

**Predictors of Extubation Failure in Critically Ill Children: A Systematic Review**

<sup>1</sup>Dr. Priyanka Bhateja, Assistant Professor, Department of Paediatrics, Adesh Institute of Medical Sciences and Research, Bathinda, Punjab, India

<sup>2</sup>Dr. Suman Gupta, Associate Professor, Department of Paediatrics, Adesh Institute of Medical Sciences and Research, Bathinda, Punjab, India

<sup>3</sup>Dr. Shifali Gupta, Assistant Professor, Department of Paediatrics, Guru Gobind Singh Medical College, Faridkot, Punjab, India

**Corresponding Author:** Dr. Shifali Gupta, Assistant Professor, Department of Paediatrics, Guru Gobind Singh Medical College, Faridkot, Punjab, India

**How to citation this article:** Dr. Priyanka Bhateja, Dr. Suman Gupta, Dr. Shifali Gupta, “Predictors of Extubation Failure in Critically Ill Children: A Systematic Review”, IJMACR– September – 2026, Volume – 9, Issue – 5, P. No. 892 – 905.

**Open Access Article:** © 2026 Dr. Priyanka Bhateja, et al. This is an open access journal and article distributed under the terms of the creative common’s attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>). Which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work non - commercially, as long as appropriate credit is given and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.

**Type of Publication:** Review Article

**Conflicts of Interest:** Nil

**Abstract**

Extubation failure remains an important complication in critically ill children receiving invasive mechanical ventilation because it exposes patients to urgent reintubation, recurrent airway instrumentation, longer ventilator exposure, and increased intensive care resource use. This systematic review evaluated demographic, clinical, airway, disease-specific, ventilatory, and physiologic predictors of extubation failure among children undergoing planned extubation in pediatric intensive care settings. A structured search of PubMed/MEDLINE, PubMed Central, open publisher databases, Google Scholar-style open web sources, and reference lists was performed from database inception to 14 September 2026. Studies were eligible when they included children beyond the neonatal period through

adolescence, reported planned extubation after invasive mechanical ventilation, and provided extractable information on extubation failure or candidate predictors. Neonatal-only studies, adult-only studies, unplanned extubations, conference abstracts without sufficient data, and reviews without primary data were excluded. Twenty-four pediatric studies were included in qualitative synthesis. Owing to heterogeneity in extubation-failure definitions, case mix, predictor thresholds, and effect measures, formal pooled meta-analysis was not performed. The most consistently supported predictors were younger age, prolonged invasive ventilation, chronic respiratory or neurologic disease, syndromic or complex comorbidity, airway abnormality or upper-airway obstruction, and reduced respiratory muscle strength. In cardiac intensive care cohorts, additional predictors

included preoperative ventilation, longer postoperative ventilation, palliative or complex surgery, genetic abnormalities, pleural effusion, diaphragm paralysis, inhaled nitric oxide at extubation, and abnormal physiologic risk analytics. Single conventional indices, including respiratory rate and rapid shallow breathing index, showed inconsistent predictive performance. Pediatric extubation readiness should therefore be assessed as a multidomain decision integrating spontaneous breathing performance, airway risk, respiratory-muscle reserve, neurologic status, secretion burden, hemodynamic stability, disease context, and post-extubation support planning.

**Keywords:** Extubation Failure, Pediatric Intensive Care, Mechanical Ventilation, Airway Extubation, Ventilator Liberation, Risk Factors, Reintubation, Extubation Readiness

## Introduction

Invasive mechanical ventilation is a lifesaving intervention for children with acute respiratory failure, shock, neurologic impairment, postoperative instability, and complex cardiorespiratory disease. However, continued endotracheal intubation carries risks, including airway injury, ventilator-associated infection, sedation-related morbidity, diaphragmatic dysfunction, impaired communication, and longer pediatric intensive care unit (PICU) stay. Pediatric ventilator liberation therefore requires clinicians to balance the harm of unnecessary ventilation against the danger of premature extubation<sup>3,4</sup>. Extubation failure is generally defined as the need for reintubation after planned removal of the endotracheal tube, most often within 24-72 hours. The 48-hour window is frequently used in pediatric and adult critical-care literature, but important variation exists. Some studies count only reintubation, whereas others include rescue

noninvasive ventilation, high-flow nasal cannula escalation, or death within a specified period. This heterogeneity is clinically important because broader definitions yield higher failure rates and may identify different mechanisms of failure<sup>5,20,28,29</sup>.

The incidence of extubation failure varies across pediatric populations. Multicenter PICU data have reported failure rates around 5-6%, while single-center general PICU studies have reported higher rates, and pediatric cardiac cohorts often show distinct rates depending on operative complexity, age, and physiologic substrate<sup>5,6,20-22</sup>. These differences reflect variation in age distribution, comorbidity, ventilation duration, airway risk, extubation criteria, post-extubation respiratory support, and definitions of failure.

Predicting extubation outcome in children is more difficult than in adults because developmental physiology, airway caliber, respiratory reserve, neurologic maturity, and disease phenotype change substantially across infancy, childhood, and adolescence. Extubation failure may result from upper-airway obstruction, unresolved parenchymal lung disease, excessive respiratory load, respiratory-muscle weakness, cardiovascular intolerance, secretion burden, altered mental status, or inadequate airway protection. No single test captures all these mechanisms<sup>7-17</sup>.

Previous pediatric synthesis has focused mainly on pre-extubation tests and indices, concluding that many individual assessments have limited or inconsistent diagnostic value<sup>23</sup>. Contemporary studies have added airway-versus-non-airway phenotyping, large pediatric cardiac datasets, physiologic risk analytics, and multicenter trends in post-extubation support<sup>19-28</sup>. A systematic review of the broader predictor landscape is therefore clinically useful.

The objective of this systematic review was to identify and synthesize predictors of extubation failure in critically ill children undergoing planned extubation after invasive mechanical ventilation, with attention to general PICU cohorts, pediatric cardiac intensive care cohorts, pre-extubation predictors, early post-extubation warning signs, and methodological limitations of the available evidence.

## Eligibility criteria

Table 1: PECO framework and eligibility criteria

| PECO item          | Operational definition                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Population         | Children older than the neonatal period through adolescence, admitted to a PICU, pediatric cardiac ICU, or mixed pediatric critical-care setting and receiving invasive mechanical ventilation.                                                                                                                   |
| Exposure/predictor | Any demographic, clinical, disease-related, airway, ventilatory, laboratory, physiologic, respiratory-muscle, or extubation-readiness factor evaluated in relation to extubation outcome.                                                                                                                         |
| Comparator         | Children without the predictor, with lower levels of the predictor, or with successful extubation, depending on study design.                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| Outcome            | Extubation failure, preferentially reintubation within 48 hours after planned extubation; studies using 24-hour, 72-hour, seven-day, or broader respiratory-support definitions were retained and interpreted by definition.                                                                                      |
| Study designs      | Prospective or retrospective cohort studies, registry analyses, secondary analyses, prediction-model studies, and relevant cross-sectional observational studies with extractable predictor/outcome data.                                                                                                         |
| Exclusions         | Neonatal-only studies, adult-only studies, animal/in vitro studies, unplanned or accidental extubation without planned-extubation data, intervention trials without extractable predictor information, conference abstracts without sufficient data, editorials, narrative reviews, and duplicate cohort reports. |

## Review

### Materials and Methods

#### Reporting standard and protocol

This review was prepared according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) 2020 statement<sup>1</sup>. A formal protocol was not prospectively registered. Because this was a review of previously published studies, ethics approval and informed consent were not required.

### Information sources and search strategy

Searches were performed from database inception through 14 September 2026 using PubMed/MEDLINE, PubMed Central, open publisher databases, Google Scholar-style open web searching, and backward/forward reference screening of eligible articles and relevant reviews. The strategy combined terms for extubation, failure or reintubation, pediatric population, intensive care, predictors, and risk factors. The search was restricted to human studies when the database interface permitted this. No date restriction was applied. English-language full-text availability was required for extraction.

Table 2: Core electronic search concepts

| Search concept | Terms used                                                                                                                          |
|----------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Concept 1      | extubation OR airway extubation OR planned extubation OR ventilator liberation                                                      |
| Concept 2      | failure OR reintubation OR failed extubation OR extubation outcome                                                                  |
| Concept 3      | child OR children OR pediatric OR paediatric OR infant OR adolescent                                                                |
| Concept 4      | pediatric intensive care OR PICU OR pediatric cardiac intensive care OR critical illness                                            |
| Concept 5      | predictor OR risk factor OR prognostic factor OR extubation readiness OR spontaneous breathing trial OR respiratory muscle strength |

Representative PubMed search string: (extubation OR reintubation OR "airway extubation") AND (failure OR predictor OR "risk factor" OR outcome OR readiness) AND (child OR children OR pediatric OR paediatric OR infant OR adolescent) AND (PICU OR "pediatric intensive care" OR "critical care" OR "cardiac intensive care").

### Study selection and data extraction

After deduplication, titles and abstracts were screened against the eligibility criteria. Full texts were assessed when the title or abstract suggested pediatric planned extubation, reintubation, extubation readiness testing, or risk-factor analysis. Data were extracted into a structured table including author, year, country, setting, design, sample size, age range, extubation-failure definition, failure rate, predictors assessed, adjusted or unadjusted effect estimates when reported, and major limitations.

Multiple reports from related cohorts were examined for overlap and interpreted separately only when they addressed distinct populations, time periods, or analytic questions.

### Risk-of-bias assessment

Risk of bias was assessed using the Quality in Prognosis Studies (QUIPS) framework, which evaluates study participation, study attrition, prognostic-factor measurement, outcome measurement, study confounding, and statistical analysis/reporting [2]. Studies were rated as low, moderate, or high concern based on the overall pattern of domain-level limitations. Registry and multicenter prospective studies with prespecified outcome definitions and adjusted analyses were generally rated as lower concern than single-center retrospective studies with limited adjustment or broad outcome definitions.

## Data synthesis

A qualitative synthesis was planned a priori because pediatric studies were expected to differ in age distribution, primary diagnosis, extubation-failure window, post-extubation support strategy, and predictor thresholds. A quantitative meta-analysis was not performed because the eligible studies reported heterogeneous predictor definitions, different effect measures, mixed adjusted and unadjusted estimates, and variable failure definitions. Results were organized by predictor domain: age and anthropometry, comorbidity and diagnosis, ventilation exposure, airway factors, respiratory-muscle and respiratory-effort variables, conventional ventilator or gas-exchange tests, pediatric cardiac factors, and outcomes after failure.

## Results

### Study selection

The search identified 71 records: 48 from electronic database/open publisher searches and 23 from reference-list and citation screening. After removal of 19 duplicates, 52 titles and abstracts were screened. Twenty-one records were excluded at title/abstract level, and 31 full-text reports were assessed for eligibility. Seven full-text reports were excluded: neonatal-only studies ( $n = 2$ ), adult-only studies ( $n = 1$ ), intervention or diagnostic-test studies without usable predictor data ( $n = 2$ ), review/editorial without primary data ( $n = 1$ ), and insufficient extractable outcome data ( $n = 1$ ). Twenty-four pediatric studies were included in the qualitative synthesis. No formal meta-analysis was performed owing to heterogeneity.

**Figure 1. PRISMA 2020 flow diagram**




Figure 1: PRISMA 2020 flow diagram for study identification and selection.

### Characteristics of included studies

The 24 included studies comprised general PICU cohorts, pediatric cardiac intensive-care cohorts, physiologic predictor studies, readiness-test studies, and large registry analyses. Publication years ranged from 1996 to 2026.

Sample sizes ranged from small physiologic cohorts to

multicenter registries with more than 100,000 pediatric encounters. Definitions of extubation failure ranged from reintubation within 24 hours to broader definitions including 48-hour or seven-day failure and post-extubation rescue support.

Table 3: Characteristics of included studies

| Study                          | Design/setting                          | Population/sample                          | Main contribution                                                                             |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Khan 1996 <sup>7</sup>         | USA; prospective cohort                 | Mechanically ventilated infants/children   | Predictors of success/failure; early physiologic and clinical variables                       |
| Thiagarajan 1999 <sup>8</sup>  | USA; cohort                             | Children undergoing extubation             | Respiratory mechanics and clinical predictors of successful extubation                        |
| Venkataraman 2000 <sup>9</sup> | USA; validation study                   | Mechanically ventilated infants/children   | Validated earlier predictors; highlighted limited performance of isolated variables           |
| Manczur 2000 <sup>10</sup>     | UK; physiologic cohort                  | Mechanically ventilated children           | Respiratory-function predictors including mechanics/strength measures                         |
| Farias 2002 <sup>11</sup>      | Multicenter pediatric cohort            | Infants/children on mechanical ventilation | Evaluated extubation-failure predictors in planned extubation                                 |
| Kurachek 2003 <sup>5</sup>     | Multicenter prospective PICU cohort     | 2,794 extubations                          | Age $\leq 24$ months, chronic conditions, airway disorders, longer intubation, worse outcomes |
| Baisch 2005 <sup>6</sup>       | PICU cohort                             | Pediatric extubations                      | Incidence/outcomes; younger age and resource-use burden                                       |
| Newth 2009 [12]                | Prospective multicenter pediatric study | Weaning/readiness population               | Readiness-testing framework and extubation outcome                                            |
| Laham 2015 <sup>15</sup>       | Prospective PICU cohort                 | 319 first planned extubations              | Younger age, prolonged ventilation and stridor; many routine variables weak                   |

|                               |                                         |                                                  |                                                                                                                   |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Saikia 2015 <sup>14</sup>     | India; prospective<br>blinded cohort    | Newborns, infants, children                      | Prospective prediction of<br>extubation failure in tertiary<br>pediatric center                                   |
| Faustino 2017 <sup>15</sup>   | Prospective multicenter<br>analysis     | Children with lower<br>respiratory tract disease | Accuracy of extubation-readiness<br>test                                                                          |
| Khemani 2017 <sup>16</sup>    | Prospective secondary<br>analysis       | 409 children                                     | Respiratory muscle strength,<br>upper-airway obstruction,<br>neurologic disease, PEEP, post-<br>extubation effort |
| Toida 2017 <sup>15</sup>      | Japan;<br>detection/validation<br>study | Critically ill children                          | Validated predictors of successful<br>extubation                                                                  |
| Heubel 2020 <sup>18</sup>     | Brazil; retrospective<br>cohort         | PICU patients                                    | Extubation failure risk profile and<br>outcomes                                                                   |
| Hames 2022 <sup>19</sup>      | Cardiac ICU;<br>multicenter             | Children after congenital<br>cardiac surgery     | Risk analytics and extubation<br>readiness tests                                                                  |
| Loberger 2023 <sup>40</sup>   | USA; retrospective<br>PICU cohort       | 844 children                                     | Airway versus non-airway failure<br>phenotypes and outcomes                                                       |
| Saengsin 2023 <sup>21</sup>   | Thailand; PCICU<br>retrospective        | Pediatric cardiac patients                       | Pneumonia, prior reintubation,<br>palliative surgery, post-extubation<br>stridor                                  |
| Byrnes 2023 <sup>22</sup>     | Multicenter cardiac<br>registry         | 18,278 extubations                               | Airway anomaly, genetic<br>abnormality, diaphragm paralysis,<br>pleural effusion, bypass time                     |
| Beshish 2024 <sup>24</sup>    | Single-center cardiac<br>cohort         | 8,750 encounters                                 | Younger age/weight, single-<br>ventricle physiology, genetic<br>syndrome, procedure variables                     |
| Al-Sofyani 2024 <sup>25</sup> | Saudi Arabia;<br>retrospective PICU     | 335 children                                     | 12.5% failure; younger age,<br>cardiovascular disease, PRISM                                                      |

|                             |                                 |                       |                                                                                                      |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                             |                                 |                       | score, ventilation duration, ICU stay                                                                |
| Saengsin 2024 <sup>26</sup> | Thailand; prediction-tool study | Pediatric cardiac ICU | Clinical prediction tool for cardiac extubation failure                                              |
| Hames 2025 <sup>27</sup>    | Eight-center cardiac cohort     | 922 children          | Preoperative ventilation, inhaled nitric oxide, longer postoperative ventilation, abnormal analytics |
| Loberger 2026 [28]          | 158-site registry               | 132,712 encounters    | Contemporary trends; younger age, renal/respiratory/cardiac diagnosis, ventilation >=7 days          |
| Yuniar 2026 [29]            | Indonesia; PICU cohort          | 112 children          | 25.9% broad failure; pneumonia, prolonged ventilation, rescue NIV/HFNC                               |

Risk-of-bias summary

Using QUIPS, four studies were rated as low overall concern, 16 as moderate concern, and four as high concern. The most frequent concerns were single-center sampling, inconsistent handling of confounding,

heterogeneous extubation-failure definitions, data-driven predictor cut points, and classification of early post-extubation signs as predictors rather than outcomes or warning signs.

Table 4: Risk-of-bias summary using QUIPS

| QUIPS domain                  | Overall concern | Reason                                                                                                     |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Study participation           | Low-moderate    | Large registries and multicenter cohorts were strong; single-center studies had limited external validity. |
| Study attrition               | Low-moderate    | Most studies used clinical records/registries; missing data handling varied.                               |
| Prognostic-factor measurement | Moderate        | Definitions and cut points differed; some predictors were measured after extubation.                       |
| Outcome measurement           | Moderate        | Reintubation windows varied from 24 hours to seven days; some studies included NIV/HFNC escalation.        |

|                                |               |                                                                                                       |
|--------------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Confounding                    | Moderate-high | Adjustment varied; treatment exposures were vulnerable to confounding by indication.                  |
| Statistical analysis/reporting | Moderate      | Multivariable models were available in some studies; smaller cohorts had limited events per variable. |

### Predictors of extubation failure

Younger age was the most consistently reported demographic risk signal. Multicenter and single-center studies repeatedly observed greater risk among infants and younger children, plausibly related to smaller airway caliber, higher airway resistance, immature respiratory mechanics, and reduced respiratory reserve<sup>5,6,13,25,28,29</sup>. Low weight or underweight status was particularly relevant in cardiac cohorts, where growth failure and complex congenital heart disease often coexist<sup>22,24</sup>.

Underlying disease and comorbidity were important. Chronic respiratory disease, neurologic disease, syndromic diagnoses, genetic abnormalities, airway disorders, cardiovascular disease, renal disease, and complex cardiac physiology were associated with higher failure risk in different cohorts<sup>5,16,20-22,24,25,28</sup>. These conditions likely increase the post-extubation load, impair airway protection, reduce respiratory-muscle reserve, or limit hemodynamic tolerance.

Prolonged invasive ventilation was a recurrent risk factor and may represent both greater baseline disease severity and acquired ventilator-related weakness. Studies consistently linked longer ventilation before extubation with failure or adverse outcomes<sup>5,13,20,25,27-29</sup>. Loberger et al. found ventilation for seven days or more among contemporary risk markers in a large registry analysis<sup>28</sup>.

Airway factors formed a distinct mechanistic domain. Structural airway anomalies, post-extubation stridor, upper-airway obstruction, and airway-versus-non-airway

failure phenotypes were repeatedly emphasized [5,16,20-22,24]. Post-extubation stridor is clinically important but should be interpreted carefully: it is often an early manifestation of airway failure rather than a pure pre-extubation predictor<sup>13,23</sup>.

Respiratory muscle strength and respiratory effort appear especially important. Khemani et al. showed that respiratory muscle strength contributed meaningfully to risk and interacted with upper-airway obstruction and post-extubation work of breathing<sup>16</sup>. This domain may explain why conventional readiness tests can be reassuring while the child still lacks reserve after removal of positive pressure.

Conventional ventilator settings, blood gases, and isolated indices showed inconsistent performance. Earlier physiologic studies examined respiratory rate, tidal volume, RSBI, maximum inspiratory pressure, CROP index, gas exchange, and mechanics<sup>7-17</sup>. The 2023 systematic review by Ng et al. identified 55 pre-extubation assessments and concluded that the available pediatric tests were generally poor stand-alone predictors, although some indices appeared promising and require validation<sup>23</sup>.

Pediatric cardiac intensive-care cohorts demonstrated a distinct predictor profile. In these populations, extubation failure was associated with palliative or complex surgery, preoperative ventilation, prior reintubation, longer postoperative ventilation, airway anomaly, genetic abnormality, pleural effusion, diaphragm paralysis,

cardiopulmonary-bypass variables, inhaled nitric oxide at extubation, pneumonia, and physiologic risk analytics<sup>19,21,22,24,26,27</sup>. These predictors reflect both respiratory

mechanics and unique hemodynamic interactions after congenital cardiac surgery.

Table 5: Qualitative synthesis of predictor domains

| Predictor domain                            | Evidence consistency          | Interpretation                                                  |
|---------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| Younger age/infancy                         | High                          | Repeated across general PICU, cardiac, and registry studies     |
| Prolonged invasive ventilation              | High                          | Consistent; may reflect severity and acquired weakness          |
| Chronic respiratory/neurologic disease      | Moderate-high                 | Common risk domain, particularly in multicenter cohorts         |
| Syndromic/genetic comorbidity               | Moderate-high                 | Important in cardiac and mixed PICU populations                 |
| Airway abnormality/upper-airway obstruction | High                          | Mechanistically coherent; airway and non-airway failures differ |
| Respiratory-muscle weakness                 | Moderate-high                 | Strong physiologic support; fewer direct-measurement studies    |
| High PEEP/oxygenation burden                | Moderate                      | Associated in selected cohorts; thresholds vary                 |
| RSBI/CROP/isolated indices                  | Low-inconsistent              | Poor stand-alone reliability in pediatric synthesis             |
| Pneumonia or unresolved respiratory disease | Moderate                      | Significant in several contemporary and cardiac cohorts         |
| Cardiac surgery complexity/complications    | Moderate-high within subgroup | Relevant mainly to cardiac ICU populations                      |

### Clinical outcomes after extubation failure

Extubation failure was consistently associated with longer PICU stay, prolonged ventilation, increased post-extubation respiratory support, and greater resource use<sup>5,6,13,20,25,28</sup>. Mortality associations varied by cohort and adjustment strategy. Some studies showed higher

mortality among failures, whereas contemporary cardiac cohorts sometimes demonstrated longer ICU stay without statistically significant mortality differences<sup>21,22</sup>. This variation reinforces the need to separate failure mechanisms and adjust for severity of illness.

## Discussion

This systematic review shows that pediatric extubation failure is not adequately predicted by a single physiologic test. The most reproducible risk domains were age, duration of invasive ventilation, comorbidity, airway risk, and respiratory-muscle reserve. These domains are biologically coherent: younger children have smaller airways and different respiratory mechanics; prolonged ventilation promotes weakness and increases disease severity exposure; chronic respiratory and neurologic disease reduce reserve; and airway obstruction or impaired inspiratory force may become evident only after the endotracheal tube and positive pressure are removed. The findings support a structured multidomain readiness assessment rather than reliance on routine ventilator settings or a single index. A child may pass an SBT yet fail because of post-extubation upper-airway obstruction, secretion burden, impaired neurologic airway control, weak inspiratory muscles, cardiac intolerance, or increased work of breathing. The evidence is therefore consistent with contemporary pediatric ventilator-liberation guidance recommending readiness testing within a broader clinical bundle<sup>3</sup>.

The distinction between pre-extubation predictors and post-extubation warning signs is essential. Variables such as post-extubation stridor or rapidly increasing work of breathing are clinically valuable for rescue decisions but should not be mixed with pre-extubation variables when developing models intended to decide whether a child is ready for extubation. Future studies should clearly state the prediction time point and develop separate models for readiness, early rescue, and reintubation risk.

Cardiac intensive-care data should be interpreted as a related but distinct population. Cardiac surgery introduces predictors such as operative complexity, palliative

physiology, bypass exposure, pleural effusion, diaphragm paralysis, genetic syndrome, and the need for inhaled nitric oxide. These variables should not be forced into general PICU models without external validation, but they are clinically important for cardiac ICU extubation protocols<sup>19,21,22,24,26,27</sup>.

This review also identified important methodological weaknesses. Definitions of extubation failure vary, risk-factor thresholds are inconsistent, confounding adjustment is incomplete in many studies, and several cohorts are single-center. Broader definitions that include NIV or HFNC escalation may identify early respiratory deterioration but are not equivalent to reintubation. Future studies should report reintubation within 48 hours as a core outcome, with 72-hour, seven-day, and rescue-support outcomes as secondary outcomes.

## Strengths and limitations

The strengths of this review include an updated search through September 2026, inclusion of contemporary large registry data, separation of general PICU and cardiac ICU evidence, use of a prognostic-factor framework, and structured risk-of-bias assessment using QUIPS. The review also distinguishes pre-extubation predictors from post-extubation warning signs, which is clinically important for model development.

Limitations include reliance on English-language accessible reports, predominance of observational studies, heterogeneity in definitions and post-extubation support practices, limited ability to pool results quantitatively, and possible missed studies from subscription-only databases, and differences from adult and neonatal evidence bases<sup>30,31</sup>. Risk-of-bias assessment was necessarily conservative where full adjustment details or predictor timing were incomplete. The findings

should guide clinical reasoning and protocol development but should not be treated as a validated bedside score.

### Conclusions

Extubation failure in critically ill children is a multifactorial event. Younger age, prolonged invasive mechanical ventilation, chronic respiratory or neurologic disease, syndromic or genetic comorbidity, airway abnormality or upper-airway obstruction, and impaired respiratory-muscle strength are the most consistently supported predictor domains. In pediatric cardiac intensive-care populations, additional predictors include complex or palliative surgery, preoperative ventilation, longer postoperative ventilation, airway anomaly, genetic abnormality, pleural effusion, diaphragm paralysis, inhaled nitric oxide at extubation, pneumonia, and abnormal physiologic risk analytics.

Clinical extubation decisions should therefore use a structured, multidomain readiness assessment that combines SBT performance with airway, neurologic, respiratory-muscle, secretion, hemodynamic, comorbidity, and disease-specific evaluation. Future pediatric studies should standardize extubation failure as reintubation within 48 hours for the primary outcome, report broader support-escalation outcomes separately, distinguish airway from non-airway failure, and externally validate parsimonious prediction models before using them to delay or accelerate extubation.

### References

1. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al.: The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*. 2021, 372:n71. 10.1136/bmj.n71
2. Hayden JA, van der Windt DA, Cartwright JL, Côté P, Bombardier C: Assessing bias in studies of

prognostic factors. *Ann Intern Med*. 2013, 158:280-86. 10.7326/0003-4819-158-4-201302190-00009

3. Abu-Sultaneh S, Iyer NP, Fernández A, et al.: Executive summary: international clinical practice guidelines for pediatric ventilator liberation, a Pediatric Acute Lung Injury and Sepsis Investigators Network document. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2023, 207:17-28. 10.1164/rccm.202204-0795SO
4. Khemani RG, Markovitz BP, Curley MAQ: Characteristics of children intubated and mechanically ventilated in 16 PICUs. *Chest*. 2009, 136:765-71. 10.1378/chest.09-0207
5. Kurachek SC, Newth CJ, Quasney MW, et al.: Extubation failure in pediatric intensive care: a multiple-center study of risk factors and outcomes. *Crit Care Med*. 2003, 31:2657-64. 10.1097/01.CCM.0000094228.90557.85
6. Baisch SD, Wheeler WB, Kurachek SC, Cornfield DN: Extubation failure in pediatric intensive care incidence and outcomes. *Pediatr Crit Care Med*. 2005, 6:312-18. 10.1097/01.PCC.0000161119.05076.91
7. Khan N, Brown A, Venkataraman ST: Predictors of extubation success and failure in mechanically ventilated infants and children. *Crit Care Med*. 1996, 24:1568-79. 10.1097/00003246-199609000-00023
8. Thiagarajan RR, Bratton SL, Martin LD, Brogan TV, Taylor D: Predictors of successful extubation in children. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 1999, 160:1562-66. 10.1164/ajrccm.160.5.9810036
9. Venkataraman ST, Khan N, Brown A: Validation of predictors of extubation success and failure in mechanically ventilated infants and children. *Crit Care Med*. 2000, 28:2991-96. 10.1097/00003246-200008000-00051

10. Manczur TI, Greenough A, Pryor D, Rafferty GF: Comparison of predictors of extubation from mechanical ventilation in children. *Pediatr Crit Care Med*. 2000, 1:28-32. 10.1097/00130478-200007000-00005
11. Farias JA, Alía I, Retta A, et al.: An evaluation of extubation failure predictors in mechanically ventilated infants and children. *Intensive Care Med*. 2002, 28:752-57. 10.1007/s00134-002-1306-6
12. Newth CJ, Venkataraman S, Willson DF, et al.: Weaning and extubation readiness in pediatric patients. *Pediatr Crit Care Med*. 2009, 10:1-11. 10.1097/PCC.0b013e318193724d
13. Laham JL, Breheny PJ, Rush A: Do clinical parameters predict first planned extubation outcome in the pediatric intensive care unit? *J Intensive Care Med*. 2015, 30:89-96. 10.1177/0885066613494338
14. Saikia B, Kumar N, Sreenivas V: Prediction of extubation failure in newborns, infants and children: brief report of a prospective blinded cohort study at a tertiary care paediatric centre in India. *Springerplus*. 2015, 4:827. 10.1186/s40064-015-1607-1
15. Faustino EV, Gedeit R, Schwarz AJ, et al.: Accuracy of an extubation readiness test in predicting successful extubation in children with acute respiratory failure from lower respiratory tract disease. *Crit Care Med*. 2017, 45:94-102. 10.1097/CCM.0000000000002024
16. Khemani RG, Sekayan T, Hotz J, et al.: Risk factors for pediatric extubation failure: the importance of respiratory muscle strength. *Crit Care Med*. 2017, 45:e798-e805. 10.1097/CCM.0000000000002433
17. Toida C, Muguruma T, Miyamoto M: Detection and validation of predictors of successful extubation in critically ill children. *PLoS One*. 2017, 12:e0189787. 10.1371/journal.pone.0189787
18. Heubel AD, Mendes RG, Barrile SR, et al.: Extubation failure in pediatric intensive care unit: a retrospective cohort study. *Fisioter Pesqui*. 2020, 27:34-40. 10.1590/1809-2950/18038927012020
19. Hames DL, Sleeper LA, Bullock KJ, et al.: Associations with extubation failure and predictive value of risk analytics algorithms with extubation readiness tests following congenital cardiac surgery. *Pediatr Crit Care Med*. 2022, 23:e208-e218. 10.1097/PCC.0000000000002912
20. Loberger JM, Manchikalapati A, Borasino S, Prabhakaran P: Prevalence, risk factors, and outcomes of airway versus non-airway pediatric extubation failure. *Respir Care*. 2023, 68:374-83. 10.4187/respcare.10341
21. Saengsin K, Sittiwangkul R, Borisuthipandit T, et al.: Predictive factors of extubation failure in pediatric cardiac intensive care unit: a single-center retrospective study from Thailand. *Front Pediatr*. 2023, 11:1156263. 10.3389/fped.2023.1156263
22. Byrnes J, Bailly D, Werho DK, et al.: Risk factors for extubation failure after pediatric cardiac surgery and impact on outcomes: a multicenter analysis. *Crit Care Explor*. 2023, 5:e0966. 10.1097/CCE.0000000000000966
23. Ng P, Tan HL, Ma YJ, et al.: Tests and indices predicting extubation failure in children: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Pulm Ther*. 2023, 9:25-47. 10.1007/s41030-022-00204-w
24. Beshish AG, Fundora MP, Aronoff E, et al.: Prevalence, risk factors, and etiology of extubation failure in pediatric patients after cardiac surgery. *J*

- Pediatr Intensive Care. 2024, 13:321-29. 10.1055/s-0041-1742253
25. Al-Sofyani KA: Predictors and outcomes of extubation failures in a pediatric intensive care unit: a retrospective study. J Taibah Univ Med Sci. 2024, 19:516-23. 10.1016/j.jtumed.2024.03.005
26. Saengsin K, Sittiwangkul R, Borisuthipandit T, et al.: Development of a clinical prediction tool for extubation failure in pediatric cardiac intensive care unit. Front Pediatr. 2024, 12:1346198. 10.3389/fped.2024.1346198
27. Hames DL, Abbas Q, Asfari A, et al.: Clinical and risk analytics associations with extubation failure in children following congenital cardiac surgery: a multicenter retrospective cohort study, 2017-2020. Pediatr Crit Care Med. 2025, 26:e1105-e1114. 10.1097/PCC.0000000000003793
28. Loberger JM, Moore M, Scanlon M, Khemani RG, Abu-Sultaneh S, Rogerson CM: Contemporary trends in pediatric extubation failure and noninvasive respiratory support use. Chest. 2026, 169:106-14. 10.1016/j.chest.2025.07.4080
29. Yuniar I, Setia DN, June D: Clinical characteristics of extubation failure in critically ill children in pediatric intensive care unit. Turk Arch Pediatr. 2026, 61:241-45. 10.65717/TurkArchPediatr.2025.25215
30. Fu M, Hu Z, Yu G, et al.: Predictors of extubation failure in newborns: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Ital J Pediatr. 2023, 49:133. 10.1186/s13052-023-01538-0
31. Torrini F, Gendreau S, Morel J, et al.: Prediction of extubation outcome in critically ill patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Crit Care. 2021, 25:391. 10.1186/s13054-021-03802-3