Network Open

# Association of Arterial Hyperoxia With Outcomes in Critically III Children A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis

Thijs A. Lilien, MD; Nina S. Groeneveld, BSc; Faridi van Etten-Jamaludin, Bc; Mark J. Peters, MBChB, PhD; Corinne M. P. Buysse, MD, PhD; Shawn L. Ralston, MD, MS; Job B. M. van Woensel, MD, PhD; Lieuwe D. J. Bos, MD, PhD; Reinout A. Bem, MD, PhD

# Abstract

**IMPORTANCE** Oxygen supplementation is a cornerstone treatment in pediatric critical care. Accumulating evidence suggests that overzealous use of oxygen, leading to hyperoxia, is associated with worse outcomes compared with patients with normoxia.

**OBJECTIVES** To evaluate the association of arterial hyperoxia with clinical outcome in critically ill children among studies using varied definitions of hyperoxia.

**DATA SOURCES** A systematic search of EMBASE, MEDLINE, Cochrane Library, and ClinicalTrials.gov from inception to February 1, 2021, was conducted.

**STUDY SELECTION** Clinical trials or observational studies of children admitted to the pediatric intensive care unit that examined hyperoxia, by any definition, and described at least 1 outcome of interest. No language restrictions were applied.

**DATA EXTRACTION AND SYNTHESIS** The Meta-analysis of Observational Studies in Epidemiology guideline and Newcastle-Ottawa Scale for study quality assessment were used. The review process was performed independently by 2 reviewers. Data were pooled with a random-effects model.

**MAIN OUTCOMES AND MEASURES** The primary outcome was 28-day mortality; this time was converted to mortality at the longest follow-up owing to insufficient studies reporting the initial primary outcome. Secondary outcomes included length of stay, ventilator-related outcomes, extracorporeal organ support, and functional performance.

**RESULTS** In this systematic review, 16 studies (27 555 patients) were included. All, except 1 randomized clinical pilot trial, were observational cohort studies. Study populations included were post-cardiac arrest (n = 6), traumatic brain injury (n = 1), extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (n = 2), and general critical care (n = 7). Definitions and assessment of hyperoxia differed among included studies. Partial pressure of arterial oxygen was most frequently used to define hyperoxia and mainly by categorical cutoff. In total, 11 studies (23 204 patients) were pooled for meta-analysis. Hyperoxia, by any definition, showed an odds ratio of 1.59 (95% Cl, 1.00-2.51; after Hartung-Knapp adjustment, 95% Cl, 1.05-2.38) for mortality with substantial between-study heterogeneity ( $l^2$  = 92%). This association was also found in less heterogeneous subsets. A signal of harm was observed at higher thresholds of arterial oxygen levels when grouped by definition of hyperoxia. Secondary outcomes were inadequate for meta-analysis.

**CONCLUSIONS AND RELEVANCE** These results suggest that, despite methodologic limitations of the studies, hyperoxia is associated with mortality in critically ill children. This finding identifies the

(continued)

Open Access. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the CC-BY License.

JAMA Network Open. 2022;5(1):e2142105. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.42105

**Key Points** 

care unit?

Question What is the association

between arterial hyperoxia and

outcomes in critically ill children

admitted to the pediatric intensive

Findings This systematic review of 16

studies and meta-analysis of 11 studies comprising a total of 23 204 patients

found an association between hyperoxia

and mortality in children admitted to the

Meaning These findings suggest that

hyperoxia is associated with harm in critically ill children; the clinical

implication of this association needs to

Author affiliations and article information are

be addressed in future studies.

Supplemental content

listed at the end of this article.

pediatric intensive care unit.

#### Abstract (continued)

further need for prospective observational studies and importance to address the clinical implications of hyperoxia in critically ill children.

JAMA Network Open. 2022;5(1):e2142105. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.42105

# Introduction

The administration of supplemental oxygen is a cornerstone treatment in critically ill patients to prevent and resolve cellular hypoxia. Although oxygen therapy can be lifesaving on many occasions, its overzealous use may lead to supraphysiological levels of the Pao<sub>2</sub> (ie, hyperoxia), which is associated with deleterious outcomes. For example, in critically ill adults, arterial hyperoxia has been associated with increased mortality, most pronounced at extreme levels of Pao<sub>2</sub>.<sup>1,2</sup> Detrimental effects of hyperoxia may derive from increased formation of reactive oxygen species, which damage biomolecules, or from its pulmonary and vascular complications, such as atelectasis and hyperoxemic vasoconstriction.<sup>3-7</sup>

In the field of pediatrics, traditionally, most attention on oxygen toxicity has been focused on preterm neonates, a specific population with high vulnerability to develop hyperoxia-associated chronic disease, such as bronchopulmonary dysplasia and retinopathy of prematurity.<sup>8,9</sup> A growing body of evidence suggests a similar hazard exists for increased mortality and morbidity associated with hyperoxia in critically ill children beyond the direct neonatal period.<sup>10,11</sup> This increase may be equally important with respect to long-term disease trajectories, as many organs and tissues, including the lungs, continue to develop and mature for several years after birth.<sup>12,13</sup> Yet, it remains unclear how generalizable these findings are, because these studies address various populations in the pediatric intensive care unit (PICU) and apply different definitions of hyperoxia. Consequently, the current practice of oxygen therapy and target oxygenation levels in the PICU are largely based on expert opinion.<sup>14-16</sup> Rigorous synthesis of the literature on the association between hyperoxia and clinical outcomes in the PICU is necessary to aid in the development of novel study protocols and future strategies to prevent oxygen-associated injury.

In this study, our aims were to describe the definitions of hyperoxia and evaluate the association between hyperoxia and outcomes in critically ill children admitted to the PICU. We hypothesized that hyperoxia was associated with worse outcomes in critically ill children.

# Methods

#### **Data Sources and Searches**

The literature search was performed in consultation with an experienced clinical librarian (F.v.E-J.). We searched the electronic databases Ovid MEDLINE (1946 to February 1, 2021), Ovid EMBASE (1947 to February 1, 2021), Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (from inception to February 1, 2021), and ClinicalTrials.gov. References of full-text articles were screened for relevant studies. No language restrictions were applied. The complete search strategy is reported in eTable 1 in the **Supplement**. This review is reported in accordance with the Meta-analysis of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) reporting guideline<sup>17</sup> and the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) guidelines.<sup>18</sup> The protocol of this review was published before start of the study in the PROSPERO International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews database.<sup>19</sup>

# **Study Selection**

The citations were screened independently by 2 of us (T.A.L. and N.S.G.) on title and abstract, and discrepancies were resolved through discussion. Full-text articles on potentially eligible studies were

retrieved and checked independently for eligibility. Eligible studies were those including patients admitted to the PICU that examined hyperoxia and contained at least 1 outcome of interest. No predefined inclusion criteria were made for the definition of hyperoxia. Only clinical trials and cohort studies were selected. Studies that included only patients with cyanotic congenital heart disease were excluded, as were conference abstracts.

# **Outcome Measures**

The primary outcome was all-cause 28-day mortality. Secondary outcomes were all-cause mortality at any follow-up, incidence and duration of invasive mechanical ventilation, duration of respiratory support, incidence of acute kidney injury, incidence and duration of organ support (continuous venovenous hemofiltration, extra corporeal membrane oxygenation [ECMO]), PICU and hospital length of stay, long-term lung function (spirometry or forced oscillation technique), and general functional status (Pediatric Overall Performance Category or Pediatric Cerebral Performance Category).<sup>20</sup>

# **Data Extraction and Quality Assessment**

Data were extracted independently by 2 of us (T.A.L. and N.S.G.) using a structured data extraction form. Differences were resolved through discussion. When necessary, 2 attempts were made to contact authors for missing data or to elucidate uncertainties.

Quality assessment of observational studies remains dubious in comparison with that of randomized clinical trials.<sup>17</sup> Risk of bias was assessed with the Newcastle-Ottawa scale.<sup>21</sup> Scoring was performed independently by 2 of us (T.A.L. and N.S.G.) and discrepancies were resolved through discussion with a third reviewer (R.A.B.). As previously suggested, a score below 7 was defined as moderate quality and below 4 as poor.<sup>22</sup> Randomized clinical trials were scored using the Cochrane Handbook.<sup>23</sup> Authors were also contacted for individual patient data meta-analysis; however, owing to insufficient response, this analysis was not deemed feasible.

# **Statistical Analysis**

Studies were grouped by patient population. If populations between studies overlapped, the study with the largest sample size was chosen for analysis. Studies including more than 10% to 15% noneligible patients (eg, adults) were omitted from quantitative analysis. Dichotomous outcomes are reported as odds ratio (OR) and corresponding 95% CI. The reported number of events and total number of events were used to calculate ORs; if only ORs were reported, these values were used. Unadjusted and adjusted ORs were analyzed separately. Inverse variance was used to pool all ORs in a random-effects model. Data were analyzed by the DerSimonian and Laird method, because we expected large differences in sample sizes. To account for the tendency of the DerSimonian and Laird method to result in smaller CIs,<sup>24</sup> additional Hartung-Knapp adjustment of the pooled effect size 95% CIs was performed.<sup>25</sup>

Heterogeneity was assessed using *l*<sup>2</sup> statistics. The contribution of studies to the overall heterogeneity was explored by leave-1-out analyses and graphical display of study heterogeneity plots.<sup>26</sup> Predefined subgroup analyses were performed to analyze more homogenous groups (1) based on outlier analyses, (2) excluding ECMO-only studies, and (3) in studies correcting for confounders.

In addition, studies were grouped by their definition of hyperoxia to determine the association between the design and observed outcomes. Data were pooled for all definitions used or from which data were extractable. Publication bias was assessed with the use of funnel plots to explore small study effect size and *P* curve analysis to explore *P* hacking.<sup>27</sup>

Statistical significance was defined as a 2-sided *P* value <.05. Analyses were performed using RevMan, version 5.3 (The Cochrane Collaboration) and R, version 3.6.1 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing) with RStudio, version 1.2.1335 (RStudio).

# Results

The literature search resulted in 1817 potentially relevant studies. After the screening process, 16 studies, including 27 555 patients, remained (eFigure 1 in the Supplement).<sup>28-43</sup> All included studies, except for 1 pilot randomized clinical trial, were observational (12 retrospective and 3 prospective). Study populations included were post-cardiac arrest (n = 6), traumatic brain injury (n = 1), ECMO (n = 2), and general critical care patients (n = 7). Other study characteristics are reported in **Table 1**. Newcastle-Ottawa scale scores for quality ranged from 7 to 9, with lack of correction for confounders the main contributor to a higher risk of bias (eTable 2 in the Supplement).

# Table 1. Study Characteristics

| Source   | Design | Patients,<br>No. | Age, median (IQR)                              | Population                                | Main measure of<br>hyperoxia | Definition for hyperoxia                                  | Main outcomes as by<br>design  |  |
|--|--------|------------------|--|---|------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Bennett et al, <sup>28</sup> 2013, US                    | RC     | 195              | Only reported<br>proportions for age<br>groups | Cardiac arrest                            | Pao <sub>2</sub>             | >200 mm Hg (27 kPa)                                       | In-hospital mortality,<br>neurological outcome   |  |
| Cashen et al, <sup>29</sup> 2018, US                     | PC     | 484              | Only reported<br>proportions for age<br>groups | ECMO                                      | Pao <sub>2</sub>             | >200 torr (27 kPa)  | In-hospital mortality,<br>kidney failure, LOS<br>PICU, LOS hospital,<br>ECMO           |  |
| Del Castillo et al, <sup>30</sup> 2012,                  | PC     | 223              | 14 (5-60) mo                                   | Cardiac arrest                            | Pao <sub>2</sub> and P/F     | >300 mm Hg (40 kPa)                                       | In-hospital mortality  |  |
| International (RIBEPCI Network)                          |        |                  |  |   |                              | P/F>300   |  |  |
| Ferguson et al, <sup>31</sup> 2012, UK                   | RC     | 1875             | 11 (2-61) mo                                   | Cardiac arrest                            | Pao <sub>2</sub>             | >300 mm Hg (40 kPa)                                       | In-hospital mortality  |  |
| Guerra-Wallace et al, <sup>32</sup> 2013, US             | RC     | 74               | Median (range), 1.8<br>(0-18) y                | Cardiac arrest                            | Pao <sub>2</sub>             | >200 mm Hg (27 kPa)                                       | 6-mo mortality   |  |
|  |        |                  |  |   |                              | >300 mm Hg (40 kPa)                                       |  |  |
| Ketharanathan et al, <sup>33</sup> 2020,                 | RC     | 71               | 8.9 (4.6-12.9), y                              | Severe<br>traumatic brain<br>iniury       | Pao <sub>2</sub>             | >200 mm Hg (27 kPa)                                       | In-PICU mortality  |  |
| the Netherlands  |        |                  |  |   |                              | >250 mm Hg (33 kPa)                                       |  |  |
|  |        |                  |  |   |                              | >300 mm Hg (40 kPa)                                       |  |  |
| Kraft et al, <sup>34</sup> 2017, Austria                 | RC     | 419              | Mean (SD), 57.8 (19.9) y                       | General PICU or<br>ICU                    | Pao <sub>2</sub>             | >120 mm Hg (>16 kPa)                                      | In-hospital mortality,<br>LOS ICU, LOS hospital  |  |
| López-Herce et al, <sup>35</sup> 2014,                   | PC     | 502              | 44.5 (5-60) mo                                 | Cardiac arrest                            | $Pao_2$ and $Fio_2$          | ≥200 mm Hg (27 kPa)                                       | In-hospital mortality,<br>neurological outcome   |  |
| international (Latin America,<br>Spain, Portugal, Italy) |        |                  |  |   |                              | Fio <sub>2</sub> 0.50-0.79                                |  |  |
|  |        |                  |  |   |                              | Fio <sub>2</sub> ≥0.80                                    |  |  |
| Numa et al, <sup>36</sup> 2018, Australia                | RC     | 1447             | 1.7 (0.3-7.1) y                                | General PICU<br>(mostly<br>postoperative) | Pao <sub>2</sub>             | >250 mm Hg (33 kPa)                                       | In-PICU mortality  |  |
| Pelletier et al, <sup>37</sup> 2020, US                  | RC     | 4469 or<br>4537  | 1.8 (0.4-8.4) y                                | General PICU                              | Pao <sub>2</sub>             | No predefined cutoff;<br>divided by bands of 100<br>mm Hg | In-hospital mortality  |  |
| Peters et al, <sup>38</sup> 2018, UK                     | RCT    | 159              | Liberal median, 0.8<br>(0.1-2.0) y             | General PICU                              | Spo <sub>2</sub> (target)    | Liberal >94%  | Feasibility of trial, LOS<br>PICU, IMV duration, 30<br>VFD, in-PICU mortality          |  |
|  |        |                  | Conservative median, 1.9<br>(0.4-5.0) y        |   |                              | Control 88%-92%   |  |  |
| Raman et al, <sup>39</sup> 2016, UK                      | RC     | 7410             | Not reported                                   | General PICU                              | Pao <sub>2</sub>             | >300 mm Hg (>40 kPa)                                      | Mortality (unspecified time point)   |  |
| Ramgopal et al, <sup>40</sup> 2019, US                   | RC     | 6250             | Only reported<br>proportions for age<br>groups | General PICU                              | Pao <sub>2</sub>             | ≥300 mm Hg (40 kPa)                                       | In-hospital mortality  |  |
| Ramgopal et al, <sup>41</sup> 2020, US                   | RC     | 3616             | Mean (SD), 8.7 (6.7) y                         | General PICU                              | Pao <sub>2</sub>             | ≥300 mm Hg (40 kPa)                                       | In-hospital mortality  |  |
| Sznycer-Taub et al, <sup>42</sup> 2016, US               | RC     | 93               | 7 (5-20) d                                     | ECMO                                      | Pao <sub>2</sub>             | >193 mm Hg (26 kPa)                                       | 30-d mortality,<br>in-hospital mortality,<br>kidney failure, LOS<br>PICU, LOS hospital |  |
| van Zellem et al, <sup>43</sup> 2015,                    | RC     | 200              | Nonsurvivors, 20.4                             | Cardiac arrest                            | Pao <sub>2</sub>             | >200 mm Hg (27 kPa)                                       | In-hospital mortality  |  |
|  |        |                  | (1.0-211.9) m0                                 |   |                              | >250 mm Hg (33 kPa)                                       |  |  |
|  |        |                  | Survivors, 37.6<br>(1.0-262.6) mo              |   |                              | >300 mm Hg (40 kPa)                                       |  |  |

Abbreviations: ECMO, extracorporeal membrane oxygenation; Fio<sub>2</sub>, fraction of inspired oxygen; ICU, intensive care unit; IMV, invasive mechanical ventilation; LOS, length of stay; Pao<sub>2</sub>, arterial partial pressure of oxygen; PC, prospective cohort study; P/F, arterial partial pressure of oxygen to fraction of inspired oxygen ratio; PICU, pediatric intensive

care unit; RC, retrospective cohort study; RCT, randomized clinical trial; Spo<sub>2</sub>, peripheral saturation of oxygen; VFD, ventilator-free days.

SI conversion factor: To convert millimeters of mercury to kilopascals, multiply by 0.133.

# **Hyperoxia Parameters and Definitions**

Definitions, period of assessment, and measures of hyperoxia are reported in **Table 2**. The  $Pao_2$  was most frequently used to assess hyperoxia (15 studies) and was usually defined as a categorical predictor with thresholds ranging from greater than 120 mm Hg (to convert to kilopascals, multiply by 0.133) up to greater than 300 mm Hg. In these studies, either absence of hyperoxia (ie, all patients below the threshold) or a custom range for normoxia was used as the comparator. With the custom range approach, the lower limit of normoxia was 60 mm Hg and the threshold for hyperoxia was the upper limit. Most studies evaluated hyperoxia within the first 24 hours of PICU admission. Several measures were used to select  $Pao_2$ , but the highest value and the first value were the most common. Less common methods focused on cumulative exposure by grouping patients by the frequency of  $Pao_2$  values in the hyperoxic range (1 study<sup>40</sup>) or by analyzing the area under the  $Pao_2$  to time relationship (3 studies<sup>33,40,43</sup>).

#### Table 2. Overview of Definitions and Assessment Periods of Hyperoxia<sup>a</sup>

|                            | Assessment period               |                              | _                                    |  |  |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| Hyperoxia definition Start |                                 | End                          | Selection criterion                  | Source                                   |  |
| Pao <sub>2</sub>           |                                 |                              |                                      |  |  |
| >120 mm Hg (16 kPa)        | Start of IMV                    | IMV day 7                    | Time-weighted mean                   | Kraft et al, <sup>34</sup> 2017          |  |
| >193 mm Hg (26 kPa)        | Start of ECMO                   | 48 h after ECMO initiation   | Mean value                           | Sznycer-Taub et al, <sup>42</sup> 2016   |  |
| >200 mm Hg (27 kPa)        | At ROSC                         | 1 h after ROSC               | None; 1 value                        | López-Herce et al, <sup>35</sup> 2014    |  |
|                            | 24 h after cardiac arrest       | 24 h after cardiac arrest    |                                      |  |  |
|                            | At ROSC                         | 6 h after ROSC               | Highest and lowest value             | Bennett et al, <sup>28</sup> 2013        |  |
|                            | PICU admission                  | 24 h after PICU admission    | Not specified                        | Guerra-Wallace et al, <sup>32</sup> 2013 |  |
|                            | PICU admission                  | 24 h after PICU admission    | Highest and cumulative exposure      | Ketharanathan et al, <sup>33</sup> 2020  |  |
|                            | PICU admission                  | 24 h after PICU admission    | Highest and cumulative exposure      | van Zellem et al, <sup>43</sup> 2015     |  |
|                            | Start of ECMO                   | 48 h after ECMO initiation   | Highest                              | Cashen et al, <sup>29</sup> 2018         |  |
| >250 mm Hg (33 kPa)        | PICU admission                  | 1 h after PICU admission     | First value                          | Numa et al, <sup>36</sup> 2018           |  |
|                            | PICU admission                  | 24 h after PICU admission    | Highest and cumulative exposure      | Ketharanathan et al, <sup>33</sup> 2020  |  |
|                            | PICU admission                  | 24 h after PICU admission    | Highest and cumulative exposure      | van Zellem et al, <sup>43</sup> 2015     |  |
| >300 mm Hg (40 kPa)        | At ROSC                         | 1 h after ROSC               | None; 1 value                        | Del Castillo et al, <sup>30</sup> 2012   |  |
|                            | 24 h after cardiac arrest       | 24 h after cardiac arrest    |                                      |  |  |
|                            | PICU admission                  | 1 h after PICU admission     | First value                          | Ferguson et al, <sup>31</sup> 2012       |  |
|                            | PICU admission                  | 1 h after PICU admission     | First value                          | Raman et al, <sup>39</sup> 2016          |  |
|                            | 6 h preceding PICU admission    | 6 h after PICU admission     | Highest                              | Ramgopal et al, <sup>41</sup> 2020       |  |
|                            | PICU admission                  | 24 h after PICU admission    | Not specified                        | Guerra-Wallace et al, <sup>32</sup> 2013 |  |
|                            | PICU admission                  | 24 h after PICU admission    | Highest and cumulative exposure      | Ketharanathan et al, <sup>33</sup> 2020  |  |
|                            | PICU admission                  | 24 h after PICU admission    | Highest and cumulative exposure      | van Zellem et al, <sup>43</sup> 2015     |  |
|                            | PICU admission                  | PICU discharge               | Highest and cumulative exposure      | Ramgopal et al, <sup>40</sup> 2019       |  |
| No threshold defined       | PICU admission                  | 72 h after PICU admission    | Highest                              | Pelletier et al, <sup>37</sup> 2020      |  |
| Fio <sub>2</sub>           |                                 |                              |                                      |  |  |
| >50%                       | At ROSC                         | 1 h after ROSC               | None; 1 value                        | López-Herce et al, <sup>35</sup> 2014    |  |
|                            | 24 h after cardiac arrest       | 24 h after cardiac arrest    |                                      |  |  |
| P/F                        |                                 |                              |                                      |  |  |
| >300                       | At ROSC                         | 1 h after ROSC               | None; 1 value                        | Del Castillo et al, <sup>30</sup> 2012   |  |
|                            | 24 h after cardiac arrest       | 24 h after cardiac arrest    |                                      |  |  |
| Spo <sub>2</sub>           |                                 |                              |                                      |  |  |
| >94%                       | PICU admission                  | PICU discharge               | NA                                   | Peters et al, 38 2018                    |  |
|                            | val mombrane outganation Fig. 6 | reation of incrited 3 Access | ment period during uthich hyperovieu | an account and the exiterion used to     |  |

Abbreviations: ECMO, extracorporeal membrane oxygenation; Fio<sub>2</sub>, fraction of inspired oxygen; IMV, invasive mechanical ventilation; NA, not applicable; P/F, arterial partial pressure of oxygen to fraction of inspired oxygen ratio; PICU, pediatric intensive care unit; ROSC, return of spontaneous circulation; Spo<sub>2</sub>, peripheral saturation of oxygen.

<sup>a</sup> Assessment period during which hyperoxia was assessed and the criterion used to select assessed measurements for all studies included.

# Outcomes

None of the studies reported the predefined primary outcome of 28-day mortality (eTable 3 in the Supplement) and we therefore converted the primary outcome to mortality at the longest follow-up. Other secondary outcomes could not be pooled owing to selective reporting. eFigure 1 in the Supplement shows studies that were omitted from the quantitative analysis.<sup>30,34,38,41,42</sup>

# Mortality

The association of hyperoxia with mortality for all 16 studies diverged substantially between studies (eFigure 2 in the Supplement). After omission of the aforementioned investigations, <sup>30,34,38,41,42</sup> meta-analysis of 11 studies analyzed by subgroup of patients, including 23 204 patients, showed a crude OR of 1.59 (95% CI, 1.00-2.51; P = .05) (**Figure 1**) (95% CI, 1.05-2.38; P = .03 after Hartung-Knapp adjustment) (**Table 3**). Between-study heterogeneity was substantial ( $I^2 = 92\%$ ) and among-subgroup heterogeneity was significant ( $I^2 = 63\%$ ). Heterogeneity was also substantial within the subgroup of general PICU patients ( $I^2 = 97\%$ ). The subgroup of patients receiving ECMO (1 study<sup>29</sup>) showed a significant association (OR, 2.23; 95% CI, 1.49-3.34; P < .001).

We performed several predefined sensitivity analyses to examine the pooled effect size in more homogeneous groups. Outlier analyses indicated 2 pronounced outliers<sup>37,40</sup> and 1 potential outlier (eFigures 3-5 in the Supplement).<sup>36</sup> Secondary analyses excluding these outliers showed similar associations to the main analysis and reduced heterogeneity (Table 3; eFigure 6 and eFigure 7 in the

Figure 1. Random-Effects Meta-analysis of Hyperoxia (Categorical Exposure) on Mortality, at Longest Follow-up, Stratified by Case Mix

|  |   |                         | OR IV, random                                      | Lower odds   | Higher odds     | Weight, |
|--|---|-------------------------|--|--------------|-----------------|---------|
| Study or subgroup  | Log, OR   | SE                      | (95% CI)   | of mortality | of mortality    | %       |
| Cardiac arrest   |   |                         |  |              |                 |         |
| Bennett et al, <sup>28</sup> 2013  | 0.1633  | 0.3038                  | 1.18 (0.65-2.14)                                   | -            |                 | 9.1     |
| Ferguson et al, <sup>31</sup> 2012   | 0.197   | 0.1518                  | 1.22 (0.90-1.64)                                   |              |                 | 10.3    |
| Guerra-Wallace et al, <sup>32</sup> 2013   | -0.0576   | 0.5161                  | 0.94 (0.34-2.60)                                   |              |                 | 7.1     |
| López-Herce et al, <sup>35</sup> 2014  | -0.1681   | 0.3973                  | 0.85 (0.39-1.84)                                   |              |                 | 8.2     |
| van Zellem et al, <sup>43</sup> 2015   | 0.3287  | 0.2932                  | 1.39 (0.78-2.47)                                   | -            | -               | 9.2     |
| Subtotal (95% CI)  |   |                         | 1.18 (0.95-1.48)                                   |              | $\diamond$      | 43.8    |
| Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 0.00$ ; $\chi^2 = 1$<br>Test for overall effect: $z = 1.48$                                   | 24, df=4 (P=<br>(P=.14)                                 | =.87); I <sup>2</sup> = | 0%   |              |                 |         |
| Traumatic brain injury   |   |                         |  |              |                 |         |
| Ketharanathan et al, <sup>33</sup> 2020  | 0.5755  | 0.6292                  | 1.78 (0.52-6.10)                                   | _            | ÷               | 6.1     |
| Subtotal (95% CI)  |   |                         | 1.78 (0.52-6.10)                                   | <            | $\sim$          | 6.1     |
| Heterogeneity: not applicable<br>Test for overall effect: z=0.91   | (P=.36)   |                         |  |              |                 |         |
| Extracorporeal membrane oxy  | genation  |                         |  |              |                 |         |
| Cashen et al, <sup>29</sup> 2018   | 0.8009  | 0.206                   | 2.23 (1.49-3.34)                                   |              |                 | 9.9     |
| Subtotal (95% CI)  |   |                         | 2.23 (1.49-3.34)                                   |              | $\diamond$      | 9.9     |
| Heterogeneity: not applicable<br>Test for overall effect: $z = 3.89$   | (P<.001)  |                         |  |              |                 |         |
| General  |   |                         |  |              |                 |         |
| Numa et al, <sup>36</sup> 2018   | 1.2981  | 0.2966                  | 3.66 (2.05-6.55)                                   |              | <b></b>         | 9.2     |
| Pelletier et al, <sup>37</sup> 2020  | -0.3773   | 0.1585                  | 0.69 (0.50-0.94)                                   |              |                 | 10.2    |
| Raman et al, <sup>39</sup> 2016  | 0.5792  | 0.1445                  | 1.78 (1.34-2.37)                                   |              | -               | 10.3    |
| Ramgopal et al, <sup>40</sup> 2019   | 1.5162  | 0.1059                  | 4.55 (3.70-5.61)                                   |              | -               | 10.5    |
| Subtotal (95% CI)  |   |                         | 2.11 (0.85-5.23)                                   |              | $\bigcirc$      | 40.2    |
| Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 0.82$ ; $\chi^2 = 1$<br>Test for overall effect: $z = 1.62$                                   | .05.29, df = 3 (<br>(P=.11)                             | (P<.001);               | l <sup>2</sup> = 97%                               |              | ~               |         |
| Total (95% CI)   |   |                         | 1.59 (1.00-2.51)                                   |              | $\diamond$      | 100     |
| Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 0.51$ ; $\chi^2 = 1$<br>Test for overall effect: $z = 1.96$<br>Test for subgroup differences: | .33.09, df = 10<br>(P=.05)<br>χ <sup>2</sup> =8.13, df= | ) (P<.001)<br>3 (P=.04) | ); I <sup>2</sup> =92%<br>); I <sup>2</sup> =63.1% |              |                 |         |
|  |   |                         | 0  | 01 01        | i 10 1          | 1       |
|  |   |                         | U  |              | 1 10 1          | 00      |
|  |   |                         |  |              | JUIII (JJ/0 CI) |         |

The diamond size represents the summary effect size. IV indicates inverse variance; OR, odds ratio.

Supplement). Secondary analysis, excluding ECMO studies as predefined, resolved among-subgroup heterogeneity, but did not show an association with mortality (Table 3; eFigure 8 in the Supplement).

In addition, we pooled the effect estimate of confounder-adjusted ORs. Twelve studies were corrected for confounders either in multivariable logistic regression or in multivariable nonlinear prediction models.<sup>28,29,31,34-37,39-43</sup> Of these, 7 studies corrected for severity of disease using (modified) severity of disease or risk of mortality scores, including Pediatric Logistic Organ Dysfunction, Pediatric Index of Mortality, and Pediatric Risk of Mortality scores.<sup>31,34,36,37,39-41</sup> Adjusted ORs were obtainable from 6 studies and could be pooled for only 3 (Table 3; eFigure 9 in the Supplement).<sup>36,40,43</sup>

Because we hypothesized that the definition of hyperoxia affects the association with mortality, we pooled study data for each primary threshold that was used or from which data were extractable (**Figure 2**). Within-group heterogeneity was significant for multiple thresholds (>200 mm Hg:  $l^2$  = 78%; >250 mm Hg:  $l^2$  49%; >300 mm Hg:  $l^2$  = 94%) and an association between hyperoxia and mortality was observed at the 250 mm Hg threshold (>200 mm Hg: OR, 1.21; 95% CI, 0.78-1.88; P = .39;>250 mm Hg: OR, 2.48; 95% CI, 1.36-4.51; P = .003; >300 mm Hg: OR, 1.72; 95% CI, 0.99-3.01; P = .06). Additional sensitivity analyses, based on previous outlier analysis, resolved withingroup heterogeneity and showed an association between hyperoxia and mortality at higher thresholds of Pao<sub>2</sub> (>200 mm Hg: OR, 1.09; 95% CI 0.77-1.53; P = .64;  $l^2$  = 0%; >250 mm Hg: OR, 1.75; 95% CI, 1.04-2.95; P = .04;  $l^2$  = 0%; >300 mm Hg: OR, 1.47; 95% CI, 1.22-1.76; P < .001;  $l^2$  = 0%) (eFigure 10 and eFigure 11 in the Supplement)

# **Other Outcomes**

Other secondary outcomes reported by studies and their outcomes are reported in eTable 3 and eTable 4 in the Supplement. Significant outcomes in terms of incidence and duration of organ support were found in 2 studies including only patients receiving ECMO.<sup>29,42</sup> One study reported a positive association of hyperoxia with continuous venovenous hemofiltration incidence (hyperoxia vs normoxia: OR, 4.42; 95% CI, 1.19-16.42; P = .03), whereas the other study reported a negative association of hyperoxia with ECMO duration (hyperoxia: median, 4.7 [IQR, 2.5-8.0] days vs normoxia: 5.9 [IQR, 3.1-10.5] days; P = .009). Associations with hyperoxia were also observed for the length of stay in the pediatric critical care unit<sup>29,34</sup> and hospital.<sup>34</sup> Both studies reported an association of hyperoxia with reduced length of stay in PICU, hyperoxia: median, 25.0 [IQR, 12.8-48.2] days vs normoxia: median, 30.5 [IQR, 15.6-54.0] days;  $P = .045^{29}$ ; hyperoxia: mean [SD], 24.5 [15.9] days vs normoxia: mean [SD], 30.7 [25.2];  $P = .04^{34}$ ; length of stay in hospital, hyperoxia: mean, 43.3 [30.2] days vs normoxia: mean, 58.9 [46.9] days;  $P < .001^{34}$ ).

Publication bias was deemed as unlikely, based on the relative symmetrical shape of the funnel plot and exploratory *P* curve results (eFigure 12 and eTable 5 in the Supplement).

| Fable 3. Pooled Effect Estimates for Hyperoxia and Mortality <sup>a</sup> |   |         |                              |                               |                                |  |  |
|---|---|---------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|
| Analysis  | Pooled effect<br>estimate,<br>OR (95% CI) | P value | 95% CI adjusted <sup>b</sup> | P value adjusted <sup>b</sup> | l <sup>2</sup> , %<br>(95% CI) |  |  |
| Main analysis, all<br>studies in quantitative<br>synthesis                | 1.59 (1.00-2.51)                          | .05     | 1.05-2.38                    | .03                           | 92 (89-95)                     |  |  |
| Sensitivity 1, omitting clear outliers <sup>c</sup>                       | 1.58 (1.21-2.07)                          | <.001   | 1.14-2.21                    | .01                           | 58 (12-80)                     |  |  |
| Sensitivity 2, omitting possible outliers <sup>d</sup>                    | 1.46 (1.17-1.83)                          | <.001   | 1.13-1.89                    | .01                           | 34 (0-71)                      |  |  |
| Sensitivity 3, omitting<br>ECMO-only studies                              | 1.52 (0.92-2.54)                          | .11     | 0.97-2.39                    | .06                           | 93 (90-96)                     |  |  |
| Sensitivity 4,<br>confounder-corrected<br>studies                         | 1.51 (0.85-2.68)                          | .07     | 0.39-5.85                    | .32                           | 63 (0-89)                      |  |  |

JAMA Network Open. 2022;5(1):e2142105. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.42105

Abbreviations: ECMO, extra corporeal membrane oxygenation; OR, odds ratio.

- <sup>a</sup> Pooled effect estimates from a random-effects model of hyperoxia and mortality using the DerSimonian and Laird method.
- <sup>b</sup> Hartung-Knapp adjustment.
- <sup>c</sup> Omitting Ramgopal et al<sup>40</sup> and Pelletier et al<sup>37</sup> based on outlier analyses.
- <sup>d</sup> Omitting Ramgopal et al,<sup>40</sup> Pelletier et al,<sup>37</sup> and Numa et al<sup>36</sup> based on outlier analyses.

# Discussion

In this systematic review, we identified 16 studies including 27 555 patients that described the association between hyperoxia and patient outcomes in critically ill children. Most evidence consisted of observational studies with heterogeneous study designs to define and assess hyperoxia. Five studies were excluded from quantitative synthesis. Meta-analysis of the remaining 11 studies showed, despite substantial heterogeneity, an association between hyperoxia and mortality in the main-analysis and in heterogeneity resolved sensitivity analyses, with a signal of harm at higher thresholds of Pao<sub>2</sub> when accounted for heterogeneity. Reports on outcomes other than mortality were scarce and inadequate for meta-analysis.

Our results may have been affected by differences in study design, such as the method used for measurement, the definition by cutoff, and the assessment period. First, the most common variable used to measure hyperoxia was Pao<sub>2</sub>. In contrast to adults, a major downside to this method of measure in children is the less common use of arterial lines in the PICU, which could hamper generalizability of our results, because children with arterial lines might be in clinically worse condition compared with those without. Furthermore, although Pao<sub>2</sub> gives clear information on the systemic burden of oxygen, it does not necessarily inform us on alveolar hyperoxia (ie, the pulmonary burden of oxygen). For example, patients with severe hypoxemia may be exposed to a high fraction of inspired oxygen (Fio<sub>2</sub>), thus a high pulmonary burden of oxygen, without leading to extremes of Pao<sub>2</sub> due to, for example, alveolar capillary diffusion disturbances or intrapulmonary shunting.<sup>44</sup> However, alveolar hyperoxia by itself may lead to lung injury.<sup>45</sup> Hyperoxia should therefore not only

Figure 2. Random-Effects Meta-analysis (Subtotals Only) of Hyperoxia (Categorical Exposure) on Mortality, at Longest Follow-up, Stratified by Threshold of Hyperoxia (Pao<sub>2</sub>)

|   |                             |                                | OR IV, random          | Lower odds   | Higher odds  | Weight |
|---|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------|
| Study or subgroup   | Log, OR                     | SE                             | (95% CI)               | of mortality | of mortality | %      |
| >200 mm Hg (27 kPa)   |                             |                                |                        |              |              |        |
| Bennett et al, <sup>28</sup> 2013   | 0.1633                      | 0.3038                         | 1.18 (0.65-2.14)       | _            | -            | 13.7   |
| Cashen et al, <sup>29</sup> 2018  | 0.8009                      | 0.206                          | 2.23 (1.49-3.34)       |              |              | 15.9   |
| Guerra-Wallace et al, <sup>32</sup> 2013  | -0.4125                     | 0.5907                         | 0.66 (0.21-2.11)       |              |              | 8.1    |
| Ketharanathan et al, <sup>33</sup> 2020   | 0.5828                      | 0.8286                         | 1.79 (0.35-9.09)       |              |              | 5.2    |
| López-Herce et al, <sup>35</sup> 2014   | -0.1681                     | 0.3973                         | 0.85 (0.39-1.84)       |              | <b></b>      | 11.6   |
| Numa et al, <sup>36</sup> 2018  | 0.7321                      | 0.2736                         | 2.08 (1.22-3.55)       |              |              | 14.4   |
| Pelletier et al, <sup>37</sup> 2020   | -0.3967                     | 0.1344                         | 0.67 (0.52-0.88)       | +            |              | 17.2   |
| Van Zellem et al, <sup>43</sup> 2015  | 0.2065                      | 0.2968                         | 1.23 (0.69-2.20)       | -            |              | 13.9   |
| Subtotal (95% CI)   |                             |                                | 1.21 (0.78-1.88)       | <            | $\diamond$   | 100.0  |
| Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 0.27$ ; $\chi^2 = 3$<br>Test for overall effect: $z = 0.86$    | 32.21, df=7 (<br>(P=.39)    | P<.001);                       | l <sup>2</sup> = 78%   |              | Č            |        |
| >250 mm Hg (33 kPa)   |                             |                                |                        |              |              |        |
| Ketharanathan et al, <sup>33</sup> 2020   | 1.0282                      | 0.7102                         | 2.80 (0.70-11.25)      | ) —          |              | 14.7   |
| Numa et al, <sup>36</sup> 2018  | 1.2981                      | 0.2966                         | 3.66 (2.05-6.55)       |              |              | 42.2   |
| Van Zellem et al, <sup>43</sup> 2015  | 0.4812                      | 0.2886                         | 1.62(0.92-2.85)        |              |              | 43.1   |
| Subtotal (95% CI)   |                             |                                | 2.48 (1.36-4.51)       |              | $\diamond$   | 100.0  |
| Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 0.13$ ; $\chi^2 = 3$<br>Test for overall effect: $z = 2.96$    | 3.94, df=2 (P<br>(P=.003)   | =.14); <i>I</i> <sup>2</sup> = | 49%                    |              | Ť            |        |
| >300 mm Hg (40 kPa)   |                             |                                |                        |              |              |        |
| Del Castillo et al, <sup>30</sup> 2012  | 0.4822                      | 0.4896                         | 1.62 (0.62-4.23)       | _            |              | 9.4    |
| Ferguson et al, <sup>31</sup> 2012  | 0.197                       | 0.1518                         | 1.22 (0.90-1.64)       |              |              | 12.7   |
| Guerra-Wallace et al, <sup>32</sup> 2013  | -0.0576                     | 0.5161                         | 0.94 (0.34-2.60)       | ,            |              | 9.2    |
| Ketharanathan et al, <sup>33</sup> 2020   | 0.5755                      | 0.6292                         | 1.78 (0.52-6.10)       |              |              | 8.0    |
| Numa et al, <sup>36</sup> 2018  | 1.5846                      | 0.3469                         | 4.88 (2.47-9.63)       |              |              | 11.0   |
| Pelletier et al, <sup>37</sup> 2020   | -0.3773                     | 0.1585                         | 0.69 (0.50-0.94)       |              |              | 12.6   |
| Raman et al, <sup>39</sup> 2016   | 0.5792                      | 0.1445                         | 1.78 (1.34-2.37)       |              |              | 12.7   |
| Ramgopal et al, <sup>40</sup> 2019  | 1.5162                      | 0.1059                         | 4.55 (3.70-5.61)       |              | +            | 12.9   |
| Van Zellem et al, <sup>43</sup> 2015  | 0.3287                      | 0.2932                         | 1.39 (0.78-2.47)       | -            |              | 11.5   |
| Subtotal (95% CI)   |                             |                                | 1.72 (0.99-3.01)       |              | $\diamond$   | 100.0  |
| Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 0.61$ ; $\chi^2 = 1.92$<br>Test for overall effect: $z = 1.92$ | L27.77, df=8<br>(P=.06)     | (P<.001)                       | ; I <sup>2</sup> = 94% | D.01 0.1     | 1 10         | 100    |
| Test for subgroup differences:  | χ <sup>2</sup> = 3.63, df = | =2 (P=.16                      | ); /²=44.9%            | OR IV, rand  | dom (95% CI) |        |

Studies were included for every primary threshold used by the study or from which data were extractable. The diamond size represents the summary effect size. IV indicates inverse variance; OR, odds ratio.

be estimated by Pao<sub>2</sub>, because Fio<sub>2</sub> might be of equal relevance to evaluate the harm of oxygen. Most of the included studies focused only on systemic hyperoxia, defined by Pao<sub>2</sub>, and thus did not sufficiently address the pulmonary burden of oxygen. Future studies on the potential harm of oxygen supplementation should evaluate both the pulmonary and systemic oxygen burden, for example, by assessment of pulmonary biomarkers of hyperoxia-induced injury.<sup>45</sup>

Second, most studies used a categorical definition of hyperoxia by cutoff. Used thresholds are arbitrary and differences therein may affect the observed association as noted herein. Because detrimental effects from oxygen seem to be dose-dependent, observed in an U-shaped association, <sup>37,39</sup> a sharp cutoff may not reflect this reality well. The degree of hyperoxia, its duration, and large fluctuations in oxygenation may be more important. In addition, the definition of the reference group is of equal importance to the observed outcome, especially if patients with hypoxemia are included.<sup>28,36,40,42,43</sup> Furthermore, some patient groups may be more susceptible to hyperoxia. For instance, both studies including only patients receiving ECMO support showed an association between hyperoxia and mortality at lower thresholds of hyperoxia.<sup>29,42</sup>

Third, because hyperoxia-induced oxidative stress seems to be time- and dose-dependent, the assessment period of hyperoxia is also of importance.<sup>33,40,46</sup> Especially when periods exceeding initial admission day are taken into account, the cumulative exposure instead of a single maximum value may be a better representation of the degree of oxygen exposure. In this regard, one study showed that maximum Pao<sub>2</sub> correlated poorly to moderately with observed cumulative exposure, defined as the area under the Pao<sub>2</sub> to time relationship, over the first day of admission.<sup>33</sup>

Another factor of importance is the primary outcome of the studies. Within this review, mortality (PICU and hospital) was the most frequently reported outcome among the studies. Although mortality is undoubtedly the most objective and most severe patient outcome, it is relatively uncommon in the PICU (2%-3%), especially compared with the rate in critically ill adults.<sup>47,48</sup> In addition, next to potential effects on mortality, hyperoxia may have less-definitive, but equally important, long-term detrimental outcomes, because organ development proceeds during childhood and could be hampered by the toxic effects of oxygen on biomolecules.<sup>3-5</sup> However, we found that outcomes related to such potential long-term effects of hyperoxia in critically ill children are lacking in the current evidence. Future studies addressing hyperoxia in the PICU should bring more focus on long-term outcomes, including lung function and general functional scores, as included by the Oxy-PICU trial.<sup>49</sup>

Our findings partly mirror the literature in critically ill adults. The association between arterial hyperoxia and mortality was also observed in 2 meta-analyses of observational studies in adults.<sup>1,2</sup> However, the association in critically ill adults appears to be more robust as the CI of the association was narrower and the association was maintained in confounder-adjusted analysis. One explanation may be the difference in power, as these adult reviews included more studies, with more than double the number of patients in their quantitative analysis. Another hypothesis could be that children's susceptibility to oxygen toxic effects differs from that of adults owing to age-related differences in vulnerability,<sup>50-52</sup> which, for example, appears to be true for ventilator-induced lung injury.<sup>53,54</sup> Although there seems to be a sound pathophysiological explanation for the observed association in this review,<sup>55</sup> further insight of the complex association between oxygen supplementation and outcome from additional prospective pediatric studies is needed.<sup>10,56</sup> In addition, the clinical implications need to be addressed in clinical trials. On this note, there have been several trials comparing liberal vs restrictive oxygen targets over the past years in critically ill adults. 44,57-60 Although a meta-analysis of the earliest trials supported an increased risk for mortality on use of liberal oxygen targets,<sup>57</sup> these findings were disputed by a recent updated meta-analysis including more large-scale trials.<sup>58</sup> The most recent trials also did not find a clear harmful effect of liberal oxygenation on outcomes, 44,59,60 which suggests that the true effect size of hyperoxia is probably much smaller than previously suggested from observational studies and more complex than thought.

#### **Strengths and Limitations**

A strength of this review is the rigorous search, independent screening, and detailed reporting of methods and findings. The observed association was consistent over multiple sensitivity analyses, including less heterogeneous groups and by grouping of hyperoxia definitions.

The study also has limitations. First, all studies included in the quantitative analysis were observational and most were retrospective. Second, many studies did not correct for severity of illness, most probably owing to small sample sizes or lack of significance in univariable analysis. This lack of correction complicated our sensitivity analysis adjusted for severity of illness. We could not resolve this limitation owing to insufficient response from authors for individual patient data meta-analysis. This lack of data is a noteworthy drawback of our study, because severity of illness is an important confounder. Sicker patients may receive more oxygen, which could lead to an overestimation of the effect of oxygen on mortality. Third, our predefined primary outcome was not reported by any included study. We therefore pooled data from mortality at the longest follow-up point, but this pooling may have contributed to the heterogeneity of our results. Fourth, there was substantial heterogeneity between studies, because of both the designs used and within the pooled effect estimates. Although the observed association was consistent in less heterogeneous groups, the wide variation in patient populations, definitions of hyperoxia, and assessment periods warrants caution with generalizability of these results.

# Conclusions

This systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies suggests an association between hyperoxia and mortality in the PICU, despite methodologic limitations of the included studies. Our findings support that oxygen may be harmful above a certain dose in critically ill children and that it perhaps should be supplied with caution. However, the substantial heterogeneity and the observational design of the included studies warrants judicious interpretation. Future research should further examine the implications of this association and its complex translation into clinical practice as observed in adults.

#### **ARTICLE INFORMATION**

Accepted for Publication: November 3, 2021.

Published: January 5, 2022. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.42105

**Open Access:** This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the CC-BY License. © 2022 Lilien TA et al. *JAMA Network Open*.

**Corresponding Author:** Thijs A. Lilien, MD, Pediatric Intensive Care Unit, Emma Children's Hospital, Amsterdam UMC, the Netherlands (t.a.lilien@amsterdamumc.nl).

Author Affiliations: Pediatric Intensive Care Unit, Emma Children's Hospital, Amsterdam UMC, Amsterdam, the Netherlands (Lilien, Groeneveld, van Woensel, Bem); Research Support, Medical Library AMC, Amsterdam UMC, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands (van Etten-Jamaludin); Paediatric Intensive Care, Great Ormond St Hospital and Respiratory, Critical Care and Anesthesia Unit, UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, NIHR Biomedical Research Centre, London, United Kingdom (Peters); Intensive Care and Department of Pediatric Surgery, Erasmus MC Sophia Children's Hospital, Rotterdam, the Netherlands (Buysse); Department of Pediatrics, University of Washington, Seattle (Ralston); Intensive Care Unit, Amsterdam UMC, Amsterdam, the Netherlands (Bos).

Author Contributions: Drs Bem and Lilien had full access to all of the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Concept and design: Lilien, Peters, Buysse, van Woensel, Bem.

Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data: Lilien, Groeneveld, van Etten-Jamaludin, Buysse, Ralston, Bos, Bem.

Drafting of the manuscript: Lilien, Groeneveld, van Etten-Jamaludin, Bem.

*Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content:* Lilien, Peters, Buysse, Ralston, van Woensel, Bos, Bem.

Statistical analysis: Lilien, Bem.

Obtained funding: Lilien.

Administrative, technical, or material support: Lilien, van Etten-Jamaludin.

Supervision: Peters, van Woensel, Bos, Bem.

**Conflict of Interest Disclosures:** Dr Peters reported receiving grants from National Institute of Health Research Heath Technology Assessment as the chief investigator on a trial of permissive vs liberal oxygenation targets in critically ill children outside the submitted work. Dr Bos reported receiving grants from the Dutch Lung Foundation, Innovative Medicine Initiative, and from Amsterdam UMC outside the submitted work. No other disclosures were reported.

**Funding/Support:** This research was partly funded through a PhD scholarship from the AMC Graduate School, Amsterdam UMC (Dr Lilien).

**Role of the Funder/Sponsor**: The funding organization had no role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; and decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

Additional Contributions: We thank all corresponding authors who were willing to answer questions regarding their studies and supply additional information where needed.

#### REFERENCES

1. Helmerhorst HJF, Roos-Blom M-J, van Westerloo DJ, de Jonge E. Association between arterial hyperoxia and outcome in subsets of critical illness: a systematic review, meta-analysis, and meta-regression of cohort studies. *Crit Care Med.* 2015;43(7):1508-1519. doi:10.1097/CCM.00000000000998

2. Damiani E, Adrario E, Girardis M, et al. Arterial hyperoxia and mortality in critically ill patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Crit Care*. 2014;18(6):711. doi:10.1186/s13054-014-0711-x

3. Dizdaroglu M, Jaruga P. Mechanisms of free radical-induced damage to DNA. *Free Radic Res*. 2012;46(4): 382-419. doi:10.3109/10715762.2011.653969

4. Rubbo H, Trostchansky A, O'Donnell VB. Peroxynitrite-mediated lipid oxidation and nitration: mechanisms and consequences. *Arch Biochem Biophys*. 2009;484(2):167-172. doi:10.1016/j.abb.2008.11.007

5. Hawkins CL, Davies MJ. Detection, identification, and quantification of oxidative protein modifications. *J Biol Chem.* 2019;294(51):19683-19708. doi:10.1074/jbc.REV119.006217

6. Rothen HU, Sporre B, Engberg G, Wegenius G, Reber A, Hedenstierna G. Prevention of atelectasis during general anaesthesia. *Lancet.* 1995;345(8962):1387-1391. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(95)92595-3

7. Watson NA, Beards SC, Altaf N, Kassner A, Jackson A. The effect of hyperoxia on cerebral blood flow: a study in healthy volunteers using magnetic resonance phase-contrast angiography. *Eur J Anaesthesiol*. 2000;17(3): 152-159. doi:10.1097/00003643-200003000-00004

8. Thébaud B, Goss KN, Laughon M, et al. Bronchopulmonary dysplasia. *Nat Rev Dis Primers*. 2019;5(1):78. doi:10. 1038/s41572-019-0127-7

**9**. Hellström A, Smith LEH, Dammann O. Retinopathy of prematurity. *Lancet*. 2013;382(9902):1445-1457. doi:10. 1016/S0140-6736(13)60178-6

**10**. Peters MJ. Linking hyperoxia and harm: consequence or merely subsequence? *Pediatr Crit Care Med*. 2021;22 (5):501-503. doi:10.1097/PCC.00000000002709

11. Pelletier JH, Ramgopal S, Horvat CM. Hyperoxemia Is associated with mortality in critically ill children. *Front Med (Lausanne)*. 2021;8:675293. doi:10.3389/fmed.2021.675293

12. Bush A. Lung development and aging. Ann Am Thorac Soc. 2016;13(suppl 5):S438-S446. doi:10.1513/ AnnalsATS.201602-112AW

13. Agustí A, Noell G, Brugada J, Faner R. Lung function in early adulthood and health in later life: a transgenerational cohort analysis. *Lancet Respir Med*. 2017;5(12):935-945. doi:10.1016/S2213-2600(17)30434-4

**14**. World Health Organization. *Oxygen Therapy for Children: A Manual for Health Workers*. World Health Organization; 2016.

**15**. Raman S, Ray S, Peters MJ. Survey of oxygen delivery practices in UK paediatric intensive care units. *Crit Care Res Pract*. 2016;2016:6312970. doi:10.1155/2016/6312970

**16**. Van de Voorde P, Turner NM, Djakow J, et al. European Resuscitation Council Guidelines 2021: paediatric life support. *Resuscitation*. 2021;161:327-387. doi:10.1016/j.resuscitation.2021.02.015

 Stroup DF, Berlin JA, Morton SC, et al. Meta-analysis of observational studies in epidemiology: a proposal for reporting: Meta-analysis of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) group. *JAMA*. 2000;283(15): 2008-2012. doi:10.1001/jama.283.15.2008

18. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, et al; PRISMA-P Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Syst Rev.* 2015;4(1):1. doi:10.1186/2046-4053-4-1

**19.** Lilien T, Groeneveld N, van Etten-Jamaludin F, et al. Systematic review of the association between hyperoxia and outcome in critically-ill children admitted to the pediatric intensive care unit (CRD42021227732). National Institute for Health Research. PROSPERO International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews. May 26, 2021. Accessed December 22, 2020. https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display\_record.php?ID=CRD42021227732

**20**. Fiser DH. Assessing the outcome of pediatric intensive care. *J Pediatr*. 1992;121(1):68-74. doi:10.1016/S0022-3476(05)82544-2

21. Wells G, Shea B, O'Connell D, et al The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses. 2021. Accessed March 26, 2021. http://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical\_epidemiology/oxford.asp

**22**. Alobaidi R, Morgan C, Basu RK, et al. Association between fluid balance and outcomes in critically ill children: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2018;172(3):257-268. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics. 2017;4540

**23**. Higgins J, Thomas J, Chandler J, et al, eds. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions. version 6.0. July 2019. Accessed March 26, 2021. http://www.training.cochrane.org/handbook

24. Langan D, Higgins JPT, Jackson D, et al. A comparison of heterogeneity variance estimators in simulated random-effects meta-analyses. *Res Synth Methods*. 2019;10(1):83-98. doi:10.1002/jrsm.1316

**25**. Knapp G, Hartung J. Improved tests for a random effects meta-regression with a single covariate. *Stat Med.* 2003;22(17):2693-2710. doi:10.1002/sim.1482

26. Olkin I, Dahabreh IJ, Trikalinos TA. GOSH–a graphical display of study heterogeneity. *Res Synth Methods*. 2012;3(3):214-223. doi:10.1002/jrsm.1053

27. Simonsohn U, Nelson LD, Simmons JP. p-Curve and effect size: correcting for publication bias using only significant results. *Perspect Psychol Sci.* 2014;9(6):666-681. doi:10.1177/1745691614553988

28. Bennett KS, Clark AE, Meert KL, et al; Pediatric Emergency Care Medicine Applied Research Network. Early oxygenation and ventilation measurements after pediatric cardiac arrest: lack of association with outcome. *Crit Care Med*. 2013;41(6):1534-1542. doi:10.1097/CCM.0b013e318287f54c

**29**. Cashen K, Reeder R, Dalton HJ, et al; Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development Collaborative Pediatric Critical Care Research Network (CPCCRN). Hyperoxia and hypocapnia during pediatric extracorporeal membrane oxygenation: associations with complications, mortality, and functional status among survivors. *Pediatr Crit Care Med.* 2018;19(3):245-253. doi:10.1097/PCC.00000000001439

**30**. Del Castillo J, López-Herce J, Matamoros M, et al; Iberoamerican Pediatric Cardiac Arrest Study Network RIBEPCI. Hyperoxia, hypocapnia and hypercapnia as outcome factors after cardiac arrest in children. *Resuscitation*. 2012;83(12):1456-1461. doi:10.1016/j.resuscitation.2012.07.019

**31**. Ferguson LP, Durward A, Tibby SM. Relationship between arterial partial oxygen pressure after resuscitation from cardiac arrest and mortality in children. *Circulation*. 2012;126(3):335-342. doi:10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.111. 085100

**32**. Guerra-Wallace MM, Casey FL III, Bell MJ, Fink EL, Hickey RW. Hyperoxia and hypoxia in children resuscitated from cardiac arrest. *Pediatr Crit Care Med*. 2013;14(3):e143-e148. doi:10.1097/PCC.0b013e3182720440

**33**. Ketharanathan N, De Jonge RCJ, Klouwen I, et al. Hyperoxia in pediatric severe traumatic brain injury (TBI): a comparison of patient classification by cutoff versus cumulative (area-under-the-curve) analysis. *Brain Inj.* 2020; 34(7):958-964. doi:10.1080/02699052.2020.1765021

**34**. Kraft F, Andel H, Gamper J, Markstaller K, Ullrich R, Klein KU. Incidence of hyperoxia and related in-hospital mortality in critically ill patients: a retrospective data analysis. *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand*. 2018;62(3):347-356. doi: 10.1111/aas.13047

**35**. López-Herce J, del Castillo J, Matamoros M, et al; Iberoamerican Pediatric Cardiac Arrest Study Network RIBEPCI. Post return of spontaneous circulation factors associated with mortality in pediatric in-hospital cardiac arrest: a prospective multicenter multinational observational study. *Crit Care*. 2014;18(6):607. doi:10.1186/ s13054-014-0607-9

**36**. Numa A, Aneja H, Awad J, et al. Admission hyperoxia is a risk factor for mortality in pediatric intensive care. *Pediatr Crit Care Med.* 2018;19(8):699-704. doi:10.1097/PCC.00000000001630

**37**. Pelletier JH, Ramgopal S, Au AK, Clark RSB, Horvat CM. Maximum Pao<sub>2</sub> in the first 72 hours of intensive care is associated with risk-adjusted mortality in pediatric patients undergoing mechanical ventilation. *Crit Care Explor*. 2020;2(9):e0186. doi:10.1097/CCE.000000000000186

**38**. Peters MJ, Jones GAL, Wiley D, et al; Oxy-PICU Investigators for the Paediatric Intensive Care Society Study Group (PICS-SG). Conservative versus liberal oxygenation targets in critically ill children: the randomised multiplecentre pilot Oxy-PICU trial. *Intensive Care Med*. 2018;44(8):1240-1248. doi:10.1007/s00134-018-5232-7

**39**. Raman S, Prince NJ, Hoskote A, Ray S, Peters MJ. Admission Pao<sub>2</sub> and mortality in critically ill children: a cohort study and systematic review. *Pediatr Crit Care Med*. 2016;17(10):e444-e450. doi:10.1097/PCC. 00000000000905

**40**. Ramgopal S, Dezfulian C, Hickey RW, et al. Association of severe hyperoxemia events and mortality among patients admitted to a pediatric intensive care unit. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2019;2(8):e199812. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2019.9812

**41**. Ramgopal S, Dezfulian C, Hickey RW, et al. Early hyperoxemia and outcome among critically ill children. *Pediatr Crit Care Med*. 2020;21(2):e129-e132. doi:10.1097/PCC.00000000002203

**42**. Sznycer-Taub NR, Lowery R, Yu S, Owens ST, Hirsch-Romano JC, Owens GE. Hyperoxia is associated with poor outcomes in pediatric cardiac patients supported on venoarterial extracorporeal membrane oxygenation. *Pediatr Crit Care Med*. 2016;17(4):350-358. doi:10.1097/PCC.000000000000655

**43**. van Zellem L, de Jonge R, van Rosmalen J, Reiss I, Tibboel D, Buysse C. High cumulative oxygen levels are associated with improved survival of children treated with mild therapeutic hypothermia after cardiac arrest. *Resuscitation*. 2015;90:150-157. doi:10.1016/j.resuscitation.2014.12.013

**44**. Schjørring OL, Klitgaard TL, Perner A, et al; HOT-ICU Investigators. Lower or higher oxygenation targets for acute hypoxemic respiratory failure. *N Engl J Med*. 2021;384(14):1301-1311. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2032510

**45**. Cronin WA, Forbes AS, Wagner KL, et al. Exhaled volatile organic compounds precedes pulmonary injury in a swine pulmonary oxygen toxicity model. *Front Physiol*. 2019;10:1297. doi:10.3389/fphys.2019.01297

**46**. Helmerhorst HJF, Schouten LRA, Wagenaar GTM, et al. Hyperoxia provokes a time- and dose-dependent inflammatory response in mechanically ventilated mice, irrespective of tidal volumes. *Intensive Care Med Exp.* 2017;5(1):27. doi:10.1186/s40635-017-0142-5

**47**. Burns JP, Sellers DE, Meyer EC, Lewis-Newby M, Truog RD. Epidemiology of death in the PICU at five US teaching hospitals. *Crit Care Med*. 2014;42(9):2101-2108. doi:10.1097/CCM.0000000000498

**48**. Capuzzo M, Volta C, Tassinati T, et al; Working Group on Health Economics of the European Society of Intensive Care Medicine. Hospital mortality of adults admitted to intensive care units in hospitals with and without intermediate care units: a multicentre European cohort study. *Crit Care*. 2014;18(5):551. doi:10.1186/s13054-014-0551-8

**49**. Registry ISRCTN. A randomised multiple centre trial of conservative versus liberal oxygenation targets in critically ill children (Oxy-PICU) (ISRCTN92103439). July 20, 2020. Accessed November 30, 2021. https://www.isrctn.com/ISRCTN92103439

**50**. Yam J, Frank L, Roberts RJ. Oxygen toxicity: comparison of lung biochemical responses in neonatal and adult rats. *Pediatr Res.* 1978;12(2):115-119. doi:10.1203/00006450-197802000-00010

**51**. Stevens JB, Autor AP. Induction of superoxide dismutase by oxygen in neonatal rat lung. *J Biol Chem*. 1977;252 (10):3509-3514. doi:10.1016/S0021-9258(17)40420-0

**52**. Autor AP, Frank L, Roberts RJ. Developmental characteristics of pulmonary superoxide dismutase: relationship to idiopathic respiratory distress syndrome. *Pediatr Res.* 1976;10(3):154-158. doi:10.1203/00006450-197603000-00002

**53**. Kneyber MCJ, Zhang H, Slutsky AS. Ventilator-induced lung injury: similarity and differences between children and adults. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2014;190(3):258-265. doi:10.1164/rccm.201401-0168CP

**54**. Schouten LRA, Schultz MJ, van Kaam AH, Juffermans NP, Bos AP, Wösten-van Asperen RM. Association between maturation and aging and pulmonary responses in animal models of lung injury: a systematic review. *Anesthesiology*. 2015;123(2):389-408. doi:10.1097/ALN.0000000000000687

**55**. Helmerhorst HJF, Schultz MJ, van der Voort PHJ, de Jonge E, van Westerloo DJ. Bench-to-bedside review: the effects of hyperoxia during critical illness. *Crit Care*. 2015;19(1):284. doi:10.1186/s13054-015-0996-4

**56**. Horvat C. Statistical note: confounding and causality in observational studies. *Pediatr Crit Care Med*. 2021;22 (5):496-498. doi:10.1097/PCC.0000000002702

**57**. Chu DK, Kim LHY, Young PJ, et al. Mortality and morbidity in acutely ill adults treated with liberal versus conservative oxygen therapy (IOTA): a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet.* 2018;391(10131):1693-1705. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(18)30479-3

**58**. Barbateskovic M, Schjørring OL, Krauss SR, et al. Higher vs lower oxygenation strategies in acutely ill adults: a systematic review with meta-analysis and trial sequential analysis. *Chest*. 2021;159(1):154-173. doi:10.1016/j. chest.2020.07.015

**59**. Gelissen H, de Grooth HJ, Smulders Y, et al. Effect of low-normal vs high-normal oxygenation targets on organ dysfunction in critically ill patients: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA*. 2021;326(10):940-948. doi:10.1001/jama. 2021.13011

**60**. Barrot L, Asfar P, Mauny F, et al; LOCO2 Investigators and REVA Research Network. Liberal or conservative oxygen therapy for acute respiratory distress syndrome. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;382(11):999-1008. doi:10.1056/ NEJMoa1916431

#### SUPPLEMENT.

eTable 1. Search Strategy

eTable 2. Newcastle-Ottawa-Score for Quality of Cohort Studies

eTable 3. Overview of All Assessed Outcomes in This Review That Were Reported in Included Studies

eTable 4. Other Secondary Outcomes Found in Included Studies

eTable 5. P-Curve Summary of Statistics

eFigure 1. PRISMA Flowchart of Study Screening Process

eFigure 2. Forest Plot of Hyperoxia (Categorical) and Mortality, Longest Follow-up, Stratified by Case Mix

eFigure 3. Bajaut Plot of the Contribution to the Overall Heterogeneity and Pooled Effect Estimate of Each Study

eFigure 4. Leave-One-Out Plots Sorted by the Effect on Overall Heterogeneity and the Pooled Effect Estimate

eFigure 5. GOSH Plot of All Subsets of Studies With the Overall Heterogeneity and Estimated Pooled Effect Size and the Three Outlying Studies Based on the GOSH Plot

eFigure 6. Sensitivity Analysis 1: Excluding Pronounced Outliers

eFigure 7. Sensitivity Analysis 2: Excluding Pronounced and Potential Outliers

eFigure 8. Sensitivity Analysis 3: Excluding Studies With Only Patients on ECMO Support

eFigure 9. Sensitivity Analysis 4: Including Only Studies With Adjusted Odds Ratio for Mortality

eFigure 10. Random-Effects Meta-analysis of Hyperoxia (Categorical) and Mortality, Longest Follow-up, Stratified by the Threshold of Hyperoxia With Exclusion of Pronounced Outlying Studies and Those Including Only Patients on ECMO Support (Subtotals)

eFigure 11. Random-Effects Meta-analysis of Hyperoxia (Categorical) and Mortality, Longest Follow-up, Stratified by the Threshold of Hyperoxia With Exclusion of Pronounced and Potential Outlying Studies and Those Including Only Patients on ECMO Support (Subtotals)

eFigure 12. Funnel Plot of Included Studies in the Main Quantitative Synthesis

eReferences