

Predisposition, Insult, Response, and Organ Dysfunction: A Well-constructed Score!

Abinaya Kannan¹, Atul Jindal²

Received on: 09 November 2022; Accepted on: 17 November 2022; Published on: 31 January 2023

Keywords: Acute physiology and chronic health evaluation IV, Intensive care units, Sequential organ failure assessment.
Indian Journal of Critical Care Medicine (2023): 10.5005/jp-journals-10071-24401

It was an immense pleasure in reading the article “Comparison of (PIRO) predisposition, insult, response, and organ dysfunction, acute physiology and chronic health evaluation (APACHE IV), and SOFA Scores in Predicting Outcome in Patients with Sepsis Admitted to Intensive Care Unit: A Two-year Cross-sectional Study at Rural Teaching Hospital”¹ and also, we could understand the efforts put forth by the authors in comparing the three scoring systems. The PIRO score is a well-structured scoring system, specially designed for sepsis unlike acute physiology and chronic health evaluation APACHE IV and sequential organ failure assessment (SOFA).² The authors have obtained an intriguing discriminative value of 0.96 for PIRO, especially, on day 3, which was not possible for any other authors to obtain so far, and the closest value achieved was 0.94 by Rathour et al.,³ 0.88 by Chen et al.,⁴ 0.86 by McDonald et al.,¹ 0.80 by Posadas-Calleja et al.,⁵ and by many other authors. Since the authors have obtained such a high discriminative value, they could have also explained the variables and scores in the PIRO scoring system in detail. Did any personalization of parameters according to the scenario was done to increase the prediction based on the past records or experience was not clear. Authors have concentrated only on the discriminative part of the scoring system and neglected the calibration property of the scoring. Calibration property is also equally important for any scoring system as that of discriminative property. If the calibration was derived by using Hosmer–Lemeshow–Chi-squared goodness of fit test, the accuracy of the score would have increased, adding more credibility to the study.⁶

ORCID

Abinaya Kannan  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2340-5495>

Atul Jindal  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0504-1077>

REFERENCES

1. Macdonald SPJ, Arendts G, Fatovich DM, Brown SGA. Comparison of PIRO, SOFA, and MEDS scores for predicting mortality in emergency department patients with severe sepsis and septic shock. *Acad Emerg Med* 2014;21(11):1257–1263. DOI: 10.1111/acem.12515.

^{1,2}Department of Pediatrics, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, Raipur, Chhattisgarh, India

Corresponding Author: Atul Jindal, Department of Pediatrics, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, Raipur, Chhattisgarh, India, Phone: +91 8224014667, e-mail: dratuljindal@gmail.com

How to cite this article: Kannan A, Jindal A. Predisposition, Insult, Response, and Organ Dysfunction: A Well-constructed Score! *Indian J Crit Care Med* 2023;27(2):150.

Source of support: Nil

Conflict of interest: None

2. Levy MM, Fink MP, Marshall JC, Abraham E, Angus D, Cook D, et al. 2001 SCCM/ESICM/ACCP/ATS/SIS International Sepsis Definitions Conference. *Intensive Care Med* 2003;31(4):1250–1256. DOI: 10.1097/01.CCM.0000050454.01978.3B.
3. Rathour S, Kumar S, Hadda V, Bhalla A, Sharma N, Varma S. PIRO concept: Staging of sepsis. *J Postgrad Med* 2015;10;61(4):235. Available from: <https://www.jpgmonline.com/text.asp?2015/61/4/235/166511>.
4. Chen YX, Li CS. Risk stratification and prognostic performance of the predisposition, infection, response, and organ dysfunction (PIRO) scoring system in septic patients in the emergency department: A cohort study. *Crit Care (London, England)* 2014;18(2):R74. DOI: 10.1186/cc13832.
5. Posadas-Calleja JG, Stelfox HT, Ferland A, Zuege DJ, Niven DJ, Berthiaume L, et al. Derivation of a PIRO Score for Prediction of Mortality in Surgical Patients With Intra-Abdominal Sepsis. *Am J Crit Care* 2018;27(4):287–294. DOI: 10.4037/ajcc2018576.
6. Rapsang AG, Shyam DC. Scoring systems in the intensive care unit: A compendium. *Indian J Crit Care Med* 2014;18(4):220–228. DOI: 10.4103/0972-5229.130573.