



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Is it taking longer to die in paediatric intensive care in England and Wales?*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:  
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/96536/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

Plunkett, A and Parslow, RC [orcid.org/0000-0002-3945-5294](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3945-5294) (2016) Is it taking longer to die in paediatric intensive care in England and Wales? *Archives of disease in childhood*, 101 (9). pp. 798-802. ISSN 0003-9888

<https://doi.org/10.1136/archdischild-2015-309592>

---

© 2016, The Authors. This is an author produced version of a paper published in *Archives of Disease in Childhood*. Uploaded in accordance with the publisher's self-archiving policy.

**Reuse**

Unless indicated otherwise, fulltext items are protected by copyright with all rights reserved. The copyright exception in section 29 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 allows the making of a single copy solely for the purpose of non-commercial research or private study within the limits of fair dealing. The publisher or other rights-holder may allow further reproduction and re-use of this version - refer to the White Rose Research Online record for this item. Where records identify the publisher as the copyright holder, users can verify any specific terms of use on the publisher's website.

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



[eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk)  
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

## **Is it taking longer to die in Paediatric Intensive Care in England and Wales?**

Adrian Plunkett, Roger C Parslow

Adrian Plunkett, Consultant, Paediatric Intensive Care Unit, Birmingham Children's Hospital,  
Birmingham, B4 6NH, UK

Roger C Parslow, Senior Lecturer in Epidemiology, Leeds Institute of Cardiovascular and Metabolic  
Medicine, Room 8.49, Worsley Building, Clarendon Way, University of Leeds, Leeds, LS2 9JT, UK

Correspondence to: Dr Roger Parslow, [r.c.parslow@leeds.ac.uk](mailto:r.c.parslow@leeds.ac.uk)

## **Abstract**

### **Introduction**

All cause infant and childhood mortality has decreased in the UK over the last thirty years. Advances in paediatric critical care have increased survival in paediatric intensive care units (PICUs) but may have affected how and when children die on PICU. We explored factors affecting length of stay (LOS) of children who died on PICU over an 11-year period.

### **Methods**

We analysed demographic and clinical data on 165,473 admissions to PICUs in England and Wales, from January 2003 to December 2013. We assessed time trends in LOS for survivors and non-survivors and explored the effect of demographic and clinical characteristics on LOS for non-survivors.

### **Results**

LOS increased 0.310 days per year in non-survivors (95% CI; 0.169-0.449) and 0.064 days per year in survivors (95% CI; 0.046-0.083). The proportion of early deaths (<24 hours of admission) fell 0.44% points per year (95% CI;-0.971-0.094) but the proportion of late deaths (>28 days of PICU stay) increased by 0.44% points per year (95% CI 0.185-0.691). The Paediatric Index of Mortality (PIM) score in early deaths increased by 0.77% points per year (95% CI; 0.31-1.23%).

### **Discussion**

Increased LOS in children who die on PICU is driven by a decreased proportion of early deaths and an increased proportion of late deaths. This trend, combined with an increase in the severity of illness in early deaths, is consistent with a reduction in early mortality for acutely ill children, but a prolongation of life for those children admitted to PICU with life-limiting illnesses.

**Introduction:**

The rate of childhood mortality from all causes in the UK has decreased over the last 3 decades.<sup>1</sup>

Data from the UK Paediatric Intensive Care Audit Network (PICANet) shows that crude mortality in British PICUs has followed the national trend, and fallen consistently from 5.5% in 2003/4 to 3.7% in 2013.<sup>2,3</sup> This fall in mortality has occurred during a period of considerable growth in the demand and capacity of PICU (admissions to British PICUs from 2004 to 2013 have risen by 15%).<sup>3</sup>

Whilst survival is improving, the prevalence of life-limiting illness and chronic disease in British children is increasing.<sup>4</sup> Previous research from the US has shown that children with Complex Chronic Conditions (CCC) have a higher mortality and experience longer stays in hospital prior to death when compared with children without CCC.<sup>5</sup> The majority (two-thirds) of deaths in British children occur in children with chronic health conditions.<sup>1</sup> Excluding deaths due to injury, the majority of childhood deaths in the UK occur in hospital<sup>1</sup> and the commonest location for childhood hospital death is the Paediatric Intensive Care Unit (PICU).<sup>6</sup>

The changing epidemiology of death and disability in children, along with improved survival from intensive care suggests that the characteristics of the children who die in PICU may also be changing over time.

We investigated whether there is a significant increase in the length of time that children spend in a PICU before their death and, if this is the case, whether this effect is universal or confined a specific sub-population of patients. We also analysed trends in PICU bed-day utilisation amongst children who die in PICU.

**Methods:**

We analysed demographic and clinical data submitted to PICANet on all children admitted to PICUs in England and Wales between January 2003 and December. PICANet collects demographic and clinical information on all children admitted to paediatric intensive care units in the United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland, and this is complete for England and Wales for all years from 2003 onwards. Details of data collection and validation methods are published in the PICANet Annual Report.<sup>2</sup> We analysed three specific aspects of the data: overall trends in length of stay by vital status, trends in length of stay (LOS) for early and late deaths, bed utilisation and clinical and demographic factors that may explain these trends. We further examined the relationship between clinical and demographic factors and trends in LOS.

**Trends in length of stay in survivors and non-survivors:**

Mean and median LOS in days was plotted against individual year for children who had died on PICU and those who had survived to PICU discharge. Linear regression was used to assess the relationship between LOS and year of admission. The following variables were analysed to establish if LOS for children who die on PICU was different in different sections of the PICU population: diagnostic group, sex, South Asian Ethnicity (based on 2 name recognition algorithms)<sup>7,8</sup>, and an area-based measure of deprivation (IMD2010)<sup>9</sup> derived from the children's address on admission. We also used the expected probability of mortality calculated using the Paediatric Index of Mortality (PIM)<sup>10</sup> using recalibrated coefficients calculated by Brady et al, 2005 and supplied by the authors, as a continuous variable and in predefined expected probability of death (POD) groups (<1%; 1-<5%; 5-<15%; 15%-<30% and 30%+). This recalibrated version of PIM was used because data collection for PIM2 did not take place throughout the study period, but data for PIM were available. We also analysed LOS over time by the broad diagnostic groups reported by PICANet. Analyses of the children's individual characteristics used random-effects linear regression to take account of centre (PICU) effects by using a random intercept term, and the natural log transformation of length of stay (LOGLOS) to account for the skewed nature of the LOS data. Likelihood-ratio tests, Akaike's Information Criterion

(AIC) and Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) were used to assess the improvement in fit of models when an interaction term was introduced to model the relationship between these individual characteristics and year of admission.

### **Analysis of early and late deaths**

Further analysis was undertaken by stratifying deaths by LOS, to allow comparison of early deaths (<1 day in PICU) and late deaths (>28 days in PICU). For this purpose, the following pre-defined LOS strata were used: 1 (early deaths): <1 day; 2: 1-3 days; 3: 3-7 days; 4: 7-14 days; 5: 14-28 days; 6 (late deaths): >28 days. For each stratum, linear regression and random effects linear regression analysis was performed to describe temporal trends in LOS. Differences in the characteristics of early and late deaths over the time period were further analysed by comparison of mean expected POD estimated by PIM score expressed as a percentage, as a surrogate for severity of illness on PICU admission.

### **Bed-day utilisation**


Trends in bed-day utilisation were determined by calculating the sum of PICU bed-days for survivors and non-survivors for each year of the time period, aggregating bed days for those children who had been admitted on more than one occasion. Regression results are presented with 95% confidence intervals. All statistical analyses were carried out in Stata Release 12.<sup>11</sup>

### **Role of the funding source**

The sponsor of the study had no role in the study design, data collection, analysis or interpretation of the findings and no role in the writing of this report. RCP had full access to all of the data in the study and had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

**Results:**

Results are based on 165,473 admissions representing 112,360 children of whom 157,918 were discharged alive and 7,555 died on PICU. Linear regression analysis of trends in LOS showed a significant trend for increased LOS in non-survivors (increased LOS of 0.314 days per year, 95% CI; 0.174-0.454) compared with survivors (increase in LOS of 0.064 days per year, 95% CI; 0.046-0.083). The random effects model estimates were 0.310, (95% CI; 0.169-0.449) and 0.064 (95% CI 0.046-0.083) days per year respectively, reflecting a marginal effect of the variability between PICUs (mean change in length of stay varied from -5 to +6 days per year). Mean and median length of stay in days are plotted by year of admission in figure 1.




**Figure 1:**

Mean and median length of stay in days for survivors and non-survivors admitted to a PICU in England and Wales between January 2002 and December 2013.

Linear regression analysis showed a statistically non-significant fall in the proportion of early deaths over the study period of 0.44% points per year in children dying in the first day (95% CI -0.971-0.094)

and a statistically significant rise in the proportion of late deaths of 0.44% points per year in those children dying who stay >28 days (95% CI 0.185-0.691). The respective estimates from the random effects regression were -0.15% points per year (95% CI -0.770-0.471) and 0.37% points per year (95% CI 0.111-0.621). The attenuation in the estimate for the proportion of children dying in the first day was attributable to four PICUs with very low or no mortality. The percentage of deaths over time in those who died within one day and after 28 days are shown in figure 2 together with the number of deaths in each year.




**Figure 2:**

Percentage of deaths occurring early (<1 day PICU LOS) and late (>28 days PICU LOS) over time.

Further analysis of the early vs. late deaths demonstrated a temporal trend of increasing PIM score in the early deaths of 0.77% points per year (95% CI 0.31-1.23%). No significant temporal trend was present in the PIM score in the late deaths group (figure 3). There was a statistically significant




improvement in model fit when an interaction term between PIM POD group and year of admission was included (LR test chi-square, 10.71,  $p=0.0301$ ). The AIC and BIC confirmed this improvement.



**Figure 3:**

Mean PIM (%) score of non-survivors over time, stratified by early (<1 day) vs. late (>28 days) deaths.

Analysis of bed-day utilisation (summed over all patients, survivors and non-survivors) demonstrated a rise in total bed-day use in survivors, but no significant change in the overall bed-day use in non-survivors (figure 4).



**Figure 4:**

Summed bed-day utilisation over time for survivors and non-survivors.

Regression analysis of diagnostic group revealed no specific diagnosis driving the increase in length of stay (data not shown). Likelihood ratio tests for improvement in the random effects regression model fit by including an interaction term between year of admission and sex, South Asian Ethnicity and deprivation respectively revealed that none of these variables had a significant impact on the observed increase in LOS of those children who died on PICU.

**Discussion:**

The LOS of children who die in PICU is increasing over time. More children who previously would have died early in PICU admission are now surviving, but some of this group will die later in the same PICU admission. There is a trend of rising severity of illness on admission (using expected probability of mortality estimated by PIM as a proxy) in children who die within 24 hours of admission to PICU. Together with the falling mortality rates in PICUs, these trends are consistent with changes in healthcare delivery which result in increased survival of children in the acute phase of critical illness.<sup>12</sup> Advances in paediatric medicine, including the introduction of acute care bundles, development of specialist training programmes, improved perioperative care, organisation of paediatric intensive care units, and the development of retrieval medicine for critically ill children may have contributed to this trend of increased survival.<sup>12-15</sup> Additional factors may contribute to the lengthening of terminal admissions in certain patient subgroups, including changes in patient and public expectations of health-care, an increase in shared decision-making and a fear of litigation amongst physicians when considering end of life decisions for children.<sup>16</sup> Within the limits of this observational study, it is not possible to assess the contribution of each of these factors to the trends we have identified, and further research in this area is indicated.

The increasing bed-day utilisation amongst children who survive PICU admission reflects the growth of the national capacity of PICUs during the study period. The bed-day utilisation amongst non-survivors is not increasing, despite a significant increase in LOS in this group. This can be explained by the falling mortality rate during the study period. Thus, although the average LOS amongst children who die is increased, they represent fewer of the PICU admissions.

Our study indicates that children who would previously have died early in PICU are now living longer. It is likely that some of these children are surviving to discharge from PICU, and some may be surviving with chronic disease. Thus, the rising prevalence of LLC and chronic conditions in children

may represent one of the costs of improved survival from PICU. This association has been described elsewhere: a cohort study of outcomes following PICU admission in a single PICU in Melbourne, spanning three decades, showed a falling mortality rate accompanied by a rising disability rate amongst PICU survivors.<sup>17</sup> Studies from other international centres also show a rising prevalence of CCC in US hospitalisations<sup>5,18</sup>, and in PICU admissions in France<sup>19</sup>, Greece<sup>20</sup> and the US.<sup>21</sup> The characteristics of patients in PICU are therefore changing over time, as children with chronic illness experience higher rates of hospitalisation, PICU admission and PICU readmission, longer length of stay and higher mortality risk.<sup>5,22-23</sup>

These studies not only capture important epidemiological trends, but also highlight the lack of consistent definitions of chronic illness and disability. LLC and CCC describe similar, but not mutually inclusive clinical states.<sup>4,24</sup>

The general trend of increased LOS in non-survivors was not explained by differences between diagnostic group, socioeconomic status, age, sex and South Asian ethnicity.

This study highlights several areas worthy of further research. Follow-up data on patients who survive PICU in the UK are rare and lacking detail. Longitudinal follow-up studies examining the long-term survival, educational level, quality of life and co-morbidities of PICU survivors in the UK are required to provide a better understanding of the health costs of improved PICU survival.

Further research is also warranted into the ethical issues surrounding the death of a child, and their effects on patients, families and staff. The scenario of an early death in PICU following treatment failure is being replaced by the death of a child at the end of a long PICU admission. The mode of these later deaths is usually the result of planned withdrawal of life support; observational data from studies in single-centres elsewhere support the view that this mode of death is increasingly common

in PICU.<sup>25,26</sup> These findings indicate that the roles of palliative care teams, the use of Advanced Care Planning (ACP) and multi-disciplinary working in the clinical management of children with LLC / CCC will be areas of future service development and research. Existing evidence points to variability in practice in this area: a single-centre study examining timing of death following agreement for withdrawal of life-support in PICU showed wide variety of timings<sup>25</sup>, and a recent survey of British PICUs found that there is wide variability in documentation for advance care planning (ACP) across the UK.<sup>27</sup> The rising prevalence of LLC/ CCC in the childhood population, coupled with our finding that children who die in PICU are spending longer in the PICU prior to death, emphasises the need to gain better understanding of end of life care for children. In particular, a key area for future research is to focus on understanding the risks and benefits of Advanced Care Planning.

Limitations of our study include a lack of information on mode of death (such as withdrawal of life support or failure of treatment) and the use of advance care planning prior to admission or during admission to PICU and the requirement for PICUs contributing to PICANet to only code a primary reason for the admission with the coding of co-morbidity requested but not mandated. This makes a robust analysis of diagnostic subgroups that rely on good coding depth unfeasible and we have avoided such an analysis as it may have introduced bias. These coding issues also limit the ability to infer prevalence of Life-Limiting Conditions LLC or Complex Chronic Conditions in children. As the PICANet dataset comprises the whole population of children admitted to PICUs there is no sample selection bias. Rigorous validation at data entry and *post hoc* validation reporting and processing ensure missing data are rare and the variables used in our analysis have an extremely high level of completion.<sup>3</sup>

What is already known on this topic:

Childhood mortality in the UK is decreasing.

The majority of childhood deaths in the UK occur in children with chronic health conditions

The prevalence of life-limiting conditions (LLC) in children in the UK is increasing

What this study adds:

The length of stay of children who die in Paediatric Intensive Care (PIC) is increasing.

The scenario of an early death in PICU following treatment failure is being replaced by the death of a child at the end of a long PICU admission.

## References

1. Child Health Reviews UK, Clinical Outcome Review Programme. Overview of Child Deaths in the 4 UK countries. September 2013. Available online: <http://www.rcpch.ac.uk/child-health-reviews-uk/programme-findings/programme-findings>
2. Davey N, Draper ES, Jones S, et al. Paediatric Intensive Care Audit Network Annual Report, March 2003 – February 2004: Universities of Leeds, Leicester and Sheffield), 2004:1-94. [Online]. Available from: [http://www.picanet.org.uk/Audit/Annual-Reporting/Annual-Report-Archive/PICANet\\_National\\_Report\\_2004.pdf](http://www.picanet.org.uk/Audit/Annual-Reporting/Annual-Report-Archive/PICANet_National_Report_2004.pdf). [Accessed 27/02/2015].
3. Paediatric Intensive Care Audit Network: A Decade of Data (published September 2014): Universities of Leeds and Leicester. [Online] Available from: [http://www.picanet.org.uk/Audit/Annual-Reporting/PICANet\\_A\\_Decade\\_of\\_Data\\_2014\\_Annual\\_Report\\_Summary.pdf](http://www.picanet.org.uk/Audit/Annual-Reporting/PICANet_A_Decade_of_Data_2014_Annual_Report_Summary.pdf). [Accessed 27/02/2015].
4. Fraser LK, Miller M, Hain R, et al. Rising national prevalence of life-limiting conditions in children in England. *Pediatrics* 2012;129(4):e923-e29
5. Simon TD, Berry J, Feudtner C, et al. Children with complex chronic conditions in inpatient hospital settings in the United States. *Pediatrics*. 2010 Oct;126:647–55.
6. Ramnarayan P, Craig F, Petros A, et al. Characteristics of deaths occurring in hospitalised children: changing trends. *J Med Ethics* 2007;33:255–260.
7. Nanchahal K, Mangtani P, Alston M, et al. Development and validation of a computerized South Asian Names and Group recognition Algorithm (SANGRA) for use in British health-related Studies. *Journal of Public Health Medicine* 2001;23:278–285.
8. Bradford Health Authority and City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council. Nam Pehchan: A program to identify and analyse South Asian names Version 2.1. City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council, 2002.

9. Department for Communities and Local Government. English Indices of Deprivation 2010.  
[Data file] [Online] Available from:  
[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/6872/1871524.xls](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6872/1871524.xls) [Accessed, 17/12/2014].
10. Shann F, Pearson G, Slater A, et al. Paediatric index of mortality (PIM): a mortality prediction model for children in intensive care. *Intensive Care Med* 1997;23:201-207.
11. StataCorp. 2011. Stata Statistical Software: Release 12. College Station, TX: StataCorp LP
12. Carcillo JA. What's new in pediatric intensive care. *Crit Care Med*. 2006 Sep;34:S183–90.
13. Booy R, Habibi P, Nadel S, et al. Reduction in case fatality rate from meningococcal disease associated with improved healthcare delivery. *Arch Dis Child* 2001;85:386–390.
14. Pearson G, Shann F, Barry P, et al. Should paediatric intensive care be centralised? Trent versus Victoria. *Lancet* 1997;349:1213-1217.
15. Ramnarayan P, Thiru K, Parslow RC, et al. Effect of specialist retrieval teams on outcomes in children admitted to paediatric intensive care units in England and Wales: a retrospective cohort study. *Lancet* 2010;376:698-704.
16. Ballard D, Li Y, Evans J, et al. Fear of litigation may increase resuscitation of infants born near the limits of viability. *Journal of Pediatrics* 2002 Jun;140:713-8.
17. 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 Sep;11:549–55.
18. Burns KH, Casey PH, Lyle RE, et al. Increasing prevalence of medically complex children in US hospitals. *Pediatrics*. 2010 Oct;126:638–46
19. Cremer R, Leclerc F, Lacroix J, et al. GFRUP/RMEF Chronic Diseases in PICU Study Group. Children with chronic conditions in pediatric intensive care units located in predominantly



- French-speaking regions: Prevalence and implications on rehabilitation care need and utilization. *Crit Care Med*. 2009 Apr;37:1456-62.
20. Briassoulis G, Filippou O, Natsi L, et al. Acute and chronic paediatric intensive care patients: current trends and perspectives on resource utilization. *QJM* 2004 Aug;97:507-18.
21. 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 Jul;40:2196-203
22. Berry JG, Hall M, Hall DE, et al. Inpatient growth and resource use in 28 children's hospitals: a longitudinal, multi-institutional study. *JAMA Pediatr* 2013 Feb;167:170-7.
23. Feudtner C, Christakis DA, Zimmerman FJ, et al. Characteristics of deaths occurring in children's hospitals: implications for supportive care services. *Pediatrics* 2002 May;109:887-93.
24. Feudtner C, Christakis DA, Connell FA. Pediatric deaths attributable to complex chronic conditions: A population-based study of Washington state, 1980-1997. *Pediatrics* 2000;106:205-209.
25. Oberender F, Tibballs J. Withdrawal of life-support in paediatric intensive care--a study of time intervals between discussion, decision and death. *BMC Pediatr* 2011;11:39.
26. Sands R, Manning JC, Vyas H, et al. Characteristics of deaths in paediatric intensive care: a 10-year study. *Nurs Crit Care* 2009;14:235-40.
27. Mitchell S, Plunkett A, Dale J. Use of formal advance care planning documents: a national survey of UK Paediatric Intensive Care Units. *Arch Dis Child* 2014;99:327-30.

## **Figure legends**

### **Figure 1:**

Mean and median length of stay in days for survivors and non-survivors admitted to a PICU in England and Wales between January 2002 and December 2013.

### **Figure 2:**

Percentage of deaths occurring early (<1 day PICU LOS) and late (>28 days PICU LOS) over time.

### **Figure 3:**

Mean PIM (%) score of non-survivors over time, stratified by early (<1 day) vs. late (>28 days) deaths.

### **Figure 4:**

Summed bed-day utilisation over time for survivors and non-survivors.

## **Author contributions:**

AP conceived the hypothesis, conducted the literature review, and contributed to data interpretation and wrote the main body of the manuscript. AP and RCP jointly developed the analysis plan. RCP analysed the data, contributed to data interpretation and edited the text of the manuscript. RCP is the guarantor. RCP affirms that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study being reported; that no important aspects of the study have been omitted; and that any discrepancies from the study as planned have been explained.

## **Competing interests:**

Both authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at [http://www.icmje.org/coi\\_disclosure.pdf](http://www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf) and declare: no support from any organisation for the submitted work; no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous three years, no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

## **Acknowledgements**

We would like to thank all the staff in participating hospitals who have collected data for PICANet. A list of participating organisations is given at: <http://www.picanet.org.uk/About/Participating-Organisations/>. We are grateful to the UK Paediatric Intensive Care Society for continued support and to the members of the PICANet Steering Group and Clinical Advisory Group.

## **Funding**

The PICANet Audit is commissioned by the Healthcare Quality Improvement Partnership (HQIP) as part of the National Clinical Audit Programme (NCA). HQIP is led by a consortium of the Academy of Medical Royal Colleges, the Royal College of Nursing and National Voices. Its aim is to promote quality improvement, and in particular to increase the impact that clinical audit has on healthcare quality in England and Wales. HQIP holds the contract to manage and develop the NCA Programme, comprising more than 30 clinical audits that cover care provided to people with a wide range of medical, surgical and mental health conditions. The PICANet Audit is funded by NHS England, the Welsh Government, NHS Lothian/National Service Division NHS Scotland, the Royal Belfast Hospital for Sick Children, The National Office of Clinical Audit (NOCA), Republic of Ireland and HCA Healthcare.

## **Ethics Approval:**

Collection of personally identifiable data has been approved by the Patient Information Advisory Group (now the NHS Health Research Authority Confidentiality Advisory Group) <http://www.hra.nhs.uk/documents/2015/05/piag-register-8.xls> and ethics approval granted by the Trent Medical Research Ethics Committee, ref. **05/MRE04/17 +5**.

**Licence statement:**

The Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of all authors, [a worldwide licence](#) to the Publishers and its licensees in perpetuity, in all forms, formats and media (whether known now or created in the future), to i) publish, reproduce, distribute, display and store the Contribution, ii) translate the Contribution into other languages, create adaptations, reprints, include within collections and create summaries, extracts and/or, abstracts of the Contribution, iii) create any other derivative work(s) based on the Contribution, iv) to exploit all subsidiary rights in the Contribution, v) the inclusion of electronic links from the Contribution to third party material where-ever it may be located; and, vi) licence any third party to do any or all of the above.