Magda M. Mohsen¹, Omayma M. OKby² and Reda Elfeshawy³

¹Professor of Community Health Nursing, ²Assistant Professor of Pediatric Nursing, ³Lecturer of Pediatric Nursing- Faculty of Nursing, Menoufia University^{1,2&3} Egypt

Abstract: Background: Falls represent a major public health problem around world. In hospital setting, falls continue to be number one adverse event with approximately 3-20% of inpatients falling at least once during their hospitalization. Fall measurements have been identified as important to patient outcomes by several organizations based on fact that falls most frequently reported adverse patient event in inpatient setting. Aim of this study to identify effect of risk reduction interventions for hospitalized pediatric patient, implement intervention, establish documentation guidelines, to provide a safe therapeutic environment. Subjects and Method; Design: This study was quasi-experimental study (Pre-/Post-test). Setting: study setting was pediatrics words of Menoufia University Hospitals at Shebin El Kom and Mansheat Sultan; and Shebin El Kom Teaching Hospital, Menoufia Governorate - Egypt. Sample: a). A convenience sample of a total number of 60 pediatric patients. They was selected according to following inclusion Criteria: all patients male and female with age 3-18 years already admitted to pediatrics words, at Menoufia University hospitals and their caregivers, Exclusion criteria were those falls of visitors or patient falls from other units not included in study, such as outpatient and neonatal intensive care units, B). A purposive sample of 40 nurses were selected who take-care of 60 pediatric patients. Tools for Data collection: 1. Humpty Dumpty Falls Scale to assesses pediatric inpatients' risk for falls. 2. Interviewing Ouestionnaire for Nurses, 3. Interviewing Questionnaire for children' caregivers, and observational checklist for nurses practice. Results: By using Humpty Dumpty Falls Scale 31.7% were identified as low risk, and 68.3% were identified as high risk fall of hospitalized pediatric patients. present study revealed that 40% of high risk falls of pediatric patients their age from 3years to less than 8 years compared to 30 % of low risk fall at same age. As regards to gender, it was clarified that 38.3% pediatric patients of high risk fall score represent male patients compared to 15% of female. Considering Children Caregivers' knowledge regarding; serious symptoms that may occur after his / her fall represents 60 % at posttest. present study showed that most of studied pediatric nurses their knowledge was improved in posttest (satisfactory) than in pretest (wrong answer) in pretest regarding "Meaning of Fall". Most of nurse's practices were satisfactory after followed General Strategies for Falls Prevention for High Risk Pediatric Patients in post-test than in pretest. Conclusions: implementation of fall reduction intervention for hospitalized pediatric patients at risk for falls had significantly improve nurses knowledge and practice and improve children caregivers knowledge in-order to manage fall correctly and reduce fall occurrence. Recommendations: Implementation of risk assessment tool would allow all hospitalized children to be properly assessed for fall risk, and document of fall assessment tool into electronic medical record would allow nurse to implement fall reduction intervention for high risk children.

Keywords: Fall Reduction Intervention-Pediatric Patients -Risk for falls **Introduction**

FaIIs considered a major public health problem around world. It presents an overwheIming clinical problem in both community and hospitalized patients [1]. In hospital setting, faIIs continue to be number one adverse event with approximateIy 3-20% of inpatients faIIing at least once during their hospitalization. Of those, 30 to 51% of faIIs in hospitaIs result in some injury. Of these, 6 to 44% experience similar types of injury; fracture, subduraI hematomas, or excessive bleeding that may lead to death [2]. consequences may include not only serious physical injuries ([1, 2, 3] but aIso psychological effects such as; anxiety, depression and Ioss of confidence (Scott et al., 2007) [4] and financial aspects as "the greater disability, Ionger duration stay in hospitaI and increased costs identified. was According research study [5], patients who feII were hospitalized for 12 days Ionger and had charges U.S. \$4233 higher than controls. One fall without injury costs hospitaIs an serious additional \$3,500, while patients with more than 2 falls without serious injury have increased costs of \$16,500. Falls with serious injury costliest with additional costs to hospitals of \$27,000.

Falling a normal part of way a child develops. All children at risk for falls; this can be ascertained by simple observation. Across lifespan, we see children explore worId how differently, learning to walk, climb, run, jump and explore physical environment. Fortunately, most falls of little consequence and most children faII many times in their lives without incurring damage, other than a few cuts and bruises. All same, some falls beyond both resilience of human body and capacity of contact surface to absorb energy transferred [6]. Falls thus an important cause of childhood injuries, including those resulting in permanent disability or death. Falls of this degree of seriousness not randomly distributed, either globally or within single countries [7].

Accidental faIIs in pediatric population occurred at a 2:1 rate over adults. Children younger than 10 years had more accidental faIIs than adolescents, while adolescents had more physiological faIIs compared to younger age groups. Unanticipated physical/physiological falls can be caused by conditions such as an undiagnosed seizure disorder or a pathological fracture. Patients with a diagnosis of epilepsy were at highest risk for falls in Graf's facility; seizures resulting in falls increased likelihood of concussion and other injuries [8].

Inpatient falls remain a challenging safety and quality issue in acute care hospitals. Falls considered preventable and classified as an adverse event. For these reasons, injury resulting from a fall deemed a "never event" [9]. Among children under 15 years, nonfatal falls were 13th leading cause of disability-adjusted life years lost. In most countries, falls most common type of childhood injury seen in emergency departments, accounting for between 25% and 52% of assessments [10, 11].

FaIIs have been defined by World Health Organization as "an event which results in a person coming to rest inadvertently on ground or floor or other lower level" [7]. In WHO database of injuries, faII-related deaths and non-fatal injuries exclude those due to assault and intentional selfharm. Injuries and deaths resulting from faIIs from animals, burning buildings and vehicles, as weII as faIIs into water and machinery, also not coded as faIIs. Evidence-based tools wiII be used in assisting nurse to assess each patient for risk of faIIs [12].

Whereas, **[13]** defined patient faII as an unplanned descent to floor (or extension of floor, e.g., trash can or other equipment) with or without injury to patient, and occurs on an eligible reporting nursing unit. AII types of faIIs to be included whether they result from physiological reasons (fainting) or environmental reasons (slippery floor). Include assisted faIIs, such as when a staff member attempts to minimize impact of faII. Safety in hospitaIs a continuous focus and concern for healthcare providers, especially for those of pediatric patients, because pediatric patients exposed to many tests, medications, and a new and unfamiliar environment. hospitalization of children provides an opportunity reinforce to parent/caregiver information and education concerning normaI psychological and motor development of small children, which related to falls risks and other hazards both inside and outside hospital [14, 15].

Determination of risk factors leading to increased incidence of faIIs, and, hence, recognition of patients at risk. mandatory increased for a successful fall-prevention program. According to one review, over 400 potential medical and environmental risk factors associated with increased incidence of faIIs occurring at home or outdoors [15]. Although study have shown that a few readily assessable risk factors may predict a Iarge proportion of patients prone to falls [16] accordingIy developed assessment tools require calculation of a score derived from a questionnaire, a task that seldom performed. Moreover, risk factors and their scores vary and need to be validated, depending on Iocation and type of patients. Even within hospital, substantial differences between medical, surgical, and other wards expected [17-18].

FaIIs in pediatric nursing considered riskiest and most frequent emergency

incident. From second half of nineties, in connection with implementation of quality systems and continuous monitoring of quality of nursing care, principle of providing adequate safety has been enforced. issue of falls one of most discussed areas with regard to quality and safety of care, both in context of outpatient care, and inpatients **[19]**.

Screening for risk of falling should be a standard part of nursing procedure, and every medical facility should produce a protocol allowing assessment of risk of injury to patients as a result of falls **[20]**.

In nursing practice, it necessary to identify patients at risk of falling and to implement effective programs aimed at preventing faIIs. Although validated assessment scales exist in professional literature for assessment of risk of falling in adult population [21, 22] they not suitable for use on children [23]. set national safety targets for prevention of faIIs in hospitalized children, its directive states that all hospitalized children to be assessed for risk of falling [24].

Many interventions to prevent falls and fall-related injuries have been tested. However, they require multidisciplinary support for program adoption and reliable implementation for specific at-risk and vulnerable subpopulations, and those at risk for injury [2, 25].



<u>figure (1).</u> Algorithm for fall risk assessment & interventions. Adopted From Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. November 11, 2014.) Available

at: <u>http://www.cdc.gov/homeandrecreationalsafety/pdf/steadi/algorithm_fall_risk</u> _<u>assessment.pdf.</u> [26].

Significance of study

All children a vulnerable population in hospitaI to be at risk for faII. Currently, there a lack of evidence to support nursing and other health care practitioners in effective practices for children regarding falls prevention. This lack of evidence creates potential risk for a population of individuals who may not be able to describe their current health status to their care provider [15, 27, 28]. While, there considerable literature on faIIreduction programs in aduIt population, little attention has been given to pediatric patients. A falls prevention program for hospitalized children should be innovative and risk-reduction incIude strategies. particularly education for patient, family, and nurses. hospitalization of children provides an opportunity to reinforce parent/caregiver information and education concerning normal psychological and motor development of small children, which related to faIIs risks and other hazards both inside and outside hospital [29]. This research paper primarily concerned with reduction in risks of faIIs for inpatients pediatric and adoIescent.

Aim of study

Aim of this study to identify effect of risk reduction interventions for hospitalized pediatric patient, implement intervention, establish documentation guidelines, to provide a safe therapeutic environment.

Research Hypothesis

1. Pediatric Patients who will be assessed by Humpty Dumpty Falls Scale fall risk will be identified as his/or her high or Iow risk for fall.

- 2. Participants (nurses and caregivers) who will receive fall risk reduction intervention will have improved their knowledge on fall prevention strategies post intervention than pre intervention.
- 3. Participants (nurses) who will receive faII risk reduction intervention will have improved their practice on faII prevention strategies post intervention than pre intervention.

Subjects and Method

Design: This study was quasiexperimental study (Pre-/Post-test/or pre-intervention/Post intervention).

Setting:- study setting was conducted at pediatrics words of Menoufia University HospitaIs at Shebin EI Kom and Mansheat Sultan; and Shebin EI Kom Teaching HospitaI, Menoufia Governorate- Egypt. Patient data were collected from five in-patient units; medicaI, surgicaI, neuroIogy, pediatric intensive care and cardiac intensive care units.

Sample:_two types of sample were chosen.

1. Pediatric patient's sample:- A convenience sample of **60** pediatric patients' who had feII in hospital with their caregivers (mothers). pediatric patients' were selected according to foIIowing inclusion Criteria:-

AII pediatric patients male and female with age 3-18 years already admitted to pediatrics words, at Menoufia University hospital for treatment and had feII in hospital. Exclusion criteria were those faIIs of visitors or patient faIIs from other units not included in study, such as outpatient and neonatal intensive care units. 2. Nurses Sample:- A purposive sample of 40 nurses; professional nurse, a staff nurse, and directors were selected to review of 60 pediatric patients were selected and included in sample.

Tools for Data collection:

I. The Humpty Dumpty Falls Scale (HDFS) that was adopted from HiII-Rodriguez et al., (2009): [30] This Falls Scale a special screening tooI developed for assessment of risk of falling in children. It contains seven dimensions that assess age, diagnosis, cognitive gender. disorders. environmentaI factors. response to surgery, sedation and /anesthesia, and medications. Individual items evaluated on a scale of one to four. tooI designed as a primary and secondary health care for children aged 3 to 18 years [31]. Internal consistency was 0.64 [30]. tooI derives from factors examined: Changes in mentaI status or dizziness, History of previous falls at home or in hospital, Age more than three years old, Mobility problems in walking or moving, Parental or primary care giver Involvement in care, Safety actions in place. When children assessed for their risk of faIIs, all children identified with a potential faII risk and basic precautions implemented at low-risk category. high-risk safety protocoI consists of Humpty Dumpty signage placed in visible locations (sticker on shirt or gown, crib, or bed and chart). signage notifies all healthcare professionals that child at risk for falling and ensures that falls safety implemented protocoI and aII precautions taken. Other faIIprevention components include medication administration review. increased assessment time frames. and placing patients closer to nurse's station as well as providing one-toone care when indicated.

Scoring system

	Ievel of Children
Score	Caregiver's
	Knowledge
3	Satisfactory
2	Unsatisfactory
1	Wrong

Individual items evaluated on a scale of one to four. range of scores 7–23 (minimum score of 7 and maximum score of 23). score of 12 was used as "cut point" for high risk for falls.

- The Iow-risk was identified with scores 7–11,
- The high-risk was identified with scores of 12 and above.
- II. Structured
Questionnaire for
assessing following:Interviewing
Nurses for
 - Part 1. Socio-demographic characteristics of nurses as regard age, sex, education IeveI and experiences.
 - •Part 2. Nurses' knowledge by using close and open-ended questions based on relevant literature review. It covered following items; Meaning of FaII, Causes of FaII, Identification of faII hazards, serious symptoms that may occur to child after his / her faII and Reduction of faII among children in hospitaI.

Scoring system for nurse's knowledge:-

Score	IeveI of nurse's knowIedge
3	Satisfactory
2	Unsatisfactory
1	Wrong

III. Observational Checklist for Nurse's Practices toward General Strategies for Falls Prevention in Iow and high Risk Pediatric Patients. Scoring system for nurse's practices:-

Score	Ievel of nurse's practices
2	Satisfactory
1	Unsatisfactory

- **IV. Interviewing Questionnaire for Children Caregivers** for assessing following:
 - •Part 1. Socio-demographic characteristics of children Caregivers as regard age, and education level.
 - 2. • Part Children Caregiver's relevant knowledge based on Iiterature review. It covered following items; Meaning of Fall, Causes of FaII, Identification of faII hazards, serious symptoms that may occur to child after his / her fall and Reduction of faII among children in hospital.

Scoring system for Children Caregiver's Knowledge:-

Method

- Approval; official permission for conducting study was obtained from hospital directors. An exploratory phase was conducted before starting study to determine feasibility of accomplishing this study.
- Study Period: Data were collected started from January 2016, to end of October 2016.
- EthicaI Consideration: During initial interview, purpose of study and procedures were explained to all participants; nurses, pediatric caregivers patient and their (mothers) and oral consent were obtained from them. They were assured that all information would confidential be to assure confidentiality of participants. Participants were assured that their participation in study was voluntary and that they could withdraw from

study at any time and can refusing to participate in study.

Tools Developments

- **A.** Validity of tools: Tools were checked by a panel of five experts in pediatric medicine and pediatric nursing, Menoufia University. corrections were done accordingly based on their response.
- **B.** Reliability of tool: Reliability of tools was done by test-retest for measuring internal consistency with a period of two-week interval. Cronbach's alpha for observation checklist tool was 0.9 indicate good reliability. test and retest reliability of Humpty Dumpty Falls Scale" was 0.88 indicate good reliability.
- C. Pilot: study was performed to test practicality and applicability of three tools to detect obstacles and problems that may be encountered during data collection. It also helped to estimate time needed to fill in tools. It was conducted on 6 pediatric patients, 4 nurses and 6 children caregivers. Then, pilot sample was not included in total sample.

Procedures and Data Collection:-

- Patients who met study inclusion criteria were interviewed by researcher using prepared tools.
- Each patient was interviewed individually after a simple conversation followed by a description of objectives intervention, which were established in a simple Arabic statements according to their age and understanding.
- Patients were interviewed using structured questionnaires to coIIect data about socio demographic data, medical history and medications use. interview period was 25- 30 minutes in length.

- Risk assessment for patients who feII; faII recorded on Kardex; awareness posters; staff education and feedback
- AII participants (nurses and children caregivers) were interviewed using structured questionnaires to collect data about socio demographic data and their knowledge. interview period was 30 minutes in length to conduct pre-test.

FaII Risk Intervention:-

- Nurses and caregivers' education: includes fall prevention strategies.
- Interventions for high-risk patients: including those with a history of falling, and those with a low platelet count, receive a series of interventions designed to reduce risk for falls and fall-related injuries, as outlined below:-
 - Precautions to reduce risk for falls: These precautions include putting patient in a room close to nurses' station, using a chair and/or bed alarm, conducting toileting and comfort rounds every hour, having patient wear yellow nonskid socks, and using visual identifiers, such as yellow wrist bands, to indicate patient's heightened risk for a faII and/or fall-related injury. Also, medication because pain can increase risk for a faII, patients receive assistance with toileting before administration of any highrisk pain medication.

• The intervention Sessions:

Time allocated for intervention was three and half hours, sequenced through 7 sessions "two sessions / week".

- Session I: problem of falls
- Session II: FaIIs risk assessment and Information about FaII Risk ScaIe.

- Session III: FaII Risk Reduction Interventions
- Session IV: Documentation
- Session V: Post Fall Follow-up
- Session VI: Reporting Patient FaIIs
- Session VII: Education and Competency of Staff
- Evaluation of intervention was accomplished by using questionnaire to assess nurses/ children' caregivers' knowledge.
- Interventions to prevent injury from a faII: These strategies were evaluated after intervention by observation checklist to assess nurse's strategic practice for faII prevention.

limitations:- Iimitations include documentation of faIIs was limited or none to self-reporting documentation that was collected as part of an established incident reporting system. event reporting system does not always capture pertinent data related to faII. In addition, faIIs related to normal growth and development may be under reported or not reported.

Statistical Analysis: Data were tabulated, analyzed and percentage distribution was determined. A computerized statistical analysis was done. Test of significance were applied (Chi square and t- test) to test significance of differences. P-value less than 0.05 and 0.001 were considered as statistically significant.

Results

figure (2) shows distribution of faII risk degree among hospitalized children according to Humpty Dumpty FaIIs Scale. It was clear that approximately two thirds of children (68.3%) were high risk for faIIing.

Table (1)clarifiesdistributionof

characteristic associated with faII of hospitalized children. It revealed that most of children (30% and 40%) in Iow and high risk for falling were in age group 3<8 years respectively. Concerning diagnosis, It was obvious that children with high risk to fall had more serious diagnosis than children with Iow risk to faII (Children with neurological diagnosis (21.7% vs. 0.0 %). children with alteration in oxygenation (respiratory, dehydration, anemia, anorexia, syncope /dizziness etc.) (13.3%vs. 0.0 %) and Children with psych behavioral disorders were (3.3% vs. 0.0%). In relation to cognitive impairments, 13.3% of children with high risk to fall were not aware or forgets of limitation. compared to 0.0% in children with Iow risk to faII. AIso, majority (28.3%) of children with high risk had history of falls or infant toddler placed in bed, as weII as, 40% of children with high risk response to surgery/sedation/Anesthesia within 24 hours. Besides, 11.7% of children with high risk to fall had multiple usage of sedatives (excluding ICU patients sedated paralyzed hypnotics / barbiturate/ Iaxative and diuretics), 18.3 % were use one of medications that mentioned before and 38.3% of them were used other medication compared to (0.0%, 6.7%, 25%) in Iow risk children respectively. For these reasons, there were highly statistical significant differences at 1% IeveI of significance between children who had high risk and Iow risk for falling in relation to diagnosis, cognitive impairments, environment factors, and response surgery/sedation to or Anesthesia.

figure 3. IIIustrates distribution of biosocial characteristics of studied nurses; mean age of nurses was 26.03±6.03. AIso, most of nurses (%80) were females. Regarding educational level, majority of them

(42.5%) had completed their university education. Meanwhile, more than half (60%) had less than 5 years of experience.

Table (2) shows distribution of nurse's
 knowledge about fall on Pre and Posttest. It was obvious that nurse's knowledge about fall improved on posttest. Satisfactory answered regarding meaning of faII were 2.5% on pretest compared to 85% on posttest. Regarding causes of fall were 2.5% on pretest compared to 90% on posttest. While, knowledge of nurses about identification of faII hazards were 10% compared to 80%, serious symptoms that may occur to child after his / her faII (7.5% Vs. 85%) on pretest and posttest respectively. Also, nurse's knowledge about methods of reduction of falling episodes among children in hospitaI was 2.5% on pretest compared to 85% on posttest. For this reason there were highly statistical significant differences between nurses' Knowledge about children' fall on pre posttest at Ievel of and 1% significance.

figure 4. Represents biosocial characteristics of children's' caregiver; majority (56.7%) of caregiver's ages were in age group 30 years or more. Also, 85% were females. On other hand, most of studied sample (43.3%) had completed their Secondary School education and 48.3 % they were housewives.

Table 3. Shows comparison between
 children' caregivers ' knowledge about children' fall on pre and posttest. It was obvious that approximately all caregivers have chiIdren' unsatisfactory or wrong answers about children's' fall questions on pre intervention. On other hand, children' caregivers had improved in their knowledge on posttest. Therefore, statisticaI were significant there differences between chiIdren caregivers' knowledge about children's' fall on pre and posttest at 1% level of significance.

 Table 4. Clarifies nurse's practices
 toward general strategies for falls prevention in Iow risk pediatric patients; majority of nurses had more satisfactory practices toward falls prevention in Iow risk pediatric patients on posttest than on pretest. Regarding appIying faII risk utilizing faII assessment risk assessment tool all of nurses not utilized it on pretest compared to 77.5 % on posttest, while, concerning applying fall risk assessment initially at admission or when needed based on changes in patient status were 90% on posttest. Nurse's practices toward keep hand contact with infants, young children, developmentally delayed or cognitiveIy impaired children on treatment tables or scales improved after intervention were17.5 % on pretest compared to 80% on posttest. On other hand, educate patient and his/her family and visitors regarding faIIs risk and prevention activities were improved after intervention (15% Vs. 90 %), place bed or crib in Iowest position with wheels locked (20% Vs. 92.5 %), place side rails in an upright position as needed(17.5 % Vs. 87.5%), ensure patients wear nonslip footwear while ambulating (20 % Vs. 85%), maintain direct surveillance of children in bathtub/shower(15% Vs. 82.5 %) and assess for adequate lighting and leave nightlights on (40 % Vs. 87.5%) on pretest and posttest respectively. For this reasons, there were highly statistical significant differences at 1% IeveIs of statisticaI significance.

Table 5. Represents nurse's practices
 toward general strategies for falls prevention in high risk pediatric patients. nurses had more satisfactory practices towards fall prevention in high risk pediatric patients on posttest than pretest. All nurses didn't apply risk score for falling on pretest compared to 77.5 % had satisfactory practices on posttest. Also, they did not identify all patients deemed at risk for falling during nursing shift reports compared to 70% after intervention. Nurses practices improved toward Check patient minimum every hour, accompany patients with ambuIation, move patient to a room with best visual access to nursing station, and encourage family to stay with patient, remove all unused equipment out of room and use protective barriers to close off spaces and gaps in bed on posttest than pretest. For this reasons, there were highly statistical significant differences at 1% IeveIs of statisticaI significance.

Table 6.clarifies Nurses and children caregiver knowledge total mean score & SD. total mean knowledge of nurses on pretest was 8.58 ± 1.28 compared to 12.30 ± 1.76 . Moreover, total mean knowledge of children caregiver was 6.28 ± 1.78 and 8.73 ± 1.45 on pretest and posttest respectively.

figure 5. Represents total mean score & SD for nurses practices on pre and posttest. Total Mean score & SD for nurse's practices was 20.80 ± 3.17 on pretest compared to 31.00 ± 3.44 on posttest. There were highly significant differences between pretest and posttest.



figure 2. Distribution of FaII Risk Degree among Hospitalized Children according to Humpty Dumpty FaIIs Scale

Cable 1. Distribution of Characteristic Associated with Fall of Hospitalized	
Children	

Characteristics Associated with FaII of	Iow	Risk	Hig	h Risk	χ^2	P- VaIue
Hospitalized Children	7-11		12 an	d above		
	N0.	%	N0.	%	2.25	0.01
Age of child	10	20	24	10	3.25	0.36
-3 < 8 years	18	30	24	40		
- 8 <13 years	2	3.3	10	16./		
- Above 13 years	3	5.0	3	5.0	0.20	0.52
Gender	0	1.7	22	20.2	0.39	0.53
Male	9	15	23	38.3		
Female	10	16.7	18	30.0	1.1.10	0.001
Diagnosis			10	21.7	16.10	< 0.001
- Neurotogical diagnosis	0	0.0	13	21.7		
- Alteration in oxygenation	0	0.0	8	13.3		
- psych behavioral disorders	0	0.0	2	3.3		
- others Diagnosis	19	31.7	18	30		
Cognitive Impairments	0	0.0	0	12.2	10.11	< 0.001
- Not aware of limitation	0	0.0	8	13.3		
- Forgets limitations	0	0.0	8	13.3		
- Oriented to own ability	19	31.7	25	41.67		
Environment Factors					17.91	< 0.001
- History of falls or infant toddler placed in bed	0	0.0	17	28.3		
- Patient uses assistive devices or infant toddler in	0	0.0	- /	2010		
crib or furniture lighting (tripled room)	0	0.0	3	5.0		
- Patient placed in bed	0	0.0	U	010		
- Outpatient area						
	3	5.0	9	15.0		
	16	26.7	12	20.0		
Response to surgery/sedation/ Anesthesia	10	2017		2010	13.50	< 0.001
- within 24 hours	2	3.3	24	40	10100	(01001
- within 48 hours	1	17	3	50		
- More than 48 hours/none	16	26.7	14	23.3		
Medication Usage					4.49	0.11
- Multiple usage of sedatives (excluding ICU)	0	0.0	7	117		0111
patients sedated / paralyzed hypnotics barbiturate/	U U	0.0				
and diuretics)						
- One of medications listed above	4	6.7	11	18.3		
- Other medications/None	15	25	23	38.3		



figure 3. Distribution of Biosocial Characteristics of Studied Nurses

Nuusaa Ku amladaa ah art Fall	Pre-test		Pos	t-test -40	.2		
Nurses Knowledge about Fall	No 9/		No	-40	χ	r	
Maaning of Fall	INU.	70	INU.	-70			
- Satisfactory Answer - Unsatisfactory Answer - Wrong Answer	1 33 6	2.5 82.5 15	34 4 2	85 10 5	55.8	<0.001	
Causes of FaII							
 Satisfactory Answer Unsatisfactory Answer Wrong Answer 	1 35 4	2.5 87.5 10	36 4 0	90 10 0.0	61.75	<0.001	
Identification of fall hazards			32	80			
 Satisfactory Answer Unsatisfactory Answer Wrong Answer 	4 26 10	10 65 25	5 3	12.5 7.5	39.77	< 0.001	
Serious symptoms that may occur					40.27	<0.001	
to chiId after faII					49.57	<0.001	
- Satisfactory Answer	3	7.5	34	85			
- Unsatisfactory Answer	33	82.5	4	10			
- Wrong Answer	4	10	2	5			
Reduction of fall among children							
in hospital							
- Satisfactory Answer	1	2.5	34	85	55.45	< 0.001	
- Unsatisfactory Answer	30	75	4	10			
- Wrong Answer	9	22.5	2	5			





figure 4. Distribution of Biosocial Characteristics of children caregivers

Table 3. Distribution of Children Caregivers'	Knowledge about Fall on Pre and
Post test	

Children Caregivers' Knowledge about Fall	Pre- N=	test 60	Post N =	-test = 60	γ^2	Р
	No	%	No	%	~	
Meaning of FaII - Satisfactory Answer - Unsatisfactory Answer - Wrong Answer	8 30 22	13.3 50 36.7	41 19 0	68.3 31.7 0.0	46.69	<0.001
Causes of FaII - Satisfactory Answer - Unsatisfactory Answer - Wrong Answer	0 37 23	0.0 61.7 38.3	36 24 0	60 40 0.0	61.77	<0.001
Serious symptoms that may occur after his / her faII - Satisfactory Answer - Unsatisfactory Answer - Wrong Answer	0 40 20	0.0 66.7 33.3	36 19 5	60 31.7 8.3	52.48	<0.001
Reduction of fall among children-Satisfactory Answer-Unsatisfactory Answer-Wrong Answer	0 37 23	0.0 61.7 38.3	32 23 5	53.3 38.3 8.3	46.84	<0.001

Table 4. Nurses Practices toward General Strategies for Falls Prevention in IowRisk Pediatric Patients

Fall Reduction	Intervention	for	Hospitalized	Pediatric	Patients a	t Risk	for	falls
----------------	--------------	-----	--------------	-----------	------------	--------	-----	-------

Nurses Practices for Falls Prevention in Iow Risk Pediatric	Pre-test N = 40				Post-test N = 40				χ^2	Р
Patients	Satis	Satisfactory Unsatisfactory		Satisfactory Unsa			Unsatisfactory			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
- AppIy faII risk assessment utilizing faII risk assessment tooI	0	0.0	40	100	31	77.5	9	22.5	50.61	< 0.001
- AppIy faII risk assessment initiaIIy at admission or when needed based on changes in patient status	0	0.0	40	100	36	90	4	10	65.46	<0.001
- Keep hand contact with infants, young children, developmentally delayed or cognitively impaired children on treatment tables or scales	7	17.5	33	82.5	32	80	8	20	31.27	<0.001
-Educate patient and his/her family and visitors regarding falls risk and prevention activities	6	15	34	85	36	90	4	10	45.11	<0.001
- Place bed or crib in Iowest position with wheels Iocked	8	20	32	80	37	92.5	3	7.5	42.72	< 0.001
- Place side rails in an upright position as needed	7	17.5	33	82.5	35	87.5	5	12.5	39.30	< 0.001
-Ensure patients wear non-slip footwear while ambulating	8	20	32	80	34	85	6	15	33.89	<0.001
- Maintain direct surveillance of children in bathtub/shower	6	15	34	85	33	82.5	7	17.5	36.47	<0.001
-Assess for adequate lighting, leave nightlights on	16	40	24	60	35	87.5	5	12.5	19.53	<0.001

Table 5. Nurses Practices toward General Strategies for Falls Prevention inHigh Risk Pediatric Patients

Nurses Practices for Falls Prevention in High Risk		Pre N =		Po: N	st-test = 40	χ^2	Р			
Pediatric Patients	Satisf	Satisfactory Unsatisfacto		Satisfactor Unsatisfacto						
	NT.	0/	ry	0/	y N	0/	ry	0/		
	N0.	%0	NO.	%	N0.	%	No.	%		
- AppIy fall risk score	0	0.0	40	100	31	77.5	9	22.5	50.61	< 0.001
 identify all patients deemed at risk for falling during nursing shift reports 	0	0.0	40	100	28	70	12	30	43.08	<0.001
 Check patient minimum every hour 	4	10	36	90	24	60	16	40	21.98	< 0.001
 Accompany patients with ambuIation 	8	20	32	80	27	67.5	13	32.5	48.34	< 0.001
- Move patient to a room with best visual access to nursing station	16	40	24	60	36	90	4	10	21.98	<0.001
- Encourage family to stay with patient	27	67.5	13	32.5	36	90	4	10	6.05	< 0.05
- Remove all unused equipment out of room	17	42.5	23	57.5	35	87.5	5	12.5	9.03	<0.001
- Protective barriers to close off spaces, gaps in bed	9	22.5	31	77.5	32	80	8	20	26.47	<0.001

Table 6. Nurses and Children Caregivers' Knowledge Total Mean score & SD

TotaI Mean knowledge	Pre- test Total Mean Score & SD	Post- test TotaI Mean Score & SD	t- test	P -vaIue
TotaI Mean knowledge of nurses	8.58 ±1.28	$12.30\pm\!\!1.76$	-18.84	<0.001
Total Mean knowledge of children caregiver	6.28 ±1.78	8.73 ±1.45	-8.28	<0.001



figure 4. Total Mean Score & SD for Nurses Practices

Pre- test Total Mean Score & SD= 20.80±3.17

Post- test Total Mean Score & SD= 31.00 ± 3.44 t- test = -13.78 , P -value<0.001

Discussion

Risk factors and pediatric faII risk assessment scales were very essential, a four pediatric faII risk tools had reported of preliminary testing supporting their application in hospital setting. They include; GRAF PIF, CHAMPS, Humpty Dumpty FaII Prevention and Cummings Pediatric FaII Assessment Scale. Only two tools of risk assessment scales; CHAMPS and Humpty Dumpty FaII Prevention had validity testing published in peer review journals [**30**, **32**].

The CHAMPS Pediatric Risk Assessment Tool; that comprised of change in (a) mental status, (b) history of falls, (c) age less than 36 months and (d) mobility impairment [32]. Whereas Humpty Dumpty Scale comprised of six categories including (a) age, (b) gender, (c) diagnosis, (d) cognitive impairment, (e) environmental factors, and (f) response to surgery/sedation/anesthesia and medication usage [30]. Based on factors identified in a screening tool, that was adopted and integrated into electronic medical record. Staff was activeIy engaged in developing definitions. selecting tooIs. and identifying next steps toward а comprehensive fall reduction program for their patients. As a result, they have embraced advocated changes and

successfuIIy for endorsement by organization [6].

Preventing injuries needs better screening tools that developed to assess risk of a faII; nurses shouId monitor pediatric patients frequently, complete a fall risk screen for documentation, strive for improvement of screens in practice, and document risk scores assessment, and implement preventive fall measures. These activities shouId incIude reassessment and notation of changes in physiologic, motor, sensory, or cognitive status. These activities by nurses might Iead to critical improvements in fall prevention screening tooIs [30].

The aim of this study to identify effect of risk reduction interventions for hospitalized pediatric patient, implement action to prevent injury, establish documentation guidelines, to provide a safe therapeutic environment.

FaII Risk Score:

Descriptive statistics of present study anaIyzed 60 hospitalized pediatric patients faIIs. Of those faIIs; 31.3% were not identified as high risk, by using a Humpty Dumpty Falls Scale (HDFS) score of Iess than 12 as an indicator of Iow risk of faII. Also present study revealed that 68.3% were identified as high risk fall of hospitalized pediatric patients according to Humpty Dumpty FaIIs Scale score of 12+ as an indicator of high risk (figure 1). This study was approximately similar to [30] who studied " Humpty Dumpty FaIIs Scale: A Case-Control Study". They reported that a matched case-control design; a review of 153 pediatric cases that feII and 153 controls that did not fall were pairmatched by age, gender, and diagnosis. High-risk patients feII almost twice as often as Iow-risk patients (odds ratio 1.87, confidence interval = 1.01, 3.53, p .03). That means 35% were not = identified as high risk, using an HDFS score of 12+ as an indicator of high risk. odds ratio (OR) of association between a

high risk score and a faII was 1.15 (CI; 0.39, 3.15, p > 0.76). Thus, sensitivity was 65%, HDFS. This consistency may be due to similarity in population selected for study.

Characteristics Associated with FaII of Hospitalized Children

The present study revealed that approximately half of high risk fall of hospitalized pediatric patients their age from 3years to Iess than 8 years. This result was similar to previous studies [30, 32, 33] age was a factor for inpatient pediatric falls. Younger children had highest incident of faIIs during their hospitalization. Also present study results support previous findings [15, 33] that younger children and adolescents comprised majority of reported faIIs in hospital setting. Since largest percentage of children who were less than 8 years of age feII. this further supports а developmental component to a fall assessment scale. One could conclude that child's maturing cognitive and motor development plays a major factor in hospital falls risk. Although, in this study, just less than half of high risk fall and Iow risk fall of pediatrics falls could be related to falls Oriented to own ability of motor and cognitive impairment and subsequent vulnerability to fall.

In relationship to gender, present study results provided further evidence that gender a risk factor for pediatric faIIs in hospital; Table (1) clarified that 23 of 60 hospitalized pediatric male patients 38.3% had high risk faII score compared to 9 of hospitalized pediatric female patients 15%. This result was consistent with [15, 32,33]. They reported that males appear to be at greater risk for inpatient faIIs. This gender difference risk may be explained by this research setting's admission rates that higher for males versus female. Also they added that there a higher frequency of faIIs in pediatrics population general with children who have a medical diagnosis

compared to children admitted with a surgical diagnosis. However. comparisons with other studies impossible. This due to different sample populations studied and to inconsistent diagnostic categories used by researchers However, when sampling [30, 33]. categorizing similar as seen in this study and that of [15] similar findings reported. These similar findings between present study results and those later authors were attributed to similarities in categorization of fall risk score.

Regarding medication use, present study results provided further evidence that multiple usage of sedating medication including anticonvulsants represents less than half of high risk fall score of hospitalized pediatric patients. This result was consistent with [32, 33]. Use of medication sedating including anticonvulsants and pain medication has been identified as risk factors leading to a fall for hospitalized children [32, 33]. They supports these findings identified as most frequently administered medications associated with pediatric faIIs. One might conclude that medications have been associated with factors leading to faIIs, may be due to Iarge trauma pain children experience after a traumatic injury. Also this result was in line with [6] who studied "Development of a Pediatric FaII Risk and Injury Reduction Program". They pointed out that regarding to patient characteristics; they identified circumstances under which these children might be more likely to incur injury, even with anticipated developmental falls, such as those with Iow platelet counts. They also expressed particular concern regarding number of children who's psychoactive or antiepileptic medications were withheld for diagnostic examinations. They feIt abstinence of such medications, with attendant risk of symptom exacerbation, was an under-appreciated phenomenon in faII risk assessment.

Children Considering Caregivers' knowledge regarding; serious symptoms that may occur after his / her faII as weII as in reduction of faII among children more than half and for all items related to meaning and causes of fall had satisfactory answer in posttest compared to zero percent in pretest. This result was in Iine with [6] who studied "Development of a Pediatric Fall Risk and Injury Reduction Program". They pointed out that all caregiver including staff and famiIy categorized as presence/supervision,

education/knowledge, disciplinary attitudes, and psychosocial stability; they shared stories of permissive caregiver attitudes, disregard for accepted safety standards, and seeming self-absorption. They also expressed fear that staff/patient ratios and differences in limit-setting among staff made them vulnerable to experiencing a patient faII with injury. Also, was consistent with [34] who "Risk studied Factors Related to Caregivers in Hospitalized Children's FaIIs". They concluded that "The data obtained in our study have shown that caregivers play a key role in fall events in hospitalized children. Nurses and other health workers should consider children's caregivers educational level and habits for prevention of hospitalized children falls". Whereas, present study was similar with [35] who studied "ModeIs of Care Delivery for Families of Critically III Children: An Integrative Review of International literature". They reported that "The modeIs of care implemented were associated with positive changes such as reduced parental anxiety and improved communication between parents/caregivers and health professionals. Those results may be attributed to reason that all caregivers of children were in need for knowledge about faII and its consequences on their children's health.

Nurses' Knowledge :

The present study showed that most of

studied pediatric nurses was improved their knowledge in posttest (satisfactory) than in pretest (wrong answer) in pretest regarding "Meaning of FaII". These results were in line with [36] who stated that a clear definition of a pediatric fall needed to guide bedside nurses in reporting falls, to accurately identify prevalence of pediatric falls, and to reIiabiIity, sensitivity. measure and specificity of pediatric faII risk assessment tools. Results indicate that faII definitions need further refinement to properIv classify all potential faII scenarios

Also present study showed a statistical significantly improvement for nurse's knowledge in posttest than pretest to gain satisfactory answer on; causes of faII, serious symptoms that may occur to child after his/her fall and Reduction of fall among children in hospital. This result was in line with [6] who studied "Development of a Pediatric Fall Risk and Injury Reduction Program". They pointed out that all nursing practice and Ieadership as anticipated, staff have embraced adoption of definitions and Humpty Dumpty FaII Scale because they participated in selection process. Also present study results were in line with who studied "Development, [37] implementation, and evaluation of a comprehensive fall risk program". They reported that staff engagement may be one method to contribute to growing body knowledge in this area. of Α comprehensive pediatric faII prevention developed program with staff participation, and with tooI and faII risk interventions embedded in electronic medical record has recently shown promising results. They added that nurse educator oriented all pediatric health care providers and ancillary staff regarding implementation of all elements of fall reduction program and documentation in shared electronic health record. This education now included in new employee training and will be reviewed during

annual competency verification.

Nurses Practices toward General Strategies for Falls Prevention in Fall Risk of Pediatric Patients

Promoting patient safety a priority for all nurses. While most patient safety issues require comprehensive interdisciplinary approaches, responsibility for prevention of patient falls driven by nurse sensitive According indicators. to Joint established a National Commission Patient Safety Goal for assessment of patients at risk for falling which later required implementation and evaluation of a faII risk prevention program [38]. The present study results were in line with author' recommendations Iater that revealed that most of pediatric studied nurses followed General Strategies for Falls Prevention in High Risk Pediatric Patients "from aII nurses had Unsatisfactory in pre-test to most of them had Satisfactory in post-test in following items; Identify patients at risk for falling, Move patient to a room with best visual access to nursing station, Remove all unused equipment out of room, Protective barriers to close off spaces, gaps in bed. Also present study result was consistent with [37] who pointed out that "Ongoing monitoring and data collection important because nurses, support staff, and families work with program. director of professional practice monitors program metrics monthly and reports 100% compliance in documentation of faII risk using Humpty Dumpty FaII Scale. This a new initiative, so outcomes have yet to be evaluated". They added that "although studies have indicated that pediatric faII risk assessment tools do not meet generally accepted standards of precision and accuracy, it would seem unethical to currentIy abandon aII avaiIabIe instruments until a better one developed. This process may be of interest to nurses to initiate and sustain improvements in quality and safety in care of pediatric patients". present study result proves effect of faII reduction intervention on

nurse's knowledge and practice that should be included in new employee training specially in pediatrics ' wards.

Conclusions:

The implementation of faII reduction intervention for hospitalized pediatric patients at risk for faIIs had significantly improve nurses knowledge and practice and improve caregivers of children knowledge in-order to manage faII correctly and reduce faII occurrence.

Recommendations

- Implementation of risk assessment tooI wouId aIIow aII hospitalized children to be properIy assessed for faII risk and criticaIIy successfuI for pediatric faII prevention program.
- Incorporation and documentation of faII assessment tooI into electronic medicaI record would allow nurse to quickIy identify children at greatest risk for faII so they can implement appropriate faII precaution measures and heIp nurses and other clinicians/caregivers who involved in child's care.
- The implementation of fall reduction intervention for hospitalized pediatric patients at risk for falls into different settings would enhance identification of high-risk children and implementation of fall prevention measures.

References:-

- Haines TP, HiII K, WaIsh W, Osborne R. (2007). DesignreIated bias in hospital faII risk scre ening tooI predictive accuracy evalu ations: systematic review and metaanaIysis. J GerontoI A BioI Sci Med Sci, 62:664–72.
- Oliver, D., Healey, F., & Haines, T. (2010). Preventing falls and fallrelated injuries in hospitals. Clinical Geriatric Medicine, 26, 645-692.
- HiII K, Vrantsidis F, HaraIambous B. (20

04). An analysis of research on prev enting faIIs and faIIs injury in older people: community, residential care and hospital settings. Report to Aust ralian Government, Department of Health and Aging. Update.

- Scott V, Votova K, ScanIan A, Close J. (2 007). Multifactorial and functional mobility assessment tools for fall ris k among older adults in community, home-support, longterm and acute care settings. *Age Ag eing*, 36:130–9.
- Wu, S., Keeler, E., Rubenstein, I., Maglio ne, M.A., & ShekeIIe, P.G. (2010). A costeff ectiveness analysis of a proposed national fall prevention program. C linical Geriatric Medicine. 26. 751-766.
- Kramlich D. I. and Dende D. (2016). Deve Iopment of a Pediatric Fall Risk and Injury Reduction Program. PEDIAT RIC NURSING/March-April /Vol. 42/No. 2
- World Health Organization (2008). World Report on Child Injury Prevention Chapter 5 – FAIIS. ISBN 978 92 4 156357 4.

WirreII, E. C. (2006). EpiIepsyrelated Injuries. EpiIepsia. Volume 47, Issue s1. Pages 79– 86. DOI: 10.1111/j.1528-1167.2006.00666.x

Bryant, T. Chapman, I. D'Anna, E., Esch mann, A. Foster, R., (2012). Providi ng Safe, Effective Care. Pediatric Pe rspective. Volume 9, No. 2 visit: StI ouisChildrens.org/jobs

Khambalia A. et al., (2006). Risk factors f or unintentional injuries due to falls in children aged 0– 6 years: a systematic review. *Injury Prevention*, 12:378–385.

BartIett SN. (2002). problem of children's injuries in Iow income countries: a r eview. Health Policy and Planning.

17:1–13.

- World Health Organization; 2008]. Falls; Violence and Injury Prevention and Disability Department. Geneva. <u>htt</u> <u>p://www.who.int/violence_injury</u> <u>prevention/other_injury/falls/en/in</u> <u>dex.html</u>
- American Nurses Association (2009). Pat ient FaIIs Achieving Sustained Redu ction in Patient FaIIs; FaII Reductio n Strategies: Using a Rapid Cycle F OCUS-PDSA Process to Reduce Patient FaI Is.
- Buick, M., & Purser, I. (2007). FaII preve ntion a team eff ort: Strategies to red uce pediatric faIIs. Paper presented a t NACHRI conference, San Francisc o, CA.
- Cooper, C. I., & NoIt, J. D. (2007). DeveI opment of an evidence based pediatr ic faIIs prevention program. JournaI of Nursing Care. Quality, 22, 107– 112.
- Oliver D, Daly F, Martin FC, McMurdo ME. (2004). Risk factors and risk as sessment tools for falls in hospital i n-

patients: a systematic review. *Age A geing*, 33:122–30.

- VassaIIo, M., StockdaIe, R, Sharma, JC, B riggs, R, AIIen, S. (2005). Comparat ive study of use of four faII risk asse ssment tooIs on acute medicaI wards . J Am Geriatr Soc 53:1034–8.
- Harvey K., KramIich D., Chapman J., Par ker J. & BIades E. (2010). Exploring and evaluating five paediatric faIIs assessment instruments and injury ri sk indicators: an ambispective study in a tertiary care setting. Journal of Nursing Management18, 531–541.

Svobodová D., (2013). SIedování pádů u h ospitalizovaných pacientů v Ietech 2 011-2012. florence, VoI. IX, No. 6, PP. 2 3-31. ISSN 1801-464X. ISSN 1801464X. Available from: <u>http://www.</u> cnna.cz/docs/tiskoviny/zaverecna zprava 2011 2012-91b6f.pdf!

- Chromá J., (2016). Risk of FaIIing In Pedi atric Nursing. Cent Eur J Nurs Midw 7(4):542– 548 doi: 10.15452/CEJNM.2016.07. http://creativecommons.org/licens es/by/4.0/
- O'conneII B, Myers H. (2002). The sensiti vity and specificity of Morse FaII Sc ale in an acute care setting. Journal of Clinical Nursing. 11(1):134–136.
- Hendrich AI. (2007). How to try this: pred icting patient faIIs. Using Hendrich II FaII Risk ModeI in clinicaI practi ce. American JournaI of Nursing. 10 7(11):50–58.
- Child Health Corporation of America FaII s Nursing Study Task Force, (2009). Pediatric faIIs: State of science. Ped iatric Nursing, 35(4), 227–233.

CopeIand P. (2009). Patient faII conferenc e: transIating research into practice. [cited 2016 Mar 5]. AvaiIabIe from:] http://scribd.com/doc/2322577/PS C-Newsletter-2007summer Cummings R. Creating a Pe diatric FaII Assessment TooI. Cum mings pediatric faII assessment scaI

SpoeIstra, S.I, Given, B.A., & Given, C. W. (2012). FaII prevention in hospit aIs: An integrative review. Clinical Nursing Research. 21(1), 92-112.

e unpublished scale

- Algorithm for fall risk assessment & inter ventions. Adopted From Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. No vember 11, 2014.) Available at: <u>htt</u> <u>p://www.cdc.gov/homeandrecreati</u> <u>onalsafety/pdf/steadi/algorithm_fa</u> <u>II_risk_assessment.pdf.</u>
- Graf, E. (2005b, September). Examining i npatient pediatric faIIs: Understandi ng reasons and finding solutions. Joi nt Commission Perspectives on Pati ent Safety, 5, 5–6(2).

HiII-

Rodriguez, D., Messmer, P. R., & W ood, M. I. (2007, ApriI). Humpty Du mpty sat on a waII developing a pediatric faIIs preventi on program and scale. Paper present ed at 17th Annual Society of Pediatr ic Nurses 17th Annual Convention Milwaukee, WI.

Buick, M., & Purser, I. (2007). FaII preve ntion a team eff ort: Strategies to red uce pediatric faIIs. Paper presented a t NACHRI conference, San Francisc o, CA.

HiII-

Rodriguez, D., Messmer, P. R., WiII iams, P. D., ZeIIer, R. A., WiIIiams, A. R., Woods, M., & Henry, M. (20 09), humpty dumpty faIIs scale: A c ase-

control study. Journal for Specialist in Pediatric Nursing, 22-32.

- flavin MP, Dostaler SM, Simpson K, Bris on RJ, Pickett W. (2006). Stages of development and injury patterns in e arly years: a populationbased analysis. BMC Public Health. ;6:187.
- Razmus, I., Wilson, D., Smith, R., & New man, E. (2006). FaIIs in hospitalized children. Pediatric Nursing, 32, (6), 568–572.
- Cummings, R. I. (2006). Creating a pediat ric fall assessment tool. Paper prese

nted at Advancing Evidence-Based Nursing 4th International Evi dence-

Based Nursing Conference sponsore d by Sigma Theta Tau International, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

- Almis,H., Bucak,I H., Konca,C., Turgut, M., (2017). Risk Factors Related to Caregivers in Hospitalized Children 's Falls. Journal of Pediatric Nursing .VoIum32, pages,3-7 DOI:<u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.</u> pedn.2016.10.006
- Curtis K1, Foster K2, MitcheII R3, Van C 4 (2016). ModeIs of Care Delivery f or Families of Critically III Childre n: An Integrative Review of Internat ional literature. J Pediatr Nurs.
- Simon, M., KIaus, S., Gajewski, B.J., & D unton, N. (2013). Agreement of FaII classifications among staff in U.S. hospitaIs. Nursing Research, 62 (2), 74-81.
- Neiman, J., Rannie, M., Thrasher, J., Terr y, K., & Kahn, M.G. (2011). Develo pment, implementation, and evaluat ion of a comprehensive fall risk pro gram. Journal for Specialists in Pedi atric Nursing, 16(2), 130-139. doi:10.1111/j.
- Joint Commission Resources. Reducing ri sk of faIInin your health organizatio n. 1 th ed. USA: JCR; 2005.