DELIRIUM IN ICU: Prevention and Management

Milind Baldi

Contents

- Introduction
- Risk factors
- Assessment
- Prevention
- Management

Introduction

 Delirium is a syndrome characterized by acute cerebral dysfunction with a change in baseline mental status, inattention, and either disorganized thinking or altered level of consciousness.

Crit Care Med 2013;41(1):263-306.

Introduction

- The prevalence of delirium in ICU cohort studies has been reported as low as 20–30% and as high as 70–80% or more.
- Incidence and prevalence rate of delirium were 24.4% and 53.6% respectively

Best Pract Res Clin Anaesthesiol. 2012 Sep; 26(3): 277–287. Gen Hosp Psych 2012 Nov-Dec;34(6):639-46



Diagnosis

 a standard clinical evaluation does not have an adequate accuracy for the diagnosis

Intensive Care Med. 2009, 35:1276-1280

Clinical manifestations

- Cognitive Symptoms
- disorientation,
- inability to sustain attention,
- impaired short-term memory,
- reduced level of consciousness

- Behavioral Symptoms
- sleep-wake cycle disturbance,
- irritability,
- hallucinations
- delusions

Delerium Scales

Intensive Care Med(2001) 27: 859-864 DOI 10.1007/s001340100909

ORIGINAL

N. Bergeron M.-J. Dubois M. Dumont S. Dial Y. Skrobik

Intensive Care Delirium Screening Checklist: evaluation of a new screening tool

Received: 15 February 2000 Final revision received: 1 November 2000 Accepted: 25 January 2001 Published online: 20 April 2001 O Springer-Verlag 2001

N.Berger on Department of Psychia try. Université de Montréal, Hörital Mainement ve-Renement. Montréal, Québec, Canada

M.-I Dubeia Division of Critical Care. Université de Montréal, Höpital Maisonneuve-Resensest, Montofal, Outbee, Oanada

M.Dumont COREV affiliated with University de Montréal, Hörital Maisonneuve-Reservent, Montréal, Québec, Canada

S.Dial Critical Care and Respirology. McGill University, Montetal, Outline, Canada

Introduction

Y. Skrobik (🖃) Critical Care, Université de Montréal. HArrital Mainternet we-Renerrow (5415 Boulevard de l'Amonption Montréal, Québec, Ganada H1T 2M4 E-mail skrobiky@total.net Phone: +1-514-252-3822 Fax: +1-514-939-8891

Behavioral disturbances in patients admitted to the in-

intensive case unit is poorly defined. is 99 % and specificity is 64%. Clinical evaluation is difficult in the setting of unstable, often intubated patients. A screening tool may imonve the detection of delirium. Method: We created a screening checklist of eight items based on DSM criteria and features of deliriuncaltered level of consciousness, instention, disorientation, hallucination or delusion, psychomotor agitation or retardation, inappropriate better patient care. mood or speech, sleep/wake cycle disturbance, and symptom fluctuation. During 3 months, all patients admitted to a busy medical/surgical intensive care unit were evaluated, and the scale score was compared to a psychiatric evaluation. Results: In 93 patients studied, 15 developed defirium. Fourteen (93 %) of them had a score of 4 points or more. This score was also present in 15 (19%) of patients without delinium, 14 of whom had a known psychiatric illness, dementia, a structural neurological abnormality or encephalopathy. A ROC analusis was used to determine the sens tivity and specificity of the screening tool. The area under the ROC

Abstract Objective: Delirium in the curve is 0.9017. Predicted sensitivity Conclusion: This study suggests that the Intensive Care Delirium Screening Checklist can easily be applied by a clinician or a nurse in a busy critical care setting to screen all patients even when communication is compromised. The tool can be utilized quickly and helps to identify delirious patients. Earlier diagnosis may lead to earlier intervention and

> Keywords Delirium - Intensive care unit . Screening . Detection-Checklist - Rating scale

Abbreviations ICU intensive care unit - DSM diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders-ROC receiver operator characteristic- APACHE acute physiologic and chronic health evaluation

[3]. Delinium occurring in the ICU setting is a poorly described and studied entity, which encompasses a sange of behavioral and neuropsychiatric disorders during tensive care unit (ICU) are common and have been as- critical illness. To date, no systematic disorder classificasociated with increased morbidity [1, 2] and mostality tion attempt exists. Much of what is described in stan-

CARING FOR THE CRITICALLY ILL PATIENT

Delirium in Mechanically Ventilated Patients

Validity and Reliability of the Confusion Assessment Method for the Intensive Care Unit (CAM-ICU)

E. Wesley Ehs, MD, MPH Sharon K. Inorese, MD, MPH Conton R. Bernard, MD Sharun Gonkor, PedD Joseph Francis, MD, MPH Lisa May, RN, ESN Brenda Truman, RN, MSN Theodore Speroff, PhD Shiva Gautan, PhD Richard Margolin, MD Bobert P. Hart, PhD Robert Dittus, MD, MPH

FLIDE M D A DISTURBANCE OF nsciounneis characterized by an neute couset and fluctuating course of impaired cognitive functioning so that a paitent's ability to receive, process, store, and eccell information is strikingly inpaired. It is associated with pour outcomes in hospitalized patients, including increased length of stay, the need for aubsequent institutionalization, and higher mortality rates.10 Although the Inequancy of delivious varies from 19% to 50% among general modical or surgical patients," ALL these rates apply to not lett such same not in the intensive care unit (fCU), and few data exist concentsing delition in the ICU. ILH

Mechanically ventilated ICU patients are at high risk for the development of deliviant due to multisystem. acute illnesses, comorbidities, medications, and numerous other risk facmes 17, 16 at In this population, cogni-

83001 American Medical Association. 42 rights reserved

Context: Delinum is a common problem in the intensive care unit. (ICU). Accurate diagnosis is limited by the difficulty of communicating with mechanically writilated patients and by keek of a colidated definitive instrument for use in the ICU.

Objectives. To validate a deletion assessment instrument that uses shandardized notverbal assessments for mechanically ventilated patients and to determine the occurrence rate of delinam in such patients

Design and Setting Prospective cohort study testing the Confusion Assessment Method for KU Patients (CAM-ICUI in the adult medical and coronary ICUs of a LS university-based medical center.

Participants A total of 111 consecutive patients who were mechanically ventilated were enrolled from February 1, 2000; to July 15, 2000; of whom 98 (86.5%) were evaluable for the development of delinam and 15 (19.5%) were sucluded because they restained comatose throughout the investigation.

Main Outcome Measures. Occurrence rate of delirum and sensitivity, specificity. and internative reliability of definition assessments using the CAM-ICU, made daily by 2 critical care study nurses, compared with assessments by delirium experts using Deagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition, criteria.

Results: A total of 471 daily pointd evaluations were completed. Compared with the reference standard for diagnosing delinam, 2 study nurses using the CAAN-ICU had senobelies of 1995 and 995, specificities of 965 and 1995, and high interratio reliability 6; -0.96; 95%; confidence interval, 0.92-0.990. Interruter reliability measures across subgroup comparisons showed a values of 0.92 for those aged 65 years or older, 0.99 for those with suspected dementia, or 0.94 for those with Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation II scores at or above the median value of 23 (al #< 001). Comparing sensitivity and specificity between patient subgroups according to age, suspected dementia, or severity of illness showed no significant differences. The mean (SD) CAM-ICU administration time was 2 (1) minutes. Releance standard diagnoses of deletian, stapor, and coma occurred in 25.2%, 21.3%, and 28.5% of all disaryotions, respectively. Delirum occurred is 80.00.3%3 patients during their ICU stay for a mean (SDI of 2.4 (1.6) days. Deletare was seen remark in 39.5% of alert or each arcaned ratient observations ha the reference standard and perioded in 10,4% of patients at hospital discharge.

Conclusions. Delirium, a complication not currently monitored in the ICU setting, is extremely common in mechanically ventilated patients. The CAW-IC U appears to be rapid, salid, and reliable for diagnosing delinam in the ICU setting and may be a useful instrument for both clinical and research purposes. IAAA 20053462703-2710

lation, print, solution

17123 8300 journal, wei, Hellinstraut, sanderlik, erkit Lating, for the Cettically II Pottent Section Editor: Debonit 1 Coult, MD, Consulting Editor, 18284, Adversey Sandt, Court Harts, MD, Chellins, Sour-Baisen, HD, Terretty Frans, MD, AdmitedPart MD, Author Altitutions are loted at the end of this article. Corresponding Author and Reprints: E. Wesley Eb. MD. MFH. Devices at Allergy Pelessensy Ottool Case Infection: Center for Hoods Services Re-marsh. 6th Risce Heckale Center Dei Hotto, Varelle-bilt University Merical Center: Hadrothe TM

discontrol www. Inconduct 5, 2005-001 246 No. 11 2703

Abarman Periality, M

Gusmao-Flores et al. Critical Care 2012, **16**:R115 http://ccforum.com/content/16/4/R115



RESEARCH

Open Access

The confusion assessment method for the intensive care unit (CAM-ICU) and intensive care delirium screening checklist (ICDSC) for the diagnosis of delirium: a systematic review and meta-analysis of clinical studies

Dimitri Gusmao-Flores^{1,2*}, Jorge Ibrain Figueira Salluh^{3,4}, Ricardo Ávila Chalhub² and Lucas C Quarantini^{2,5,6}



Critical Care 2012, 16:R115



Critical Care 2012, 16:R115

 The present meta-analysis demonstrates that the CAM ICU is an excellent tool for the detection of delirium in critically ill ICU patients regardless of the subgroup of patients evaluated Journal of Critical Care (2012) 27, 212-217



Journal of Critical Care

Comparison of CAM-ICU and ICDSC for the detection of delirium in critically ill patients focusing on relevant clinical outcomes

Cristiane Damiani Tomasi^a, Carmen Grandi^a, Jorge Salluh^b, Márcio Soares^b, Vinícius Renê Giombelli^a, Sarah Cascaes^a, Roberta Candal Macedo^a, Larissa de Souza Constantino^a, Daiane Biff^a, Cristiane Ritter^a, Felipe Dal Pizzol^{a,*} the CAM-ICU has a fast application (2-5 min) and does not depend exclusively on the verbal response, thus being relevant for patients on mechanical ventilation

Assessing Delirium

• Step 1: Level of Consciousness

Step 1 Level of Consciousness: RASS*

Scale	Label	Description
+4	COMBATIVE	Combative, violent, immediate danger to staff
+3	VERY AGITATED	Pulls to remove tubes or catheters; aggressive
+2	AGITATED	Frequent non-purposeful movement, fights ventilator
+1	RESTLESS	Anxious, apprehensive, movements not aggressive
0	ALERT & CALM	Spontaneously pays attention to caregiver
-1	DROWSY	Not fully alert, but has sustained awakening to voice
		(eye opening & contact >10 sec)
-2	LIGHT SEDATION	Briefly awakens to voice (eyes open & contact <10 sec)
-3	MODERATE SEDATION	Movement or eye opening to voice (no eye contact)
L,	If RASS is ≥ -3 procee	ed to CAM-ICU (Is patient CAM-ICU positive or negative?)
-4	DEEP SEDATION	No response to voice, but movement or eye opening to physical stimulation
-5	UNAROUSABLE	No response to voice or physical stimulation
-5	UNAROUSABLE If RASS is -4 or -5 \rightarrow	No response to voice or physical stimulation STOP (patient unconscious), RECHECK later

• Step 2: Content of consciousness

• Delirium is a syndrome characterized by acute cerebral dysfunction with a change in baseline mental status, inattention, and either disorganized thinking or altered level of consciousness.

Delirium is a syndrome characterized by acute cerebral dysfunction with a change in baseline mental status,

Feature 1: Acute change or fluctuating course of mental status

And

Delirium is a syndrome characterized by acute cerebral dysfunction with a change in baseline mental status, inattention

Feature 1: Acute change or fluctuating course of mental status

And

Feature 2: Inattention

And

Delirium is a syndrome characterized by acute cerebral dysfunction with a change in baseline mental status, inattention, and either disorganized thinking



Delirium is a syndrome characterized by acute cerebral dysfunction with a change in baseline mental status, inattention, and either disorganized thinking or altered level of consciousness.



Confusion Assessment Method for the ICU (CAM-ICU) Flowsheet



Pictures

Step 1



Step 2







 Versions available in Hindi and other regional languages too

DSM V

 No major changes from DSM-IV were made to the core elements of DSM-5 criteria for delirium, there are some differences in content and wording of the criteria.



BMC Medicine 2014, 12:164

PREDECTING Delirium

- Development and validation of PRE-DELIRIC (PREdiction of DELIRium in ICu patients) delirium prediction model for intensive care patients: observational multicentre study
- 10 risk factors—age, APACHE-II score, admission group, coma, infection, metabolic acidosis, use of sedatives and morphine, urea concentration, and urgent admission

BMJ 2012;344:e420

ORIGINAL

- M. van den Boogaard
- L. Schoonhoven
- E. Maseda
- C. Plowright
- C. Jones
- A. Luetz
- P. V. Sackey
- P. G. Jorens
- L. M. Aitken
- F. M. P. van Haren
- **R. Donders**
- J. G. van der Hoeven
- P. Pickkers

Recalibration of the delirium prediction model for ICU patients (PRE-DELIRIC): a multinational observational study

Intensive Care Med (2014) 40:361–369

RISK FACTORS

- Strong
- o Age
- o **Dementia**
- o Hypertension
- o **Coma**
- APACHE II
- Delirium previous day
- Emergency surgery
- Mechanical ventilation
- Polytrauma
- Metabolic acidosis

Crit Care Med 2015; 43:40–47

- Inconclusive
- Alcohol use
- Nicotine use
- Acute respiratory disease
- Kidney failure
- o Fever
- benzodiazepines

Delirium risk factors

- Four baseline risk factors are positively and significantly associated with the development of delirium in the ICU: preexisting dementia, history of hypertension and/or alcoholism, and a high severity of illness at admission.
- **Benzodiazepine** use may be a risk factor for the development of delirium in adult ICU patients.
- In mechanically ventilated adult ICU patients at risk of developing delirium, dexmedetomidine infusions administered for sedation may be associated with a lower prevalence of delirium compared to benzodiazepine infusions

Table 1

Comparison of risk factors between delirious (either incidence or prevalence cases) and non delirious subjects using univariate analysis

Risk factor	Delirious subjects, n=75 (frequency)	Non-delirious subjects, n=65 (frequency)	chi-Square test/t test (significance)
Prodisposing factors (heat factors)			
A op (in second)	40 53+10 27	3743413 04	47078-001
Eklerly natients (>65 years).	23	1	19.12 (0:001)
Gender male	43	29	2.25 (P=13)
Smalling (have been smaking for at least 1 years regularly and	20	9	3 48 (0 0.5)
currently smoking just prior to falling acutely ill)	20		3.46 (0.00)
Hypertension			0.146 (0.702)
Diabetes mellitus	4	3	Fisher's Exact test, P=1.00
Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease	13	5	2.89 (.089)
Chronic kidney disease	1	3	Fisher's Exact test, P=.33
Coronary artery disease	5	0	2.76 (.096)
Anemia	-90	32	0.23(.62)
Hypothyroidism	2	2	Fisher's Exact test, P=1.00
Malignancy	4	1	Fisher's Exact test P= 37
Past newchistric illness			Fisher's Faset lest P= 50
Illness related factors		-	
Glasona Coma Scale acore	6 96+2 13	5 44+2 77	364 (P<001)
APACHE II some	10 5315 65	1455+5 28	481 (000)
CNS infections	6	1	195/174
Reprint and the full state	49	31	375 (056)
Henry and the second section levels < 135 mEa(1)	30	20	1 20 (25)
Hypothaleening (service and any loweds ~135 million)	15	14	0.05 (03)
Hypernatemia (serum sodium levels > 145 minq L)	15	14	0.20 (45)
Hyperkalema (serum poussium seven < 5.0 mtx/L)	21	10	0.20(.00)
Hypokalemia (serum potassium levels < 3.5 m/tq/L)	9	12	2.69 (.10)
Hyperuncemia (serum unc acid > / mg/di)	28	12	6.07 (.014)
Hypoalbuminemia (serum albumin levels <3.4 g/dl)	35	20	3.69 (.05)
Hypertulirubinemia (>2 mg/dl)	3	4	Fisher's Exact test, P=.70
Orea (>100 mg/dl)	5	2	0.00 (1.00)
Creatinine (>2 mg/dl)	0	3	0.22 (.63)
Deranged AST (>120 IU/I)	21	12	1.75 (.18)
Deranged ALT (>120 IU/I)	25	12	3.96 (.047)
Acidosis (pH <7.35)	45	17	16.16 (<.001)
Alkalosis (pH >7.45)	22	18	0.04 (.83)
Acute renal failure	3	8	2.27 (0.132)
Multiple organ failure	13	8	0.69 (.40)
Respiratory infection	13	16	1.12 (.28)
Sepsis	31	32	0.87 (.34)
Postoperative	5	3	0.05 (.81)
Treatment-related factors			
Mechanical ventilation	60	-34	12.10 (.001)
(patient requiring assisted ventilation in the form of ventilator)			
Steroid medication	52	34	4.733 (.030)
Sedative medication	27	13	4.36 (.037)
Antibiotics	59	49	0.21 (.64)
Antipsychotics	14	7	1.70 (.19)
Antihypertensives	18	11	1.06 (.30)
Insulin	38	17	8.77 (.003)
Total number of medication received	5.97±1.33	5.46±1.16	2,402 (.018)

* Chi-square value with Yate's correction.





Reducing latrogenic Risks

ICU-Acquired Delirium and Weakness – Crossing the Quality Chasm

 "In this article, we advocate for the adoption and implementation of a standard bundle of ICU measures with great potential to reduce the burden of ICU-acquired delirium and weakness"

Prevention

Individual components of this bundle are evidence based and can help standardize communication, improve interdisciplinary care, reduce mortality, and improve cognitive and functional outcomes.

 "ABCDE bundle," for awakening and breathing coordination, delirium monitoring, and exercise/early mobility
Building blocks of managing Pain, Agitation and Delirium



Α	• Kress JP, et al. <u>N Engl J Med</u> 2000;342:1471-7
В	• Ely EW, et al. <u>N Engl J Med</u> 1996;335:1864-9
С	• Riker R. et al, <u>JAMA</u> . 2009;301:489-499
D	 Preventing and Managing Delirium
E	 Schweickert et al, <u>Lancet</u> 2009;373:1874-82

	• Kress JP, et al. <u>N Engl J Med 2000;342:1471-7</u>
В	• Ely EW, et al. <u>N Engl J Med 1996;335:1864-9</u>
	• Riker R. et al, <u>JAMA</u> . 2009;301:489-499
	 Preventing and Managing Delirium
	• Schweickert et al, <u>Lancet</u> 2009;373:1874-82

The New England Journal of Medicine

EFFECT ON THE DURATION OF MECHANICAL VENTILATION OF IDENTIFYING PATIENTS CAPABLE OF BREATHING SPONTANEOUSLY

E. WESLEY ELY, M.D., M.P.H., ALBERT M. BAKER, M.D., DONNIE P. DUNAGAN, M.D., HENRY L. BURKE, M.D., ALLEN C. SMITH, M.D., PATRICK T. KELLY, M.D., MARGARET M. JOHNSON, M.D., RICK W. BROWDER, M.D., DAVID L. BOWTON, M.D., AND EDWARD F. HAPONIK, M.D.

Ely EW, et al. <u>N Engl J Med 1996;335:1864-9</u>

Spontaneous <u>B</u>reathing Trial

 Daily screening of the respiratory function of adults receiving mechanical ventilation, followed by trials of spontaneous breathing

Characteristic	INTERVENTION GROUP (N = 149)	CONTROL GROUP (N = 151)
Male sex — no. (%)	67 (45)	84 (56)
Treatment in coronary care unit - no. (%)	33 (22)	29 (19)
Age — yr	61.7±15.8	60.5±15.5
APACHE II score	19.8±6.0	17.9±6.2
Acute-lung-injury score	1.9 ± 0.8	1.7 ± 0.8
Median duration of respiratory failure — days†	3.0	2.0
Mode of ventilation — no. of patients (%) Intermittent mandatory ventilation Pressure-support ventilation Both Pressure-control ventilation Assist-control ventilation Continuous positive airway pressure	$\begin{array}{c} 42 \ (28) \\ 26 \ (17) \\ 64 \ (43) \\ 3 \ (2) \\ 6 \ (4) \\ 8 \ (5) \end{array}$	50 (33) 19 (13) 65 (43) 5 (3) 4 (3) 8 (5)
Cause of respiratory failure — no. of patients (%) Congestive heart failure Other heart disease COPD or asthma exacerbation Pneumonia ARDS or multisystem organ failure Gastrointestinal and liver disease Cancer or leukemia Overdose or ketoacidosis Neurologic emergency Other	$\begin{array}{c} 18 \ (12) \\ 17 \ (11) \\ 23 \ (15) \\ 21 \ (14) \\ 23 \ (15) \\ 7 \ (5) \\ 7 \ (5) \\ 11 \ (7) \\ 7 \ (5) \\ 15 \ (10) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 15 \ (10) \\ 23 \ (15) \\ 22 \ (15) \\ 23 \ (15) \\ 19 \ (13) \\ 13 \ (9) \\ 9 \ (6) \\ 5 \ (3) \\ 4 \ (3) \\ 18 \ (12) \end{array}$

TABLE 1. BASE-LINE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STUDY PATIENTS.*

 "Your patient has successfully completed a 2hour trial of spontaneous breathing and has an 85 percent chance of successfully staying off mechanical ventilation for 48 hours"

TABLE 2. COMPARISON OF OUTCOMES BETWEEN STUDY GROUPS.

END POINT		RVENTION GROUP I = 149)	Co G (N	NTROL ROUP = 151)	P Value
		median n (interquar	o. of d tile rar	ays nge)	
Weaning time*	1	(0-2)	3	(2-7)	< 0.001
Mechanical ventilation	4.5	5 (2-9)	6	(3 - 11)	0.003
Intensive care	8	(4 - 18)	9	(5 - 16)	0.17
Hospital care	14	(9-26)	15.5	(6-30)	0.93

*Weaning time was defined as the number of days from the time the patient had a successful screening test to the discontinuation of mechanical ventilation.

A	• Kress JP, et al. <u>N Engl J Med 2000;342:1471-7</u>
	• Ely EW, et al. <u>N Engl J Med 1996;335:1864-9</u>
	• Riker R. et al, <u>JAMA</u> . 2009;301:489-499
	 Preventing and Managing Delirium
	 Schweickert et al, <u>Lancet</u> 2009;373:1874-82

INTERRUPTION OF SEDATIVE INFUSIONS IN CRITICALLY ILL PATIENTS UNDERGOING MECHANICAL VENTILATION

DAILY INTERRUPTION OF SEDATIVE INFUSIONS IN CRITICALLY ILL PATIENTS UNDERGOING MECHANICAL VENTILATION

JOHN P. KRESS, M.D., ANNE S. POHLMAN, R.N., MICHAEL F. O'CONNOR, M.D., AND JESSE B. HALL, M.D.

N Engl J Med 2000;342:1471-7

TABLE 2. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STUDY PATIENTS ON ADMISSION TO THE INTENSIVE CARE UNIT.

VARIABLE	INTERVENTION GROUP (N=68)	CONTROL GROUP (N=60)	P
Age (yr)			0.57
Median	57	61	
Interquartile range	42-71	40-74	
Sex (no.)			0.56
Male	34	26	
Female	34	34	
Weight (kg)			0.70
Median	69.9	66.0	
Interquartile range	58.9-90.2	60.4 - 78.8	
APACHE II score*			0.30
Median	20	22	
Interquartile range	15 - 25	16 - 25	
Permissive hypercapnia (no.)	12	15	0.42
Diagnosis (no.)			
Acute respiratory distress syn- drome or pulmonary edema	20	15	0.72
Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease or ventilatory failure	22	17	0.76
Asthma	4	3	0.86
Sepsis	10	15	0.21
Delirium	8	5	0.73
Hemorrhagic shock	1	3	0.52
Cardiogenic shock	2	2	0.70
Drug overdose	1	0	0.95

Spontaneous <u>Awakening</u> Trial

 TABLE 3. THE DURATION OF MECHANICAL VENTILATION, LENGTH OF STAY

 IN THE INTENSIVE CARE UNIT AND THE HOSPITAL, AND DOSES OF SEDATIVE

 DRUGS AND MORPHINE, ACCORDING TO STUDY GROUP.*

VARIABLE	INTERVENTION GROUP (N=68)	CONTROL GROUP (N=60)	P VALUE
	median (intere	quartile range)	
Duration of mechanical ventilation (days)	4.9 (2.5-8.6)	7.3 (3.4-16.1)	0.004
Length of stay (days) Intensive care unit Hospital	6.4 (3.9–12.0) 13.3 (7.3–20.0)	9.9 $(4.7-17.9)$ 16.9 $(8.5-26.6)$	0.02 0.19
Midazolam subgroup (no. of patients) Total dose of midazolam (mg) Average rate of midazolam infusion (mg/kg/hr)	37 229.8 (59–491) 0.032 (0.02–0.05)	29 425.5 (208-824) 0.054 (0.03-0.07)	0.05 0.06
Total dose of morphine (mg) Average rate of morphine infusion (mg/kg/hr)	205 (68-393) 0.027 (0.02-0.04)	481 (239–748) 0.05 (0.04–0.07)	0.009 0.004
Propofol subgroup (no. of patients) Total dose of propofol (mg) Average rate of propofol infusion (mg/kg/hr)	31 15,150 (3983–34,125) 1.9 (0.9–2.6)	31 17,588 (4769–35,619) 1.4 (0.9–2.4)	0.54 0.41
Total dose of morphine (mg) Average rate of morphine infusion (mg/kg/hr)	352 (108-632) 0.035 (0.02-0.07)	382 (148–1053) 0.043 (0.02–0.07)	0.33 0.65

<u>C (A+B)</u>

Efficacy and safety of a paired sedation and ventilator weaning protocol for mechanically ventilated patients in intensive care (Awakening and Breathing Controlled trial): a randomised controlled trial

- administration of sedatives by continuous infusion has been identified as an independent predictor of a longer duration of mechanical ventilation as well as a longer stay in the intensive care unit and in the hospital.
- Extended sedation may limit clinicians' ability to interpret physical examinations. It may be difficult to distinguish changes in mental status that are due to the action of a sedative from those that are due to neurologic injury.



	Intervention group (n=167)	Control group (n=168)
Age (years)	60 (48 to 71)	64 (51 to 75)
Sex (female)	77 (46%)	83 (49%)
APACHE II score	26 (21 to 33)	26-5 (21 to 31)
SOFA score	9 (6 to 11)	8 (6 to 11-5)
Diagnosis on admission to intensive care		
Sepsis/acute respiratory distress syndrome	79 (47%)	87 (52%)
Myocardial infarction/congestive heart failure	22 (13%)	29 (17%)
Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease/asthma	17 (10%)	12 (7%)
Altered mental status	18 (11%)	12 (7%)
Hepatic or renal failure	9 (5%)	5 (3%)
Malignancy	3 (2%)	2 (1%)
Alcohol withdrawal	1(1%)	1(1%)
Other*	18 (11%)	20 (12%)
RASS on first study day	-4 (-5 to-2)	-4 (-5 to -2)
Sedation before enrolment		
Benzodiazepines (mg)†	8 (4 to 34)	10 (2 to 41)
Opiates (µg)‡	815 (184 to 4380)	850 (142 to 4685)
Propofol (mg)	5102 (2340 to 9720)	3248 (1455 to 7420)
Time from admission to enrolment (days)	2·2 (1·1 to 3·9)	2.2 (1.1 to 3.9)

Data are n (%) or median (IQR). APACHE II=acute physiology and chronic health evaluation II. RASS=Richmond agitation-sedation scale. SAT=spontaneous awakening trial. SBT=spontaneous breathing trial. SOFA=sequential organ failure assessment. *Including gastrointestinal bleeding, metabolic disarray, haemoptysis, pulmonary embolism, and status epilepticus. †Expressed in lorazepam equivalents.³⁴‡Expressed in fentanyl equivalents.³⁴

Table 1: Baseline characteristics

	Intervention group (n=167)	Control group (n=168)	p value
Ventilator-free days*			
Mean	14-7 (0-9)	11.6 (0.9)	0-02
Median	20-0 (0 to 26-0)	8-1 (0 to 24-3)	
Time to discharge (days)			
From intensive care	9-1 (5-1 to 17-8)	12.9 (6.0 to 24.2)	0-01
From hospital	14.9 (8.9 to 26.8)	19-2 (10-3 to NA)†	0.04
28-day mortality	47 (28%)	58 (35%)	0.21
1-year mortality	74 (44%)	97 (58%)	0.01
Duration of brain dysfunction (o	days)		
Coma	2 (0 to 4)	3 (1 to 7)	0-002
Delirium	2 (0 to 5)	2 (0 to 6)	0-50
RASS at first successful SBT	-1 (-3 to 0)	-2.5 (-4 to 0)	0.0001
Complications			
Any self-extubation	16 (10%)	6 (4%)	0-03
Self-extubation requiring reintubation‡	5 (3%)	3 (2%)	0-47
Reintubation‡	23 (14%)	21 (13%)	0.73
Tracheostomy	21 (13%)	34 (20%)	0.06

Data are mean (SD), n (%), or median (IQR). RASS=Richmond agitation-sedation scale. SAT=spontaneous awakening trial. SBT=spontaneous breathing trial. *Ventilator-free days from study day 1 to 28. †Greater than 25% of patients in the SBT group remained in the hospital at study day 28. ‡Reintubation within 48 hours of extubation.

Table 3: Main outcomes

	 Kress JP, et al. <u>N Engl J Med</u> 2000;342:1471-7
	• Ely EW, et al. <u>N Engl J Med</u> 1996;335:1864-9
	• Riker R. et al, <u>JAMA</u> . 2009;301:489-499
	 Preventing and Managing Delirium
E	 Schweickert et al, <u>Lancet</u> 2009;373:1874-82

Early physical and occupational therapy in mechanically ventilated, critically ill patients: a randomised controlled trial

William D Schweickert, Mark C Pohlman, Anne S Pohlman, Celerina Nigos, Amy J Pawlik, Cheryl L Esbrook, Linda Spears, Megan Miller, Mietka Franczyk, Deanna Deprizio, Gregory A Schmidt, Amy Bowman, Rhonda Barr, Kathryn E McCallister, Jesse B Hall, John P Kress

 randomization to early exercise and mobilization (physical and occupational therapy) during periods of daily interruption of sedation (intervention; n=49) or to daily interruption of sedation with therapy as ordered by the primary care team

Early Mobilty and Exercise

Primary diagnosis on admiss	ion to intensive care	
Acute lung injury	27 (55%)	31 (56%)
COPD exacerbation	4 (8%)	6 (11%)
Acute exacerbation of asthma	5 (10%)	4 (7%)
Sepsis	7 (14%)	9 (16%)
Haemorrhage	1(2%)	2 (4%)
Malignancy	2 (4%)	1(2%)
Other	3 (6%)	2 (4%)

Data are number of patients (%) or median (IQR). APACHE II-Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation II. COPD-chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. Barthel Index scale 0–100, APACHE II scale 0–71.

	Intervention (n=49)	Control (n=55)	pvalue
Return to independent functional status at hospital discharge	29 (59%)	19 (35%)	0.02
ICU delirium (days)	2.0 (0.0-6.0)	4-0 (2-0-7-0)	0.03
Time in ICU with delirium (%)	33% (0-58)	57% (33-69)	0-02
Hospital delirium (days)	2.0 (0.0-6.0)	4-0 (2-0-8-0)	0.02
Hospital days with delirium (%)	28% (26)	41% (27)	0.01
Barthel Index score at hospital discharge	75 (7-5-95)	55 (0-85)	0.05
ICU-acquired paresis at hospital discharge	15 (31%)	27 (49%)	0.09
Ventilator-free days*	23.5 (7.4-25.6)	21.1 (0.0-23.8)	0.05
Duration of mechanical ventilation (days)	3.4 (2.3-7.3)	6-1 (4-0-9-6)	0-02
Duration of mechanical ventilation, survivors (days)	37 (2-3-7-7)	5-6 (3-4-8-4)	0.19
Duration of mechanical ventilation, non-survivors (days)	2-5 (2-4-5-5)	9-5 (5-9-14-1)	0.04
Length of stay in ICU (days)	5-9 (4-5-13-2)	7-9 (6-1-12-9)	0.08
Length of stay in hospital (days)	13-5 (8-0-23-1)	12-9 (8-9-19-8)	0.93
Hospital mortality	9 (18%)	14 (25%)	0.53

Data are n (%), median (IQR), or mean (SD). ICU=intensive care unit. *Ventilator-free days from study day 1 to day 28. Barthel Index scale 0–100, APACHE II scale 0–71.

Table 3: Main outcomes according to study group

	• Kress JP, et al. <u>N Engl J Med 2000;342:1471-7</u>
	• Ely EW, et al. <u>N Engl J Med</u> 1996;335:1864-9
	• Riker R. et al, <u>JAMA</u> . 2009;301:489-499
D	 Preventing and Managing Delirium
	 Schweickert et al, <u>Lancet</u> 2009;373:1874-82

Preventing delirium through improving sleep in the ICU

- Very little sleep in the ICU is restorative, REM sleep
- Reasons for poor sleep in the ICU include the continuous cycle of alarms, lights, beepers, care-related interruptions, pain, anxiety and ventilator dyssynchrony.
- medications that disrupt REM sleep including sedatives (particularly benzodiazepines), analgesics, vasopressors, beta-agonists, and corticosteroids

Crit Care Clin. 2013 January ; 29(1): 51–65

Preventing delirium through improving sleep in the ICU

- Peak noise is not the main determinant disturbing the patient in the ICU. Phones ringing and people talking are reported as more annoying
- Patients sleeping with earplugs showed 15% mild confusion, whereas the control patients scored 40% in this category. Taking both categories, delirium and mild confusion, into account, 60% of the control group showed cognitive disturbances against only 35% in the study group.

Critical Care 2012, 16:R73

Preventing delirium through pharmacologic interventions

no medication is FDA approved for the prevention or treatment of delirium

Haloperidol prophylaxis in critically ill patients with a high risk for delirium

- Results of prophylactic treatment were compared with a historical control group and a contemporary group (n = 299 + 177)
- The predicted chance of developing delirium in the intervention and control group was 75 ± 19% and 73 ± 22%, respectively (P = 0.50)
- intravenous haloperidol 1 mg/8 h

Critical Care 2013, 17:R9

- The actual delirium incidence was 65% in the intervention group, compared with 75% in the control group (P = 0.01)
- Prophylactic treatment with haloperidol resulted in a relative 28-day mortality reduction of 20% (hazard rate 0.80; 95% CI 0.66 to 0.98).
- Haloperidol was stopped in 12 patients because of QTc-time prolongation (n = 9), renal failure (n = 1) or suspected neurological side-effects (n = 2).

- Effect of intravenous haloperidol on the duration of delirium and coma in critically ill patients (Hope-ICU): a randomised, doubleblind, placebo-controlled trial
- to receive haloperidol 2 5 mg or 0 9% saline placebo intravenously every 8 h

- Patients in the haloperidol group spent about the same number of days alive, without delirium, and without coma as did patients in the placebo group
- These results do not support the hypothesis that haloperidol modifies duration of delirium in critically ill patients

The HARPOON study

 Efficacy and safety of haloperidol prophylaxis for delirium prevention in older medical and surgical at-risk patients acutely admitted to hospital through the emergency department

Preventing delirium through management of sedatives

Dexmedetomidine vs Midazolam for Sedation of Critically III Patients A Randomized Trial

JAMA. 2009;301(5):489-499

Choice of Sedation

Figure 2. Daily Prevalence of Delirium Among Intubated Intensive Care Unit Patients Treated With Dexmedetomidine vs Midazolam



Delirium was diagnosed using the Confusion Assessment Method for the Intensive Care Unit (CAM-ICU).²⁴ At baseline, 60.3% of dexmedetomidine-treated patients and 59.3% of midazolam-treated patients were CAM-ICU-positive (P=.82). The effect of dexmedetomidine treatment was significant in the generalized estimating equation²⁷ analysis, with a 24.9% decrease (95% confidence interval,16%-34%; P<.001) relative to mid-azolam treatment. Numbers differ from those for primary analysis because patients were extubated, discharged from the intensive care unit, or had missing delirium assessments.

JAMA. 2009;301(5):489-499

Preventing delirium through management of sedatives

 Benzodiazepine Versus Nonbenzodiazepine-Based Sedation for Mechanically Ventilated, Critically III Adults: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Trials



Critical care medicine, 2013 Sep;41(9 Suppl 1):S30-8

Benzodiazepine Versus Nonbenzodiazepine-Based Sedation

Compared to a benzodiazepine sedative strategy, a nonbenzodiazepine sedative strategy was associated with

- a shorter ICU length of stay (n = 6 studies; difference = 1.62 d; 95% CI, 0.68–2.55; p = 0.0007)
- duration of mechanical ventilation (n = 4 studies; difference = 1.9 d; 95% CI, 1.70–2.09; p < 0.00001)

But

 a similar prevalence of delirium (n = 2; risk ratio = 0.83; 95% Cl, 0.61–1.11; p = 0.19)

Critical care medicine, 2013 Sep;41(9 Suppl 1):S30-8
Alpha-2 agonists for long-term sedation during mechanical ventilation in critically ill patients

- Seven studies, covering 1624 participants, compared dexmedetomidine with traditional sedatives
- reduced the mean duration of mechanical ventilation by 22% (95% CI 10% to 33%; four studies, 1120 participants, low quality evidence)
- the length of stay in the intensive care unit (ICU) by 14% (95% CI 1% to 24%; five studies, 1223 participants, very low quality evidence).
- no evidence that dexmedetomidine decreased the risk of delirium (RR 0.85; 95% CI 0.63 to 1.14; seven studies, 1624 participants, very low quality evidence)

Preventing delirium through pain management

 ICU patients who were assessed for pain were less likely to receive sedatives, particularly deliriogenic benzodiazepines, and more likely to receive analgesic medications (non-opioids or opioids) than those who never had a pain assessment

Delirium prevention

- Early mobilization of adult ICU patients whenever feasible to reduce the incidence and duration of delirium.
- no recommendation for using a pharmacologic delirium prevention protocol in adult ICU patients, as no compelling data demonstrate that this reduces the incidence or duration of delirium in these patients.
- Haloperidol or atypical antipsychotics administration is not recommended to prevent delirium in adult ICU patients.
- We provide no recommendation for the use of dexmedetomidine to prevent delirium in adult ICU patients, as there is no compelling evidence regarding its effectiveness in these patients.

Treatment

- Nonpharmacological and pharmacological therapy.
- the therapy of potential underlying cause, that is, medical conditions that promote delirium should be evaluated and treated.
- The nonpharmacological treatment strategy is in large part similar to the prevention strategies.

 The question how to treat delirium correctly is not easily answered, because there has been no conclusive evidence from a multitude of surveys

Current Opinion in Critical Care 2011, 17:131–140

- In the previous version of these guidelines, the recommended use of haloperidol for the treatment of delirium was a Level C recommendation based only on a case series. These data did not meet the evidence standard for this version of the guidelines.
- No recent prospective trials have verified the safety and efficacy of haloperidol for the treatment of delirium in adult ICU patients. Data on the use of other antipsychotics in this patient population are similarly sparse.
- Robust data on haloperidol in non-ICU patients that could potentially be applied to the ICU patient population are lacking

Crit Care Med 2013; 41:263–306

- Haloperidol, risperidone, olanzapine and aripiprazole in the management of delirium: A comparison of efficacy, safety, and side effects
- were equally effective in the management of delirium; however, they differed in terms of their side-effect

- The atypical antipsychotics are attractive alternatives to haloperidol with improved safety profiles but are flawed by limited data to support dosing and efficacy
- Future studies that provide large, prospective, double-blinded, placebo-controlled data to support the implementation of these agents as standard therapy over haloperidol are needed

Journal of Intensive Care Medicine 2012 Nov Dec 27(6) 354-361

- Rapidity of onset Haloperidol_has an onset of action 15 to 20 minutes after intravenous infusion.
- Duration of effect it's duration of effect varies and depends upon the cumulative dose.
- Dosage regimens The administration of haloperidol intravenously is common, but it has not been approved by the United States' Food and Drug Administration (FDA).
- 2 to 10 mg intravenous bolus doses administered every 20 to 30 minutes until calm is achieved

Take home message

- Identifying patients with high risk factors
- Frequent formal assessment for delirium
- Assess for pain at frequent intervals
- Sticking to a bundled approach for delirium prevention
- Haloperidol prophylaxis in patients with high risk
- Non pharmacological treatment of delirium