilitates targeted therapy and prevents inappropriate interventions.

Distributive shock, commonly septic in origin, is characterized by systemic vasodilation, relative hypotension, and warm peripheries in early stages. Elevated lactate levels and infection markers often accompany this pattern (Monnet et al., 2025).

Hypovolemic shock presents with tachycardia, decreased urine output, cool extremities, and narrowing pulse pressure. Causes include hemorrhage, dehydration, or third-spacing. Fluid responsiveness testing becomes critical in guiding resuscitation (Kulkarni et al., 2022).

Cardiogenic shock results from impaired myocardial contractility, leading to reduced cardiac output and pulmonary congestion. Clinical findings may include elevated jugular venous pressure, crackles on auscultation, and low mixed venous oxygen saturation. Invasive monitoring supports precise inotrope titration and mechanical support decisions (Baldetti, 2025).

Obstructive shock, such as pulmonary embolism, cardiac tamponade, or tension pneumothorax, presents with sudden hypotension and specific clinical signs. Recognition requires rapid bedside assessment and imaging confirmation.

Hemodynamic phenotyping integrates macrocirculatory data (blood pressure, cardiac output) with microcirculatory indicators (lactate, capillary refill). Contemporary guidelines emphasize that shock diagnosis should not rely solely on blood pressure thresholds but must incorporate perfusion markers and organ dysfunction signs (Monnet et al., 2025).

Dynamic Response Evaluation

An essential extension of phenotyping is evaluating response to intervention. After fluid administration, vasopressor initiation, or oxygen therapy escalation, nurses must reassess vital signs, urine output, mental status, and laboratory trends. Failure to improve suggests reassessment of diagnosis or therapy.

For example, persistent hypotension despite adequate fluid resuscitation may indicate cardiogenic or obstructive pathology rather than distributive shock. This dynamic reassessment strengthens clinical reasoning and prevents therapeutic inertia.

Structured Escalation

Effective escalation communication is a hallmark of safe practice. Structured frameworks such as SBAR (Situation–Background–Assessment–Recommendation) enhance clarity and reduce omission errors. Escalation reports should include:

- Current EWS and trajectory
- Key hemodynamic indicators (urine output, lactate, perfusion status)
- Interventions administered and response
- Specific clinical concerns and proposed differential diagnosis

Integration of EWS-triggered escalation with rapid response teams has demonstrated improved patient safety outcomes (Tien et al., 2025). Clear articulation of hemodynamic findings strengthens interdisciplinary collaboration and facilitates timely ICU transfer when necessary.

Importantly, escalation should not be delayed while waiting for score thresholds if clinical concern is high. Evidence indicates that reliance solely on numeric triggers may miss early deterioration (Goodacre et al., 2025). Clinical intuition, grounded in physiologic understanding, remains indispensable.

Balancing Technology and Clinical Judgment

Digital EWS and AI-enhanced systems offer predictive advantages but require careful integration into workflow. Over-alerting may contribute to alarm fatigue and desensitization (Edelson et al., 2024). Therefore, nurses must critically appraise automated alerts, correlating them with bedside assessment.

Clinical judgment bridges the gap between algorithmic scoring and individualized care. The goal is not replacement of professional reasoning but augmentation through structured data interpretation.

Strengthening Clinical Judgment in Nursing Practice

Clinical judgment integrates knowledge, experience, and contextual interpretation. Scott et al. (2026) emphasize that EWS effectiveness depends on clinician response quality. Nurses must therefore:

- Recognize subtle deterioration beyond numeric thresholds
- Override low scores when clinical concern persists
- Advocate for advanced hemodynamic evaluation

Goodacre et al. (2025) reinforce that clinical gestalt remains indispensable.

Implementation Strategies

Effective integration of hemodynamic monitoring and Early Warning Scores (EWS) requires structured institutional implementation rather than isolated training sessions. Successful adoption depends on education, workflow alignment, interdisciplinary collaboration, and continuous quality evaluation.

Education and Simulation

Competency-based education must extend beyond theoretical knowledge of shock physiology to include applied clinical reasoning. Nurses should be proficient in understanding preload, afterload, contractility, oxygen delivery, and microcirculatory perfusion. Training modules should incorporate:

- Recognition of early shock states
- Arterial waveform interpretation
- Identification of damped or artifact-laden monitoring signals
- Interpretation of lactate trends and urine output in perfusion assessment
- Integration of NEWS2/MEWS scores with physiologic findings

Simulation-based learning is particularly effective in strengthening clinical judgment. High-fidelity simulation scenarios involving septic shock progression, postoperative hemorrhage, or cardiogenic shock allow nurses to practice dynamic reassessment and escalation in a safe environment. Monnet et al. (2025) emphasize that structured hemodynamic assessment training improves consistency in shock management across multidisciplinary teams.

Interprofessional simulation exercises also enhance communication between nurses, physicians, and rapid response teams. Structured debriefing sessions following simulations facilitate reflective learning, reinforce decision-making pathways, and address cognitive biases. Incorporating Tanner's Clinical Judgment Model or similar reasoning frameworks into simulation curricula may further strengthen analytic thinking.

Ongoing competency validation should include periodic skills assessment in:

- Arterial line setup and troubleshooting

- Passive leg raise testing and fluid responsiveness evaluation
- Documentation of EWS trends
- Structured escalation communication

Digital learning platforms and microlearning modules may support continuous professional development while accommodating staffing constraints.

Governance and Quality Improvement

Institutional governance plays a critical role in ensuring effective integration of EWS and hemodynamic monitoring. Hospitals should establish standardized protocols outlining:

- Frequency of vital-sign monitoring
- EWS-triggered escalation thresholds
- Mandatory documentation of reassessment
- Criteria for rapid response activation
- ICU transfer pathways

Continuous quality improvement (CQI) systems should monitor key performance indicators, including:

1. Timeliness of vital-sign documentation
2. Accuracy of EWS calculation
3. Time from elevated EWS to clinician review
4. ICU transfer delays
5. Cardiac arrest incidence outside ICU
6. Alarm frequency and alarm fatigue burden

Edelson et al. (2024) caution that advanced digital or AI-enhanced systems must align with real-world workflow. Overly sensitive alert systems may increase alarm fatigue and reduce responsiveness. Therefore, governance frameworks must balance sensitivity and specificity while ensuring usability.

Audit-and-feedback mechanisms should provide frontline nurses with performance data. For example, reviewing cases of delayed escalation can identify systemic barriers such as staffing shortages or communication breakdowns. Root cause analysis of adverse events can guide protocol refinement.

Leadership commitment is equally essential. Nurse managers and clinical educators should champion a culture of safety where escalation is encouraged rather than perceived as overreaction. Psychological safety within teams enhances timely reporting of deterioration.

Implications for Nursing Practice, Administration, and Research

Nursing Practice

In daily practice, integration of EWS with perfusion-focused hemodynamic reasoning transforms deterioration detection from reactive to proactive care. Nurses should:

- Assess perfusion indicators alongside EWS scoring
- Recognize subtle trends preceding threshold triggers
- Advocate for early review when clinical concern persists
- Document hemodynamic rationale clearly

Evidence indicates that reliance solely on numeric thresholds may miss clinically significant deterioration (Goodacre et al., 2025). Therefore, professional judgment must guide interpretation and action.

Additionally, nurses must be vigilant regarding microcirculatory indicators such as capillary refill time, mottling, urine output decline, and mental status changes. These often precede overt hypotension and are critical for early shock identification (Monnet et al., 2025).

Nursing Administration

Administrative support is foundational for sustainable implementation. Staffing ratios influence monitoring frequency and escalation timeliness. Inadequate staffing may compromise both EWS accuracy and hemodynamic reassessment.

Administrators should ensure:

- Adequate nurse-to-patient ratios in high-acuity units
- Availability of functional monitoring equipment
- Access to rapid response teams
- Structured competency validation programs
- Investment in digital infrastructure

Resource allocation must align with institutional patient acuity profiles. For example, surgical and cardiac units with higher risk of sudden hemodynamic compromise may require enhanced monitoring capacity.

Organizational policy should also support early ICU transfer without bureaucratic delay when physiologic instability persists. Clear escalation hierarchies prevent ambiguity and reduce preventable deterioration.

Nursing Research

Emerging technologies demand rigorous evaluation. Future research priorities include:

- Comparative effectiveness of traditional versus AI-enhanced early warning systems (Ko et al., 2023)
- Outcome-based evaluations of EWS implementation beyond predictive accuracy (Scott et al., 2026)
- Validation studies in specific populations such as cardiac surgery, trauma, or oncology patients
- Evaluation of alarm fatigue mitigation strategies
- Impact of structured hemodynamic training on patient outcomes

Research should also explore how nurse experience level influences integration of EWS and hemodynamic reasoning. Mixed-method studies incorporating qualitative perspectives may illuminate barriers to escalation and clinical judgment development.

Implementation science frameworks can guide evaluation of adoption, sustainability, and contextual adaptation in diverse healthcare settings.

Conclusion

Hemodynamic monitoring and Early Warning Scores serve complementary and interdependent roles in critical care nursing. EWS provide standardized detection of physiological deterioration and facilitate communication across multidisciplinary teams. However, they represent screening tools rather than diagnostic solutions. Hemodynamic monitoring, by contrast, offers physiologic depth, enabling targeted therapeutic intervention and refined shock classification.

Evidence demonstrates that while EWS enhance risk stratification, their predictive performance varies and cannot replace professional clinical judgment (Goodacre et al., 2025; Edelson et al., 2024). Contemporary international guidelines reinforce the importance of structured hemodynamic assessment in circulatory shock management (Monnet et al., 2025).

The true strength of these systems lies in integration. Accurate measurement, trend recognition, rapid phenotyping, dynamic reassessment, and structured escalation collectively form a comprehensive clinical judgment framework. When supported by robust education, governance, and quality improvement systems, this integrative approach reduces preventable deterioration, strengthens interdisciplinary communication, and enhances patient safety.

In an era of expanding digital and AI-driven monitoring technologies, the critical care nurse remains central to interpretation, contextual reasoning, and compassionate intervention. Technology augments—but does not replace—the clinical expertise that ultimately safeguards patient outcomes.

References

Baldetti, L. (2025). Invasive hemodynamic monitoring in acute heart failure and cardiogenic shock. *Reviews in Cardiovascular Medicine, 26*(6), Article 34.

Beltrame, M., Rossi, A., Conti, G., & Bove, T. (2025). Non-invasive hemodynamic monitoring in critically ill patients. *Journal of Clinical Medicine, 14*(3), 1250–1264.

Chen, L., Zhang, Y., Huang, H., & Li, X. (2025). Predictive performance and temporal dynamics of NEWS2. *The Lancet Regional Health – Western Pacific, 45*, 100987.

Edelson, D. P., Carey, K., & Churpek, M. M. (2024). Early warning scores with and without artificial intelligence. *JAMA Network Open, 7*(8), e2424885.

Goodacre, S., Sutton, L., & Thomas, B. (2025). Accuracy of NEWS2 in emergency department patients. *Emergency Medicine Journal, 42*(2), 115–121.

Ko, R. E., Kim, J., Lee, H., & Park, S. (2023). Deep learning–based early warning score for deterioration prediction. *Cancers, 15*(21), 5145.

Kulkarni, A. P., et al. (2022). ISCCM guidelines for hemodynamic monitoring. *Indian Journal of Critical Care Medicine*, *26*(Suppl 2), S1–S89.

McEachron, K. R., Moore, H. B., & Moore, E. E. (2025). Invasive and non-invasive hemodynamic monitoring in the ICU. *Trauma Surgery & Acute Care Open*, *10*(Suppl 1), e001780.

Mhd Yunin, N. S., Abdullah, A., Rahman, R. A., & Ismail, N. (2025). NEWS2 as a prognostic tool in emergency departments. *PLOS ONE, 20*(5), e0326058.

Monnet, X., Cecconi, M., Rhodes, A., & De Backer, D. (2025). ESICM guidelines on circulatory shock and hemodynamic monitoring. *Intensive Care Medicine*, *51*(4), 567–589.

Royal College of Physicians. (2023). *National Early Warning Score (NEWS2)*. RCP Publications.

Scott, L. J., Brown, M., & Patel, K. (2026). Does the use of NEWS/NEWS2 improve outcomes? *Systematic Reviews*, *15*(1), 88.

Tan, A. D. A., Lim, K. H., & Ong, M. E. H. (2022). Modified Early Warning Score and deterioration prediction. *Indian Journal of Critical Care Medicine*, *26*(9), 1012–1018.

Tien, H. Y., Wang, C. Y., & Lin, C. H. (2025). MEWS and ICU readmission risk. *Journal of Critical Care*, *76*, 154321.

Wong, D. C. W., Green, A., & Marshall, A. P. (2024). Effect of digital early warning systems on observation compliance. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, *26*, e46691.