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PROCEEDINGS  
(8:03 a.m.)

Welcome and Introductions

DR. DWORKIN: Good morning. I'm Bob Dworkin, and I'll give you a very, very few minutes introduction to what ACTTION is. ACTTION is a public-private partnership that was established by the FDA in 2010. They're not here. I don't see them.

The people who were incredibly instrumental in getting this going and continuing it were Bob Rappaport, who's now retired from the FDA, and currently Sharon Hertz, the director of the Division of Anesthesia, Analgesia, and Addiction Products, and Allison Lin, who I think will be here later today. And lots of other people from the FDA have been involved in supporting and helping out with ACTTION since 2010.

So what is ACTTION? It's a public-private partnership. The FDA, its notion of public-private partnerships is to get everybody working together to accomplish something. So the initial mission of ACTTION was to -- and I'm not going to get this right. But the essence of the initial mission of ACTTION was to figure out how to accelerate the development of improved treatments for acute and chronic pain, improved being either better efficacy, or better safety, or both within a couple of years.

Within a couple of years, I think around the 2012-2013 time frame options, ACTTION's scope has expanded to include three additional therapeutic areas: sedation, addiction medicine, and peripheral neuropathy. So since about 2012, ACTTION has tried to figure out, as a public-private partnership, how do we accelerate the development of improved treatments and interventions across those four different therapeutic areas.

I haven't figured out how to kind of analyze this in a quantitative way, but my gut feeling is about 40 to 50 percent of ACTTION's activities now are pain, and the other three areas of addiction, medicine, sedation and peripheral neuropathy are split equally with the remaining 50 to 60 percent.

In the FDA's view, a public-private partnership brings together all the relevant stakeholders, and ACTTION I think has been quite successful in involving individuals from professional societies. For example, Denham was the ASA's first representative to the ACTTION executive committee. Jim Eisenach, who many of you know, is the current ASA representative to the ACTTION executive committee.

We have participation of multiple professional societies, academic investigators from around the world, and patient advocacy groups; pharmaceutical and device companies provide support and of course government agencies, not only the FDA, but NIH, CDC, and occasionally DEA. And we do our very best to get international participation, specifically from the EMA, but also from other European initiatives.

The mission has remained the same, so with respect to the mission, I think our focus across the four different therapeutic areas of pain, sedation, addiction, and peripheral neuropathy has really been clinical trials. How can we optimize and improve the design of randomized clinical trials across those different areas of medicine? How can we optimize the design, the outcome measures used, the statistical approaches to analysis, and make sure that the data are interpreted correctly? That's not the entirety of what ACTTION has done, but the bulk has really focused on clinical trials and improving their design and execution and analysis.

The other thing I should say before I end is we've also done our very best -- and we think this is incredibly important -- to encourage the participation of junior investigators whenever possible and in any way possible. We provide support every year for a 4-day pain school that's held outside of Montreal, Canada, where 30 trainees, both basic and clinical, spend 4 days learning about how to do pain research.

We're doing the same thing this summer with a preclinical boot camp in Dallas, Texas. With...
1 respect to initiatives like this meeting, and
2 publications, and systematic reviews, we do our
3 best to get junior investigators involved. So if
4 you have a junior colleague who would like to get
5 involved in any of ACTTION's activities, please,
6 please just have them shoot me an email, and we'll
7 figure out a way to plug them into something that
8 they would be interested in.
9 I think I've said everything. I'm looking
10 at my notes, two other things. Just in terms of
11 funding, ACTTION has been financially supported by
12 a series of grants and contracts from FDA. We've
13 had two contracts and two 5-year cooperative
14 agreement research grants.
15 As I said, we also get support from
16 pharmaceutical and device companies. We've had a
17 little bit of philanthropy, not much philanthropy
18 but some, and even less royalties. But the bulk of
19 the funding is really industry support and FDA
20 support, and we've just actually submitted another
21 contract application to FDA.
22 Finally, this is the first time I'm saying
23 this publicly, so it pleases me to be able to say
24 that last week, ACTTION got its 100th publication
25 accepted for publication, so we're really proud of
26 the milestone.
27 (Applause.)
28 DR. DWORIN: Thanks very much. We're
29 really proud of the milestone of having published a
30 hundred articles since ACTTION was launched by the
31 FDA in 2010.
32 Before I sit down and shut up, any questions
33 about ACTTION?
34 (No response.)
35 DR. DWORIN: Okay. The only other thing to
36 say is it's ACTTION with 2 T's, and our website is
37 action.org, and there's a whole lot of information
38 on the website. Thanks very much.
39 DR. WARD: Thanks, Bob.
40 A nice introduction to what ACTTION is and
41 what we're trying to do. I got involved with it
42 when I was his department chair when he came to me
43 and said I want to put in this thing to the FDA to
44 get some money. And I said, "That's a great idea
45 if you want to get money." But then I got more
46 involved with it when it expanded to sedation.
47 I think maybe we'll start out -- after the
48 cocktails at dinner last night, it sounds like
49 everybody knows everybody, but I don't think that's
50 quite true. So maybe let's start with Rick Riker
51 and go around and introduce yourselves. There is a
52 list of all our participants and I guess any other
53 comments that you want to make.
54 DR. RIKER: Rich Riker, clinical and
55 neurocritical care at Maine Medical Center in
56 Portland. What a tremendous group we have here.
57 So thanks. I'm glad to be here for sure, from the
58 same Maine Medical Center and our clinical
59 pharmacists, and honored to be here.
60 DR. FRASER: Gilles Fraser from the same,
61 Maine Medical Center. I'm a clinical pharmacist
62 and honored to be here.
63 DR. WARD: David?
64 DR. GOZAL: David Gozal. I'm from
65 Jerusalem, Israel. I run the sedation service at
66 Hadassah University Hospital.
67 DR. SESSLER: Dan Sessler, Cleveland Clinic.
68 I'm a trialist.
69 DR. FLOOD: Pamela Flood. I'm from
70 Stanford. I do anesthesia and pain medicine, and
71 I'm also a grateful former ICU patient.
72 DR. SHAFER: Steve Shafer from Stanford
73 University.
74 DR. VAN CLIEF: I'm Martha Van Clief. I'm
75 at the Food and Drug Administration.
76 DR. BAZINI: Alla Bazini, also FDA.
77 DR. EGAN: Talmage Egan from Salt Lake City,
78 University of Utah.
79 DR. BALAS: Michele Balas from The Ohio
80 State University, College of Nursing.
81 DR. DEVLIN: John Devlin. I'm a critical
82 care pharmacist from Northeastern and Tufts Medical
83 Center.
84 DR. ABSALOM: Good morning. I'm Tony
85 Absalom. I'm an anesthesiologist from Groningen in
86 the Netherlands.
87 DR. MAZE: Mervyn Maze, UCSF,
88 anesthesiologist.
1 DR. SUN: Lena Sun, pediatric anesthesiologist and SmartTots. I'm at Columbia University.
2 DR. EGEROD: Good morning. Ingrid Egerod, I'm a professor of nursing at the University of Copenhagen.
3 DR. BROWN: David Brown, and I'm here representing ICU patients, and I'm a recovering academic.
4 (Laughter.)
5 DR. AITKEN: Leanne Aitken. I'm a professor of critical care at City University in London, and I do also have an appointment still in Australia at Griffith University.
6 DR. NEEDHAM: I'm Dale Needham. I'm a professor of pulmonary critical care at Johns Hopkins and then outcomes research and work in the medical intensive care unit.
7 DR. COLANTUONI: Elizabeth Colantuoni, biostatistician at Johns Hopkins.
8 DR. DEXTER: Frank Dexter, University of Iowa. I do economic studies, managerial epidemiology studies.
9 DR. COURSIN: I'm Doug Coursin. I'm an internist/anesthesiologist/intensivist at the University of Wisconsin. I'm looking forward to the polar vortex leaving town so I can get my kayak and water. Thank you.
10 (Laughter.)
11 DR. TUNG: Avery Tung, anesthesiologist/intensivist from University of Chicago.
12 DR. SPIES: Claudia Spies, anesthesiologist/intensivist from Berlin.
13 DR. BURRY: Lisa Burry, ICU pharmacists at University of Toronto and Mount Sinai.
14 DR. SKROBIK: My name is Yoanna Skrobik. I'm from Montreal. I'm an intensivist and recently a pharmacology degree.
15 DR. SHEHABI: Good morning. I'm Yahya Shehabi from Monash University. I'm a critical care physician and an intensivist, and I'm sorry I missed the dinner last night.
16 DR. DWORKIN: Bob Dworkin.
17 DR. TANG: Wing Yu Tang, Pfizer. I'm the health economics and outcomes research lead for our targeted hospital grants.
18 DR. PANDHARIPANDE: Pratik Pandharipande, anesthesia and critical care from Vanderbilt University Medical Center.
19 DR. HOPKINS: Mona Hopkins, professor of psychology and neuroscience at Brigham Young University and an outcomes researcher at Intermountain Medical Center.
20 DR. GIRARD: Tim Girard. I'm an intensivist at the University of Pittsburgh.
21 DR. KRESS: JP Kress. I'm pulmonary and critical care at the University of Chicago.
22 DR. URMAN: Rich Urman, anesthesiologist, Brigham and Women's Hospital in Boston.
23 Presentation - Denham Ward
24 DR. WARD: Great. Thank you. Just as a little introduction, what we're going to try to do in the next couple of days, we've got a great group of people with a variety of interests, outcomes, statistics, critical care, pharmacology, and at least three continents that I heard. So I think we've got a group that should give us an interesting discussion. We all know about how a new compound makes it to be used in our intensive care units, from discovery of the compound, through FDA approval, and post-clinical trials. What we're interested in this meeting is the phase 1 to 3 clinical trials. The past meetings have discussed that aspect of it. As mostly phase 3, but as JP actually wrote it in a prospective, there seems to be a little lack of high-quality phase 1 and 2 trials occasionally before we end up with a phase 3 clinical trial. It's not just a new compound. I think we're also discussing possible devices with possible protocols, anything that would change our practice in the ICU; what's the evidence that we need to generate in order to change that practice so we all believe it? There are a lot of perspectives to this. What we want to try to do at this meeting is take
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1 as many of the perspectives as we can. Obviously,
2 a clinical trial design is just at the early end of
3 this, and you still need good clinical practices to
4 collect the data, and you have to have the right
5 outcome measures. But it's different whether
6 you're sitting at the FDA, you're a practicing
7 physician, you're in pharma, or even more
8 importantly, you're a patient in the public and
9 what's your interest in the right kind of
treatments when you're unfortunately a patient in
11 the ICU.
12 So SCEPTER, as Bob alluded to, has been a
13 sub-consortium in ACTTION. If you ever need an
14 acronym developed, I know who you need to go to.
15 In these days, it's very important -- as we'll
16 see, most of the ICU clinical trials have acronyms,
17 and if you get stumped, please email Bob. He will
18 definitely easily come up with an acronym for you.
19 Bob came up with this acronym for us, Sedation
20 Consortium on Endpoints and Procedures for
21 Treatment, Education, and Research.
22 We've done a little bit already. This is

1 first one was efficacy. We didn't get an editorial
2 for part 2, but it was selected as the article of
3 the month. So we moved from a critical editorial
4 to a complimentary article of the month selection
5 for our two papers.
6 In the first two meetings -- and I want to
7 suggest we think of something similar for this
8 meeting -- we took the IOM reports that talked
9 about the healthcare quality domains: safe,
t10 timely, patient-centered, effective, efficient, and
t11 equitable.
12 We decided for procedural sedation that
equitable and timely weren't necessarily important
13 areas, so it shouldn't be any issues about either
14 of those for procedural sedation, but the other
15 four were important, to be safe, patient-centered,
e16 and effective. And efficient was perhaps a little
17 less so, and we didn't address efficiency quite as
e18 much. That may be more important in ICU sedation.
19 Patient centered is both patient and
c10 clinician centered, and there is overlap. This was
c20 a slide we used for the SCEPTER I and II meetings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 21</th>
<th>Page 23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 There are things that the patient is very interested in. These pretty much apply to the ICU sedation also, things that the clinicians are interested in, and a lot of overlap. So when we say patient centered, it has to be patient centered, and it also needs to be centered about what the clinician needs, but the clinician side is the efficacy and efficiency side. ICU sedation is complex. I'm not an intensivist. I'm an anesthesiologist, respiratory, physiologist, clinical trialist mainly in phase 1 type clinical trials. But I've learned a lot in last I guess almost 9 months in organizing this meeting, and I've done a tremendous amount of reading and a few emails from new and old friends to help me figure out what's going on. This review paper by Reade in the New England Journal back in 2014 had a diagram that I couldn't resist putting up on how complex ICU sedation is. One point I want to make is pain and agitation, unpleasant awareness, is the important pieces that analgesia and sedation is trying to accomplish in the ICU. We've had a lot of discussions before the meeting about delirium. For the purpose of this meeting, delirium is truly an important outcome, but it's not something that we're really going to have to be able to discuss about treatments for delirium, per se, either preventive or treating once it's right. But clearly it's a piece of the important employment outcome of ICU sedation and analgesia. We didn't do a systematic review before this meeting like we did on SCEPTER I and II, and that was because my friends said, well, we've really already done that, and this was last fall, saying the paper's going to come out; it's going to come out soon. And in fact it did. It came out last last fall. So the PADIS guidelines published in 2018 really provides a lot of the details and systematic review that we perhaps would have done prior to this meeting if we hadn't been so lucky for the PADIS guidelines to come out, and we're fortunate that many of the authors of these guidelines are here with us today. That's what we'll start out with, with our first panel being, really, a discussion of what PADIS found that perhaps could be improved methodologically and why there are things that PADIS recommendations couldn't have been made because there wasn't methodologically adequate studies to provide the evidence. Housekeeping, Valorie, who you all met at the front desk, is standing and can wave back there. If you need anything, she'll fix it for you. By the way, the places at your desk, a red light goes on if you start talking. This meeting is being recorded and transcribed, so when you make a comment, please talk into the microphone. Make sure the light comes on so we can get the recording. Speak clearly and, please, every time you make a comment, please say your name. By the end of the meeting if you don't know who you are already, we will know who you are by the end of meeting, but the transcriptionist doesn't. And when I go back and read the transcript, it's nice to know who it was that made that comment, so please say your name before you make your comment. I guess it goes without saying that this is being recorded and transcribed, so you may want to be careful what you say. In fact, Bob, do we put it up on the Web? DR. DWORKIN: Yes. DR. WARD: Yes. So it will actually be put up on the website for the public. It's actually buried a little bit, so it's not easy to find, but it is on the ACTTION website. So you may want to be a little careful if you don't want your comments put out there for everybody to find on the internet, anyway. Please sign in daily at the registration. These are Val's things. Obviously, silence your cell phones. It's being audiotaped; directly in the microphone. Restrooms are outside to the left. WiFi, select the Western meeting rooms on your browser, and ACTTION with 2 T's is the access code.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 Lunch and dinner is upstairs where we had dinner last night in the Mayfair Court. Our breaks will be done right here.
2 Any questions, comments, concerns what we're going to try to accomplish in the next two days?
3 (No response.) DR. WARD: Okay. Nobody's had enough coffee yet.
4 Our first panel, Doug is going to moderate, and John and Yoanna are going to review where we are at this point from what PADIS came up with to get us started as the background.
5 Presentation - Douglas Coursin
6 DR. COURSIN: Good morning. I'm Doug Coursin, for the record. I'm taking my blazer off for my friends from Vanderbilt, but I do have a tie. I wasn't sure as a moderator what the role really was. I also wasn't sure if I was allowed to have slides. And I figured by the end of this we might be PowerPointed to death, so I was going to take a shot at doing it without slides.
7 A discussion moderator is a person whose role is to act as a neutral participant in the discussion. I have no biases, nobody's paying me to be here, know nothing as Alfred E. Neuman once said. But I try to hold the participants to a time limit and try to keep them from straying off the topic of the questions being raised.
8 Fortunately today, we have two of the world's experts in sedation and a host of other ICU related issues. They have significant experience in study design, reporting studies, guideline development, and publications in this area, and I will introduce them in a minute.
9 This is a broad area. And just to provide a little historical perspective, we live in the ongoing tsunami of guidelines. There was a guideline how to get here today, how to get on the metro, and how to get into the hotel. And we often encounter competing guidelines.
10 These guidelines were developed initially in 2002, and there are two survivors of the three generations. I'd like to recognize my good friends from Portland, from Maine Medical Center, Rich Riker and Gilles Fraser, who managed to give birth and participate strongly in all three generations.
11 In the late '90s, early 2000, the first generation was pulled together with a collection of experts, and the focus was purely on sedation and analgesia. Like so many other guidelines, I think ACLS is the best of all of them. I expect in another generation or two, they'll cover all of critical care. But in the case of the sedation analgesia ones, the whole area of delirium, altered mental status in our critically ill adults became an additional focus.
12 One of the buzzwords, which I think really is the core to what we're going to talk about here today and tomorrow, is patient comfort and safety, because I find when I participated, they jettisoned me after the second generation; probably a good move. I'd either lost so much hair and my beard turned so gray that I just couldn't stand up to the pressure. As they expanded things, they began to look more at the spectrum of what we do with our critical care patients and what the critical care patient brings to us with their comorbidity, their mental status to start with, and the like. In the third generation, they expanded from the SAD guidelines -- sedation, analgesia, and delirium -- to the PADIS guidelines, and to this they added in immobility.
13 I think the elegant work that Mona and others have done and the Australians have done, they're encouraging us to get people the heck out of bed and get people to maintain at least their musculoskeletal function as best they can and maintain their respiratory function as well, but also I think moving the clavicles up for us to more aggressively address our cognitive function in the intensive care unit.
14 With that, they added the "S" to the PADIS, and that is sleep, which is a whole other topic to discuss, an incredibly complex topic, and I don't think is going to be a particular focus of the group here.
15 So I just wanted to provide, the first
guidelines came out in 2002. The next gestation was incredibly prolonged and painful. It came out in 2013. John and Yoanna did a spectacular job in herding an incredible cross section of cats to produce an expanded deeper guideline.

Each of the generations, in the first one, we didn't have anything like Cochrane analysis or grade, or PICO, which I think Yoanna and John will talk about. That came out in the second generation. That allowed us to focus and that facilitated trying to come up with evidence-based guidelines.

The problem with all of that has been where's the evidence? Show me data. Not the money, but show me the data, and show me the data in my patients, whether it's in Portland, at Tufts, or across the border with our friends in Montreal and elsewhere, what is the data? And what's your population like in it at all? Medical ICU, or adult surgical ICU, or God forbid, it's a subspecialty ICU.

Critical care is becoming more diffused. It's, unfortunately, in my humble opinion, likely, if we're not careful, to be more siloed. We're likely to have the CT surgical group, and the neurosciences group, and the widget group over here. We really need to work within that context because my drug that I advocate for may be totally reasonable in my population but not yours.

I think another thing that we have to take into account as we look here is that most of the drugs, save one that Mervyn and others developed, was never developed for the ICU. It was imported from someplace else. And I think from a development viewpoint, if I was a pharmaceutical executive, what would be my motivation to develop an ICU drug?

So I think the things that Yoanna and John can also point out to us is how they came about to come up with a host of recommendations but they really nicely identify what are our gaps in knowledge, and they are not insignificant. I think as we come out of a meeting and a lively discussion like this, that's really something we want to focus on as we try to move ahead and the future studies with the expertise of methodologists, biostatisticians, and of course clinical experts across the spectrum from physicians, nursing, pharmacists, physical therapy related individuals. Critical care for those who don't practice, it is a team sport, and there's good data that as a team sport we do well if we have team leaders and team expertise. But most importantly, we do our best work when we have good communication.

So just in closing, I'd raised the following questions that I hope we can address at this meeting, if I can find where I listed them. What do we want from the medications and non-pharmacological interventions and protocols that we generate? What properties would the ideal agent, or agents -- if they're going to be pharmacologically mediated or non-pharmacologic approaches, what would they look like? What would they give us? What's likely the best way to get at developing something new or taking what we already have and identifying the right patient, the right intervention, and the right outcome? With that, I'll close, try to maintain my neutrality, and turn to the experts. Our experts today, Yoanna Skrobik from McGill in Montreal. She has so many titles and degrees I can't go into all
of them. At some level, She's a molecular
genomicist. She's an intensive care physician.
She's becoming increasingly an addiction
specialist, which I think is very germane to our
practice in the ICU considering the average ICU
patient is receiving what, Gilles? Would you say
10 to 14 medications a day?
DR. FRASER: That's the bottom.
DR. COURSIN: Many of them as continuous
infusions; many of them with very under-recognized
central nervous system effects, and I think we need
to keep that into account.
Our other expert -- and they were the
co-authors, and John was really the driving force
in this and had agreed, last night I heard, to do
the next generation. Thank you very much, John.
(Laughter.)
DR. COURSIN: On behalf of the board of
directors of SCCM, we thank you. John is a
professor at Northeastern and a professor at Tufts
Medical School and brings a wealth of knowledge.
Yoanna, I think you have slides for us.

DR. MAZE: Can I just ask a question of you,
Doug?
DR. COURSIN: Yes.
DR. MAZE: As an interloper who hasn't been
involved in either the previous iterations, I'd
like to understand how you went from SAD, to PAD,
to PADIS, because I think that is clearly not the
end of the acronym.
DR. COURSIN: Rig
DR. MAZE: And I say that because if you now
have, as you've identified, a post-injury
condition, surely there's something you've missed
doing or not doing in that critical care period.
DR. COURSIN: Mervyn, I think you've hit a
nail right on the head, and I'll have the other
speak to this more eloquently than I can. But SAD,
I think the beginning, which was sedation and
analgesia, and they tweak out from that the use of
paralytic agents, neuromuscular blockers.
There's a whole guideline on this, and I
think Gilles and John and others from the PharmD
world would agree that the use of the paralytic
agents in the ICU has gone like this [gestures]
over the ensuing two decades, unless you're
occasionally using something like cisatracurium,
therapeutically, not just to paralyze patients,
with really severe ARDS.
So they started I think with a very specific
focus, and I think we had a naive -- Gilles and I
were heavily involved in that first iteration with
Judy Jacoby, a former president of SCCM and a very
gifted PharmD. Our focus was, well, we came from
an era where everybody got high-dose morphine,
high-dose valium, and high-dose vecuronium.
Probably 10 to 20 percent of our patients
back in the '90s were being paralyzed, so everybody
worried what could be worse than paralyzed and not
adequately analgesed [ph] and sedated, and we began
to see a lot of very strange things occur. We have
of course all the issue with tolerance to the
morphine. You give a big slug of valium. You give
valium or lorazepam as an infusion. It's dissolved
propylene glycol. You have issues with renal
dysfunction, metabolic acidosis, and then you have
drugs that have extremely long either lives or very
active metabolites.
Then you look at vecuronium and you look at
the world that we lived in at that time with renal
dysfunction with a drug that has 3 active
metabolites that are renally excreted. So we
started to see these very weird post-paralysis
myopathies, any one of the number of things.
We also got lot smarter in the way we
ventilated people, and we woke up to the fact that
maybe it wasn't such a good thing to have people
just flat in bed, stone cold, not moving. We very
simply moved to one of the key bundled pattern
things, which is unless you can't do your patient
care at least at 30, so you limit the aspects of
aspiration pneumonia. You limit the development of
ventilator-associated or hospital-acquired
infections.
So I think the first charge, what we very
simply thought -- and correct me if I'm wrong,
Gilles or Rick, we thought, well, let's get a
handle on sedation analgesia. Let's come up with
1 some recommendations. Propofol was just coming into its own. Etomidate had fallen off the map because of its issues that you and others looked at with adrenal steroidogenesis.

2 We now have a short-acting benzo that, quote/unquote, "did not have active metabolites," which is not true, and those active metabolites were never going to be a problem when, one, hydroxy midazolam actually can accumulate. But we were used to giving midazolam in the operating room as a pre-med, a couple of milligrams or in the endoscopy suite and get on your way home after your colonoscopy. We were given 10, to 20, to 30 milligrams an hour of midazolam, not for an hour or two, but for days.

3 Our length this day over the last 20 years has gone like this [gestures]. Our length of stay in a major medical center is under 4 days. Now, that doesn't mean that you're not critically ill when you go out the door, buy you may go out the door with a trache in place that we percutaneously put in, and you're either going to go upstairs to our intermediate care unit where you can be ventilated on a trache, or you're going a mile away to our LTAC, long-term acute care hospital. So I think what people saw then, I think Pratik, and Tim, and Wes Ely and others, Yoanna, folks from Britain and the continent, started to point out that people had really strange recoveries when it came to delirium and cognitive function. I think it started to come out that delirium wasn't just me up here acting out or going into withdrawal, but that it was a hypoactive delirium, that this was very common, that we were under-recognizing it.

4 Just editorially, I have good opinions that tell me we grossly under-recognize pain in the ICU. We also grossly under-recognize what the patients and the families perceive of things and how their needs to communicate may have changed.

5 So I think what happened in the second generation, two big things. One was people became aware that delirium and post-op cognitive dysfunction was a major issue potentially in the ICU. What was the role of sedative and analgesics, either inappropriate utilization of them or prolonged utilization, or any one of a number of factors, in playing a role in delirium.

6 I think one of the things you are expert in and I know very interested in is what about all the other things that have gone on, comorbidities, inflammatory processes, surgical procedural intervention, that in and of themselves may create a delirium situation or a post-ICU cognitive dysfunction.

7 DR. DEVLIN: I didn't mean to interrupt. I was just going to add a couple of thoughts, too. Sorry.

8 DR. COURSIN: A couple of what?

9 DR. DEVLIN: I was just going to add a couple of thoughts additionally.

10 DR. COURSIN: No, please interrupt if you --

11 DR. DEVLIN: No, no. I didn't mean to interrupt. Sorry.

12 DR. COURSIN: Okay.

13 DR. DEVLIN: I think the other thing with guidelines, that we firmly believe it's an instrument for change, right? We want to be making change at the bedside for all these things, and they're so interchangeable that we felt, when we went to the Board of Regents at SCC and to propose this plan for having five sections, including a large immobility section and a sleep section is, again, the interchangeability in clinicians at the bedside don't necessarily put them into these particular buckets: why is the patient awake at night; why do they have the ICU cardiac weakness, et cetera?

14 The other thing that really came out from PAD 2013 was we had questions not necessarily focused on immobility, but Gilles and I worked on the part where we were looking at ways to reduce delirium, and of course JP Kress' landmark study had come out in terms of early mobility, and we put that in the context of the guidelines as a way to reduce delirium. But obviously the far bigger question is we need to really tackle this...
1 immobility thing.
2 So obviously with Bill Needham's leadership
3 and many others, that's why that's all included,
4 and we felt if we don't do this, these are bedside
5 patient-derived issues. Again, the PADIS
6 guidelines are all focused on patient symptoms.
7 That's what PADIS stands for.
8 We thought if we didn't bring that context
9 in here, even though realizing -- for example, with
10 sleep, that there's just so little data and such a
11 complex area, that if we didn't start to define
12 that, and point out gaps, and drive people forward,
13 at least it's going to help clinicians think about
14 these things and what they should or should not do.
15 Sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt, but
16 those are just some important --
17 DR. COURSIN: No problem.
18 DR. DEVLIN: -- that sort of came along.
19 DR. COURSIN: Just for Denham's benefit,
20 that was Mervyn Maze asking us about other areas
21 and how this expanded, and John Devlin weighing in.
22 DR. WARD: I can recognize Mervyn's voice.

1 think that has some unintended consequences
2 regarding either people's development of protocols
3 or people's interpretation of the guidelines,
4 particularly when John and Yoanna spent so much
5 time with the collective group trying to say what
6 is the basis of the guideline and what is the
7 quality of data from this guideline, and how should
8 we interpret that?
9 As you look through their pages of
10 discussion on these, there aren't a lot of really
11 high-grade 1A recommendations, and I'm interested
12 in my own community to see how relatively
13 conditional low or very low database guidelines,
14 how they're applied in my institution. In very
15 short order, in the world of protocolization, they
16 get chiseled in stone, so as an outgrowth
17 additionally of the PADIS guidelines, SCCM has put
18 together A, B, C, D, E, F of a bundled guideline
19 approach or extrapolation from guidelines, and I'm
20 really interested to see what comes next, E, F, G,
21 H. I'm trying to think of things for X.
22 DR. SKROBIK: I'd like to say, Doug, we've

1 DR. COURSIN: Okay. Excellent.
2 (Laughter.)
3 DR. COURSIN: But I think one additional
4 piece to the development of both SAD guidelines and
5 then the PADIS guidelines was that they began to
6 bring in a way to try to come to a collective
7 recommendation and a quality of that recommendation
8 to answer very focused questions that had not been
9 undertaken in the first one. That's a very
10 interesting process. The panelists will address
11 both the PICO approach and the use of grade because
12 it's not as if there aren't issues with that or
13 controversies.
14 There's always the age-old issue in any of
15 these of getting a collection of experts together
16 and having the wallflower up against a strong
17 personality or the aspect of we really don't have
18 much data, but our constituency wants a
19 recommendation.
20 I think one of the final things I'd comment
21 on is I'm quite interested as an observer to see
22 how these guidelines are actually applied, and I

1 infiltrated them.
2 DR. COURSIN: Okay. Excellent. So we'll go
3 from there.
4 Yoanna, I believe has some slides and
5 overview and discussion, and I appreciate people's
6 questions, and hopefully we can provide some useful
7 information. Yoanna?
8 Presentation - Yoanna Skrobik
9 DR. SKROBIK: Thank you. My name is Yoanna
10 Skrobik. I have the privilege of having been
11 invited to vice chair the PADIS guidelines with
12 John. It's daunting to stand in a room of people
13 this smart, and it's daunting to summarize, in what
14 I think is a short period of time, what I would
15 like to be a summary of what we did in the
16 guidelines and an invitation to come up with an
17 actionable methodology, or two, to invite the next
18 generation to do better or to do differently.
19 So I would like to invite all of you who are
20 doing something else to set that aside for maybe 15
21 minutes and listen to the content of what we did,
22 in summary, but more and more in the discussions
that we've had, what we didn't do, and try and
perhaps come up with one or two suggestions of your
own so that when we come together into these
groups, rather than have a speaker and content, to
open up the discussion.

We are not just privileged speakers. There
are a lot of smart people here. As I was coming up
to this magnolia flower-filled neighborhood, I was
thinking about the privilege of what money buys and
how lucky we are to have the partnership that was
set up by Dr. Denham and others to think; the
luxury of being able to step back.

So I hope to be able to honor the people in
this room and the process by at least helping with
one or two deliverables, and considering how many
ideas I have in my head and how chatty I am, it is
going to be a challenge. So what I would like to
do is summarize very briefly what we did and
highlight what we're proud of.

When we brought it rehabilitation, the
reason that John said GP's important work, some of
us had small children also, so we thought if you
move people, they're going to be more relaxed, and
then they're going to sleep better at night. It's
artificial to dissociate sedation and sleep. We
said we wouldn't address sleep today, but you all
know that in the clinical environment, one of the
most important reasons to administer sedatives is
sleep.

So all of those topics, as Dr. Maze said,
our confluent, and as Dr. Egerod softly pointed out
to me last night, it's not perfect, and there's
some uncertainty.

I think we were delighted to have patients
both as collaborators and co-authors because we
learned so much, and we brought in experts from
Europe and Australia to a traditionally American
bastion. Dale sweetly pointed out that we had not
included other continents, but I think that it was
something to be proud of that we had at least
broadened it a little.

We were particularly also proud of saying
not only what is but what isn't, and saying why it
isn't, because we thought that was really

important. So it's the first guideline to do that
within the SCCM. In the supplemental material, we
hid in the 84 pages of the online supplement, we
also published how people voted on each of the
recommendations. We snuck comments into the grid
because we thought it was really important to not
be proscriptive, and if we were going to consider
the reality of contextual and clinical variability,
it's not true that there's always one right thing
with a capital R and capital T.

So those were our attempts to do better. We
also came up with some new questions. What I
wanted to stay in the retrospective after all that
work, we realized that we had gone over some of the
topics anew, and some we had not, and I'll give an
example of that over the next slides; 37
recommendations. It was 2 ungraded practice
statements and 32 ungraded statements, and I'll
speak to that very briefly.

We use the grade method for ranking data,
and therefore favored RCTs. We did not consider
qualitative data. We didn't find a way to
| 1 | diversity. I want to acknowledge that without |
| 2 | John's rigor and enthusiasm, because I've always |
| 3 | wanted to have what he puts in his coffee in the |
| 4 | morning, we would not have had the performance |
| 5 | metrics that we had. |
| 6 | We delivered the guidelines on time and with |
| 7 | a hundred percent participation in each of the |
| 8 | recommendations regardless of whether people agreed |
| 9 | with them or not. And I think that is to the |
| 10 | creditor of our fearless leader. I think we also |
| 11 | honored the ICU survivors, and I'll never be sure |
| 12 | whether we did it enough, but we tried. |
| 13 | We used PICO questions for the |
| 14 | recommendations that we made, and I wanted to give |
| 15 | you two examples of how we did that are |
| 16 | relevant to the sedation issue, and then give you |
| 17 | one more recommendation to think about. |
| 18 | The pain assessment and management question, |
| 19 | should a protocol be used, was one of our PICO |
| 20 | questions. We said you have to differentiate |
| 21 | between analgesia first and analgesia-based |
| 22 | sedation, meaning you do your analgesia first and |

| 1 | then say, “Ooh, do you still need sedation?” We're |
| 2 | playing you soft music or rap music, if that's what |
| 3 | you prefer. We're massageing your feet. Do you |
| 4 | want a drug on top of that, versus using an |
| 5 | analgesic as a sedative. |
| 6 | When John and I were discussing this more |
| 7 | recently, we thought, well, that would be an |
| 8 | opiate, wouldn't it? Would we have phrased it the |
| 9 | same way now that opiates are front and center as |
| 10 | being potentially problematic and potentially |
| 11 | problematic in terms of their effectiveness as |
| 12 | analgesics. |
| 13 | So we then delivered improbably this good |
| 14 | practice statement that pain should be guided by a |
| 15 | routine pain assessment. I think it is actually |
| 16 | extraordinary that all we could do is come up with |
| 17 | a good practice statement because it would seem |
| 18 | humanistically that it doesn't make sense to do |
| 19 | anything else. |
| 20 | So you see where I'm highlighting all of the |
| 21 | caveats because if you use a framework that |
| 22 | requires RCTs, what kind of caregiver wouldn't want |

| 1 | to palliate pain? In fact, the data suggests that |
| 2 | not only don't we evaluate it very well, but we |
| 3 | don't manage it all that well. |
| 4 | So here we are talking about sedation and |
| 5 | analgesia for sedation, and maybe the analgesia |
| 6 | part and opiate part are not so straight forward as |
| 7 | we thought. So we suggested -- and this is the |
| 8 | content of the guideline -- that there be an |
| 9 | assessment driven and protocol based approach, but |
| 10 | we lumped analgesia and analgesia-based sedation. |
| 11 | The process that we used meant that all of |
| 12 | the patients ranked things according to priority, |
| 13 | so the pain part before giving sedation was hugely |
| 14 | important to patients, and I just want to highlight |
| 15 | that. If patients thought that that was so |
| 16 | important and we say we’re doing patient-centered |
| 17 | care, how are we going to incorporate that in what |
| 18 | recommendations actually say or don't say? Where |
| 19 | is the place for the patient's voice? |
| 20 | I’m switching gears now to the actual notion |
| 21 | of managing agitation and sedation. We've come to |
| 22 | understand -- thanks to the work of several people |

| 1 | in this room, probably the most |
| 2 | compellingly -- that sedatives are actually not |
| 3 | very good for you short term; not long term. We |
| 4 | have some notion that long term, they may increase |
| 5 | cognitive dysfunction, but how and so on. |
| 6 | We state in these guidelines that a specific |
| 7 | indication for giving sedatives is imperative. |
| 8 | Nobody asks the question. Your patient rolls in, |
| 9 | they get delivered a drug, but we stated that pain |
| 10 | should be addressed first and then sedatives should |
| 11 | be given; that there should be a reliable scale; |
| 12 | and that adverse events should be thought about. |
| 13 | In the gaps that we identified -- and this |
| 14 | list is very long -- pathophysiologic state, so |
| 15 | inflammatory states were blood-brain barrier |
| 16 | permeability may not be the same for drugs that are |
| 17 | potentially toxic like sedatives; reduce drug |
| 18 | clearance; PK/PD that have been studied extensively |
| 19 | in children but not in adults; drug-drug |
| 20 | interactions, which some of us have modestly been |
| 21 | interested in and every pharmacist knows about but |
| 22 | aren't necessarily integrated into how we practice; |
how individuals respond.

I think Pam Flood rattled me. She described the subjective sensation of getting dexmedetomidine versus propofol during one of the panel guideline meanings and described her husband's reaction to the two drug exposures. We had no room in our guidelines for integrating how you feel, so all of you who have taken an opiate, a sedative, know that different ones do different things to you. Where is that in the way that we practice, and does it really matter? Does how you feel about it matter at all?

Of course, genomic epigenomic factors are huge because we are starting to understand that they play a huge role in drug metabolism. All caveats that we listed with specific, we were not able to address or answer these questions. We looked at short-term outcomes in the 2013 guidelines. We tried to look at long-term outcomes in the 2018 guidelines to speak to Dr. Maze's question, and we hit the wall of the lack of information, and the lack of precision, and the lack of rigor of consistency across studies and how that was done.

We looked at all the topics in all the sections based on rank order. The experts said this is what we think is important, and then we handed it to the patients. So the order, for instance, for the pain section was dramatically altered by the patients; most of the others were not.

Here are the most important ones for the sedation group. Sedation and clinical outcomes was considered to be the highest ranking, and then the sequelae of lighter versus deeper sedation. I'll speak to the light versus deep sedation because it also highlights some of the questions.

We are looking at 15 years of literature. We were able to find 8 RCTs and 3 observational studies. So we're making recommendations for the universe based on a relatively small amount of data and end up saying we should be using lighter sedation versus deeper station, but we don't know what light means, and Pratik could talk about this for an hour and a half, I'm sure, if he was so inclined, but he's not.

How do you define where the harm line is? Is it an average, over 48 hours, or is it one moment where you're completely -- the anesthesiologists in this room will tell you that you get post-operative cognitive dysfunction. How is that different from the exposure of the sedatives or the opiates that we given in the intensive care unit where we give more drug longer than most places. How that changed over time and impacts people in the long term is also not clear, and how do we describe what happens to patients?

I was listening to Dr. Brown casually say describe the fallout from the intensive care experience that he had and that his family experienced. How do you measure it and how do you say that it matters?

Judy Davidson from the family-centered guidelines taught me that 25 percent of families from ICU survivors are not back at work 6 months later because they are too burdened by the caring and the psychological fallout of having had someone you love go be near death. How do you measure that economically? We're looking at hospitals costs. What about the impacts on society, and should that matter? So we didn't go there, and I think that there's the patient specific factors.

When we asked the specific questions, we said for medical and surgical ICU patients, so non-cardiac surgery patients specifically, should we use propofol or benzodiazepines, or dexmedetomidine versus benzodiazepines, or dexmedetomidine versus propofol? We sat and talked. They said, okay, so it's meaningful. What would make you choose one or the other? That was one of my favorite discussions.

What do you think? What does your nurse manager think? If you're occupying your bed for 4 more hours or 4 less hours, it doesn't change the nursing shift. And the definition that we came up with were an agreement between the patients and the clinicians saying if you lighten up in that much faster -- 4 hours faster is what we decided.
completely, and I think it was reasonable but we
made it up -- what do we think is a significant
shortening of extubation time?
The patient answers to this were the most
interesting man. They said, "Well, I don't really
care." So it highlighted that all of our metrics,
duration of mechanical ventilation, mortality, the
patient said, "Well, if I am better and I have to
spend one more night on the ventilator, then I
don't really care." I was thinking, "My God, and I
couldn't talk and express myself," so there you go.
So much for my understanding.
So the recommendation was that we use either
propofol or dexmedetomidine because benzodiazepines
had problems associated with them that are well
described. But we were not able to define what
long-term and patient-centered outcomes were, and
the meaning to survivors was something that we
couldn't quite put our finger on. We learned from
Pam and others that patient perceptions were
something that we were not able to methodologically
capture, and the pharmacology piece was hugely
missing.

Costs were the subject of huge discussions
also. Here we were with an Australian, or two, or
two, and Europeans, and Canadians, and the
Americans. I don't need to tell you that melatonin
costs a very different amount in each of these
places; that each of the drugs cost something
different in each of these places and how does that
compute into what you end up deciding.
I think Dale has also highlighted the Third
World's application of what we say. They're cost
limited in a way that we don't consider, and the
whole question of analgosedation and patient
subgroups. These were the gaps who identified for
the sedation choices.
I want to acknowledge all of the people who
made this possible. It was hard work, and when I
was on phone calls with a group beside my dying
father, there were times when I wondered what I was
doing there. My father was a man who liked things
that would be delivered so that they would serve to
build something else, and I think that all of the
people in the PAD guidelines who spent these five
years with us all had moments where they could have
and would have been doing something else and chose
to contribute.
So I would like to think that we can honor
this work and take it a step further, and I would
particularly like to thank the patients who were
not only part of it but engaged to the very
delivery of the manuscript and contributed to it
even more through that. Thank you.
(Applause.)
DR. SESSLER: Dan Sessler. Did you address
how to measure sedation?
DR. SKROBIK: Pratik, I don't know if you
would like to speak to that. We had addressed the
scales in the previous guidelines, so we had done
the psychometric qualities of the sedation
measurements. How to measure sedation is a wider
question then that. Pratik led the sedation group.
I don't know if --
DR. PANDHARIPANDE: Pratik Panharipande just
for the recording purposes. We did tackle it with
regards to the scales, and because there was no
difference between evidence between the 2013
guidelines and the 2018 guidelines, which
recommended using either the SAS or the RASS as the
two scales with the greatest psychometric
properties, we did not address that separately in
the 2018 guidelines because there was new evidence
to suggest anything should change with regards to
that.
The area that we tried to delve in deeper
was within the context of the scales, how do you
define light versus deep sedation? I'll touch on
some of that tomorrow as well, but that was an area
of debate and a fair amount of discussion because
the literature doesn't clearly articulate what is
the best definition for that. In each of the
studies that targeted light versus deep levels of
sedation either used different scales or used
different cutoffs for that.
So in general, we taught, based on what we
read, somewhere between a minus 2 to plus 1 on a
RASS scale and equivalent [indiscernible] on other
scales was what people defined as light sedation. But again, that was an area that was relatively nebulous because none of the studies actually targeted that. So that would be an area that we will discuss tomorrow as far as what may be ways to try and determine what is a definition of light versus deep sedation.

DR. DEVLIN: The other thing to add -- this is John Devlin -- Rich Riker led an important descriptor question, too, on objective sedation assessment as well. It wasn't an actionable question, but I think it was a great summary of where we're at in some of the pluses and minuses of incorporating that in the ICU. I just wanted to add that.

DR. COURSIN: Denham?

DR. WARD: Denham. Thank you. This was a great summary, and it brings lots of questions if I was sitting here with a new drug in my pocket that I wanted to get approved. I'll just start with one to follow up with Dan's. I've decided to use RASS as my measure in my clinical trial for a new agent. How much do I have to worry about the training and quality assurance of my people who are measuring RASS? Do I have to in my clinical trial -- my experience came from procedural sedation, and Roche when they came out with midazolam and flumazenil and advocated the use of the MOAS system, they actually had a training video that they produced. You had quite a long training video. Then they had examples at different levels of scores, and you had to score them and compare it to the experts' scoring. Then as you used the scale, there was a quality assurance program to go through and make sure that your clinical trial person was actually using the scale properly for that.

DR. SKROBIK: If we could just hold on a second. Steve and David and Claudia I know have questions. I'd just like to make two comments. One, Dan, I think you're absolutely on the money having a standardized and reproducible technique, and I think there are three others in the audience I'd like to hear from about that in the studies they've done, SEDCOM and others. So if I'm designing a clinical trial and using RASS for my sedation measurement, how much do I have to worry about the training and the quality assurance of the people who are making that measurement?

DR. SKROBIK: I think at the sake of sounding like I'm always making things more complicated, if you don't know that your pain assessment was done properly, how are you even going to go down the sedation road? The data that we have that are current from Lisa Burry's work and others in the Netherlands, and in Canada, and in the community, and in academic centers, suggests that nurses assess pain maybe 50-60 percent of the time in ICU patients. And when they do, their documentation of it is different than what the patient reported. So to answer your question, I think I would add a layer to it and say you would have to mandate in every sedation protocol that pain be measured first and that it be tracked because in the same way that I think I drive a car better than --

MALE VOICE: Doug.

(Laughter.)

DR. SKROBIK: -- we all have the sense we do things well.

MALE VOICE: You've got your license?

DR. SKROBIK: I came close to losing it on the way to the airport. This was not Yoanna Skrobik. So if we measure what we're doing and then compare each other in a trial specifically -- if you're doing a multicenter trial, I think it would be interesting to say how often and how reliably are you measuring whatever it is that your bedside metric is, and I would hope that that would improve the overall pattern of care.

DR. COURSIN: If we could just hold on a second. Steve and David and Claudia I know have questions. I'd just like to make two comments. One, Dan, I think you're absolutely on the money having a standardized and reproducible technique, and I think there are three others in the audience I'd like to hear from about that in the studies they've done, SEDCOM and others. But Pratik and Rick and Gilles, in your studies, in multicenter studies, how did you
control for the quality of SAS or RASS, if you happen to be a Richmond guy or a Maine Medical Center guy, in your analysis? How did you control for the quality of their subjective scoring?

DR. RIKER: Riker. For SEDCOM, as part of our startup meeting, we actually had the folks from Vanderbilt who developed or validated RASS and developed CAM-ICU, spend time with each of the research teams to train them in that process. We didn't do secondary confirmation of reliability or anything like that at each site. We didn't go that far, but it was included as far as our startup meeting for training.

DR. COURSIN: Sir, yes? You had a comment to that?

DR. SHEHABI: I just wanted to add, Rich, I think it's very important that the sites get trained specifically on site to control the quality of conducting a pain and sedation and delirium assessment. Like what Rich did in SEDCOM, in sites where we ran it in 74 ICUs around the world, the team visited every single center to train them on how to conduct these tests.

We left them with videos that they can use at the bedside with PowerPoint presentations, and then we had a study monitor who visited every single site at least twice during the conduct of the study for the quality control of the data and how they're doing it. I think that's very important in terms of making sure that the frequency visits are done as supposed to be done and they're done in a standard fashion across all sites in a large multicenter trial.

DR. SKROBIK: Can I ask, other than the social engagement that you make when you connect live, do you think it's feasible to do that more cheaply through electronic platforms or through more pragmatic -- we talk about the cost of doing RCTs and how huge it is for results.

DR. SHEHABI: I think it took quite a while. It took us two years in doing that. We introduced the site in a target fashion, so they were not all started on April 1, and we had multiple people who were doing that, visiting the sites. Like for example, at the Malaysian site, there were 11 sites there. It would have been impossible to do that on a video call.

That engagement at the beside training for the research team and the senior clinicians was very, very critical for them to understand what they're expected to do. Even in the UK, the sites there preferred onsite training, so we conducted at least 5 centralized meetings in the UK for that purpose.

DR. COURSIN: I want John just to get a chance to jump in.

DR. DEVLIN: I think the other thing that Yoanna and I have had a lot of discussions, two particularly with delirium assessment, is nurses I find want to know does my patient have delirium or they don't, and they're challenged, and it can add a little bit of stress to them as "I'm not really sure."

I think it's important through the education to give them that knowledge that it's okay that they're not sure exactly what the RASS score is if the patient's CAM positive, but then to seek out someone else in the unit because this could be a night nurse who might be maybe a better trained colleague that can really help.

Certainly in the research I've done it at Tufts, we've really promoted that, and it seems to have prevented a lot of not able to assess or not really sure. I haven't done research on it, but I think it's helped the validity of some of the assessments or at least let the investigators know the next day that they weren't sure. That was just one thing to add. I just wanted to give Claudia a chance in the back. She's patiently been waiting to comment. Thank you.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 69</th>
<th>Page 70</th>
<th>Page 71</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>benzodiazepine withdrawal are routinely measured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR. SPIES: Thank you. I have one comment</td>
<td>In the trajectory of an ICU with all of the</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>drugs that we deliver, we actually don't test for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the discussion right now. We're doing a study</td>
<td>it very often in adults. To my knowledge, there</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>are two or three studies describing it, suggesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>now with the German Ministry of Health involving</td>
<td>that the incidence is as variable as 15 to</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>70 percent, so not an insignificant amount, and I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>several centers. And our impression was in the</td>
<td>think in the don't knows, I think that's part of</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beginning that all these measurements on sedation,</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analgesia, and delirium didn't work if you really</td>
<td>So we implemented a blended learning concept,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>where we have e-learning as a beginning so people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tried to give it by guidelines or give it by</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>In Canada, there are three provinces now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>know what they are talking about. So that's very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-learning.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>that have electronic registries where you can't</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>important because of the different professions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So we implemented a blended learning concept,</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>close your days charting if you haven't done the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>involved at the patient's bedside. And even the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where we have e-learning as a beginning so people</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>pain measurements and the sedation measurements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>know what they are talking about. So that's very</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>I'm not sure the content of what's written in there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important because of the different professions</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>reflects what the patient actually has or doesn't</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involved at the patient's bedside. And even the</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>have, but I was grateful enough to be part of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relatives and the patient, him or herself, are</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>quality assurance of setting it up for the delirium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>always concerned. So if you train the people, they</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>component and for the three components of sedation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perform better.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>So there are ways to make sure that the assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second, we have a simulator-based concept,</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>are done, and in each of those platforms there's an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>quality assurance of setting it up for the delirium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so people are not corrected at the bedside. They</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>uncertainty box.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>don't feel annoyed. Sometimes they feel annoyed if</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don't feel annoyed. Sometimes they feel annoyed if</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>DR. COURSIN: You have to be careful, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you do that. So I think that's not good to do it</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>think, of the old VA jokes that the patient had</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>that way. So we have a simulator-based concept,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and at the end you do supervising at the bedside.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>normal vital signs an hour after they were declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>This at least decreases the inter-rater. Also the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>inter-rater, we have a lot of variability in that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>setting, and I think it's very important that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>we -- some think we do the same things, but we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>don't.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The other point I would like to address to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>the methods of the studies. If you want to address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>pain, I think you need a pain measurement, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>that's not done in many of the studies. The second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>point, if you want to try sedation, you need -- all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>the things that are not clearly stated in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>uncertainty box.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>that's not done in many of the studies. The second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>point, if you want to try sedation, you need -- all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>the things that are not clearly stated in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>confusion because sometimes if you measure pain,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>you measure side effects of sedation and not pain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>itself. So this is complicated, and I think there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>are a lot of things we need to consider together to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR. SKROBIK: If I could just add to that, I</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>released all that out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>think the other caveat that we thought about later</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>is that the notion of benzodiazepine withdrawal,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>for instance, is not something. In children and in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>the pediatric population, opiate withdrawal and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>the pediatric population, opiate withdrawal and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 clinical trials perspective, I absolutely agree that fidelity monitoring and the inter-rater reliability is something that we definitely need to build upon in the ICU community, but also the need for that conceptual clarity when we’re looking at the symptoms; not just the outcomes but the symptoms that we’re looking at.

DR. COURSIN: Thank you.

Steve Shafer?

DR. SHAFER: I’d like to step back for a second. Steve Shafer from Stanford. I’m not an intensivist, but certainly your paper from last year in Critical Care Medicine is just a wonderful piece of work outlining both recommendations but also the gaps in the knowledge. One of the things that jumps out to me is there are so many gaps in the knowledge and so many things. I went through and made a list of all things where it says low-quality evidence. And since we’re here to talk about clinical trials, I think that one of the things we’re here to talk about is how do you fill in this low-quality evidence that really dominates both sedation and analgesia, particularly, in my view, the sedation piece? Because it costs money to fill in this evidence, and the question is what’s the economic driver for it?

DR. SHAFER: That’s one of the drivers. I don’t see that happening. Other drivers would be physicians, perceiving a gap in care. And I’m not one of these physicians, but I don’t get a sense that our ICU doctors are saying we have these huge gaps in care. You’ve identified the gaps and the knowledge, but are the physicians saying -- the boots on the ground in the ICU -- we need these gaps of knowledge filled or there’s an economic gap.

DR. COURSIN: We could do better and we could pay for this work if we could save money by doing these things, and that would fund the studies. What is the economic driver to fund the research to fill the pretty overwhelming knowledge gaps that you identified?

DR. SKROBIK: I think that what you speak to is exactly that. We have a 4 percent error rate across our medical systems no matter where or how you look. We don’t acknowledge it. We don’t apologize for it. So in addition to saying we are not perfect, you want us to say and maybe we don’t deliver, and it doesn’t make sense. On the other hand, you talk about making money from an intervention. How much money would you save if you delivered the care according to whatever simple metrics? Not the sexy new molecule that is going to make my wrinkles go away, but the delivery of what the patient expects.

DR. DEVLIN: I just wanted to add really quick, I think with the caregiver, it’s a really, really good point you brought up. I think it also depends on the paradigm perspective of the clinician, what they feel is the goals of care and whether they truly are well versed on some of the dangers of deep sedation and the mobility, not being able to mobilize patients and as such.

Obviously, in the U.S. at least, we’re...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 77</th>
<th>Page 78</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 dealing with a system where we're focused on the cost of care in the hospital, but obviously this spills over post-ICU, and readmissions, and everything else.</td>
<td>1 system is intentionally stringent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 DR. COURSIN: Steve, one observation I'd make -- you've raised excellent points. Who's going to spend half a billion dollars to bring a drug to the market place that doesn't have the multiplier of the next generation of statins, or Z-Pak. The second piece to that, though, I think that for the most part, in critical care, we are pretty satisfied with what we have and what we have that comes out.</td>
<td>2 If we're trying to improve on the quality of our recommendations with better data, that's a really high bar to jump over. Having sat through these meetings and these consensus guideline writing, you almost have to hit a grand-slam in a particular area to get a strong recommendation. So if we're hoping to get the next generation of these guidelines with all strong recommendations, I think it's almost, if not certainly, impossible based on the system we use to give studies and recommendations grades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 DR. DEVLIN: That's such an important point, JP. I think the other thing too is we're framing our guidelines, PADIS, for all critically ill adults. This is just one example. So then we downgrade things when there's not a patient population that's been well studied, which is all different subtypes of patients of critically old adults. So that's an automatic downgrade when there could be a great randomized study and a good answer potentially in a subgroup of, say, a certain type of surgically critically ill patients. We ran into this all the time in our guidelines.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 DR. SKROBIK: Could I just speak to the grade comment? We have huge discussions over the grade methodology over these guidelines, and I think it's a very interesting and important point. I'm not sure how it influences trial design because if we're going to be asking the questions within the trials, perhaps that imperfect metric should be set aside altogether because in itself, it is the best tool we have so far. But for the very reasons and many others that you've point out, it has major limitations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 DR. SESSLER: It's true that with some limitations.</td>
<td>6 DR. COURSIN: Dan Sessler?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 DR. SESSLER: It's true that with some limitations.</td>
<td>14 DR. DEVLIN:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 DR. KRESS: One thing -- and maybe we'll talk about it later -- this gap in what we currently have and what we're seeking in terms of quality there or continence and the recommendations. I think it's important that if you look at the way that the grading system for these consensus statements is used, it's a really, really high bar to get a strong recommendation.</td>
<td>7 DR. SESSLER: It's true that with some current systems, it's hard to make strong recommendations, but that's not a fault of the system. It's because we don't have the underlying data, and there is a bit of a history of groups coming out with fairly strong recommendations that didn't hold up, and you only have to look at the recent World Health Organization recommendation on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 JP, you had popped up with something. I wanted to make sure I didn't oversee it.</td>
<td>8 and many others that you've point out, it has major limitations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 DR. KRESS: One thing -- and maybe we'll talk about it later -- this gap in what we currently have and what we're seeking in terms of quality there or continence and the recommendations. I think it's important that if you look at the way that the grading system for these consensus statements is used, it's a really, really high bar to get a strong recommendation.</td>
<td>17 coming out with fairly strong recommendations that didn't hold up, and you only have to look at the recent World Health Organization recommendation on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 If you look at the published guidelines for many, many different areas, what percentage of grades are low quality or weak recommendation compared to strong? I would submit it's probably more than 10 to 1, and maybe that's because the</td>
<td>18 coming out with fairly strong recommendations that didn't hold up, and you only have to look at the recent World Health Organization recommendation on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 5 miles of an ICU, but yet get admitted? So I think those are key issues.</td>
<td>19 coming out with fairly strong recommendations that didn't hold up, and you only have to look at the recent World Health Organization recommendation on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 care patient at the bedside.</td>
<td>20 coming out with fairly strong recommendations that didn't hold up, and you only have to look at the recent World Health Organization recommendation on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 I don't realize that 25 percent of families are not back to a functional state working. Their quality of life is impacted a year later, and we haven't even gotten to the root cause analysis of what about the huge percentage of patients in the United States, anyhow, who shouldn't be within 6 5 miles of an ICU, but yet get admitted? So I think those are key issues.</td>
<td>14 DR. DEVLIN:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 DR. KRESS: One thing -- and maybe we'll talk about it later -- this gap in what we currently have and what we're seeking in terms of quality there or continence and the recommendations. I think it's important that if you look at the way that the grading system for these consensus statements is used, it's a really, really high bar to get a strong recommendation.</td>
<td>15 DR. SESSLER: It's true that with some current systems, it's hard to make strong recommendations, but that's not a fault of the system. It's because we don't have the underlying data, and there is a bit of a history of groups coming out with fairly strong recommendations that didn't hold up, and you only have to look at the recent World Health Organization recommendation on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 JP. I think the other thing too is we're framing our guidelines, PADIS, for all critically ill adults. This is just one example. So then we downgrade things when there's not a patient population that's been well studied, which is all different subtypes of patients of critically old adults. So that's an automatic downgrade when there could be a great randomized study and a good answer potentially in a subgroup of, say, a certain type of surgically critically ill patients. We ran into this all the time in our guidelines.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 and many others that you've point out, it has major limitations.</td>
<td>16 DR. SESSLER: It's true that with some current systems, it's hard to make strong recommendations, but that's not a fault of the system. It's because we don't have the underlying data, and there is a bit of a history of groups coming out with fairly strong recommendations that didn't hold up, and you only have to look at the recent World Health Organization recommendation on</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
supplemental oxygen, which defies available data, so there's a lot to be said for being rigorous. Along those lines, you presented a very formal way of developing consensus of doing a full systematic review, grading everything, voting, recording how people voted, making sure that people don't vote if they have a conflict, which might even be defined as having done for relevant research in the area.

DR. COURSIN: And we did do that.

Along those lines, you presented a very formal way of developing consensus of doing a full systematic review, grading everything, voting, recording how people voted, making sure that people don't vote if they have a conflict, which might even be defined as having done for relevant research in the area.

DR. COURSIN: And we did do that.

DR. SESSLER: Okay. That is becoming a standard. It's the way we develop the Canadian Society of Cardiology guidelines. It's not what we're doing here, which is just something to think about. I mention it because I was involved in a PCORI consensus process and papers, and we got huge pushback from reviewers that basically said this is no longer the way it's done, and frankly, I think the reviewers were right.

So going forward, we might think about doing this a little more formally so that we are at the current standard of care.

DR. SKROBIK: I think it can be said of patient representation, if I could just add that, because Dale has done some very elegant work using groups of patients that were representative of populations in using Delphi rounds and going through a very rigorous process. We got slammed in the guidelines for having randomly apparently selected patients who just happened to wander in and want to donate that much volunteer time. Can we agree? It couldn't have been -- if you would have asked a representative sample to do this thing, they would have told you where you can get off the bus. I think the most elegant response to that was Cheryl Misak's, who said, "What is your presentation anyway?" And who speaks for whom and under what auspice? And I think what Dr. Ward was talking about earlier, benevolence is not a small -- it shouldn't be set aside.

Pratik and I had a very lively discussion over the day yesterday in terms of what intellectual conflict of interest means. The key is the transparency and the communication. If you can say we did this transparently, this is what we did, this is exactly what we did, you can knock it, but you know what it was.

The communication among those who share ideas the way we are has to be about the content and not about your opinion and whether somebody should be getting sedatives. We had one interesting intervention, and that was why would you give somebody a sedative anyway? You say that to most people, and --

DR. COURSIN: David, I wanted to give you an opportunity. I apologize. David Brown.

DR. BROWN: Again, I'm going to wear my patient hat a little bit more and family hat. I noticed -- and Yoanna, a great job on summarizing -- it was only survivors, and I wonder about the families of deceased ICU people to bring to bear because my experience in this area of working with people with advanced illness, one person has an advanced illness, the whole family has the advanced illness. Maybe I missed it.

DR. SKROBIK: We had both, but we didn't declare it up front.

DR. COURSIN: Dr. Shehabi?

DR. SHEHABI: Yahya Shehabi. I think in terms of the recommendations, I think it's important to link that to the outcome looked at and make a recommendation. I think when it comes to the sedation group -- and Pratik, you could speak to that -- I think we made the bar very high in terms of the outcome.

Instead of saying we're going to accept a short and mechanical ventilation to make a sound recommendation for X versus Y, which now it has to reduce 90-day mortality, or it has to do reduce such and such and such at 6 months. I think that probably what led to a lot of recommendations being made conditional, a low recommendation, because there's just simply no data on that.

DR. DEVLIN: Yes, and that's a really important concern. That's one of the things obviously grade requires, is we did vote on our highest priority outcomes for our PICO question,
and there was some pushback as people get familiar with the data, and later on as we're trying to make recommendations, "Well, can we just change some of these?" And we were basically, no, we can't, but that's such an important point, because the data, it did drive a lot of lower-level quality recommendations.

DR. COURSIN: Pam?

DR. FLOOD: I'll add on to what David said.

MALE VOICE: Could you speak into the mic, Pam?

DR. FLOOD: Sure.

DR. COURSIN: That was Pam Flood.

DR. FLOOD: I just want to add on to David's comment -- Pamela Flood, Stanford -- that we are absolutely -- particularly those in this room who are ICU survivors -- not a representative sample. Not only have we survived, we survived intact, and we were relatively healthy academic physicians before all of this happened. So what's important to us and our families might not be important to everyone, and other things might have greater importance.

DR. EGEROD: This is Ingrid Egerod. I'm a qualitative researcher, and I have some concerns about the way the patient representatives are used in research because we discussed this at length about whether it's representative when we do our qualitative research. I have a feeling that that whole layer of discussion has disappeared when we have patient representatives, and patients suddenly become a representative to a much larger degree than they really should.

In qualitative research, we always put in all these important discussions of can this be generalized and so on and so forth. I think that's another thing that we need in research, is to really define or discuss how to use patients and families so it makes sense.

DR. COURSIN: If I could, Dale Needham, with your expertise, would you comment on this?

DR. NEEDHAM: This is Dale Needham from Johns Hopkins. I do think, and I did perhaps say to John and Yoanna, sure we have some patient representation, but it's pretty tiny. I think that our knowledge in how to do this is evolving. When I present in an hour or so, I'll talk about one approach that we had to try to have in a formal consensus methodologies and Delphi, and try to have about a quarter of our representatives be patients or families.

I think we've still got lots of ways to learn and how to do that, and I was sharing some of that with John and Yoanna as well, but I'm not sure that we know the answer yet. But I think it's important that we continue to bring this up to ourselves, continue to think about how we should do that and recognize that often patients are going to talk about an experience of one person, and we need to put that in context, too.

I've seen sometimes where I think we just give too much weight to what might be an outlier or one representation. I say that just because the research that I've done for 15 years looks at long-term outcomes of ICU survivors. So we've done assessments on thousands, thousands of assessments, so I think I have a little bit of a feel. Of course, my bias as well, but sometimes one voice may not always be the representative.

So that's a couple of thoughts, and I think when I present, I'm happy to share some of our learnings and thoughts that have come out of that.

DR. COURSIN: I want to get Leanne Aitken's thoughts as well. I'm sorry. I'm trying to get both of you.

DR. AITKEN: That's okay. Leanne Aitken.

Some of you may not be aware, but within the UK research funding environment, you basically won't get any government funding without a reasonable patient and public involvement process, and that includes some sort of consultation with PPI, as well as PPI members as co-applicants on the grant with you.

In the current study that I'm a co-app on --

DR. SKROBIK: Sorry. What's PPI?

DR. AITKEN: Sorry. Patient and public
involvement.

DR. SKROBIK: Not protein, pumpkin --
(Laughter.)

DR. AITKEN: No. And there's another PPI
related to insurance. It's not that either. In
the current study that I'm a co-op on that's
comparing dexmedetomidine versus clonidine versus
usual sedation, through our PPI process, one of the
outcomes that was considered most important to a
group of about 20 was how well the patient could
communicate with the family member.
We would never have thought of that. We
would never have put emphasis on it. That's a
single example, but I think it's an important
example of how we do need to think differently and
make sure that we get that voice. Now, we have a
group of between 18 and 20 that we consult with
regularly, and we have two patients and public on
our co-op team, but that's the process throughout
the whole of UK government-funded research.

DR. SKROBIK: If I could just speak
to -- this is Yoanna Skrobik -- the reproducibility
within this small effort, what struck me was the
cohesion between the 5 patient representatives that
we had, who the exception of their preference of
depth of sedation spoke with one voice despite
their different experiences. I know it's not the
thousands that Dale refers to and not the long-term
outcomes, but within these specific topics, I was
struck by the homogeneity.

DR. COURSIN: Ingrid, you had a comment?

DR. EGEROD: Yes. I just wanted to add to
that, that I think one of the problems is that
we're trying to generalize and maybe we should just
accept that we can't generalize and that's
okay.

What we're doing is we're giving a lot of
good examples of what might be meaningful to
patients, but we're in a different paradigm, and I
think we really need to keep remembering that it's
all right that they're not completely
representative. People are different.

DR. COURSIN: Mervyn, you had a comment?

DR. MAZE: Yes, and this is not meant to get
into wordsmithing, but I want to ask about the way
that a recommendation is framed either in the
negative or the positive. And I'll give an example
of what you've said, but I won't read for
word. You say something must not be used in all
patients. How does that differ from it is useful
in some patients and start defining what that some
is?

DR. SKROBIK: I think that's an excellent
point, and on the last slide that I showed, the
subgroup comments spoke to that, the gaps being if
people are all different in terms of pathology and
in terms of how they respond to whatever
intervention, being pharmacological or not, how do
you tailor?

You're not looking at a cohort with an
average when you're looking at the patient in front
of you, and if that subgroup hasn't been studied or
that personality profile hasn't been studied -- the
Israelis published a beautiful study looking at
whether being a controlling person made you more
likely to develop delirium. I have to say it was
one of my favorite papers.

So how do you make that transition? And I
think that's where the -- subgroups specifically,
because we made recommendations for pain management
in the previous guidelines based on two studies in
two very specific subpopulations, and said opiates
were all the same because 2 opiates were compared
in each of those studies; so an imperfect example
of how you make a recommendation.

DR. MAZE: But are you therefore saying that
unless the subgroup is not identified, that it's
better to frame it in the negative?

DR. SKROBIK: No. I think you should think
about it and just express it clearly. This is a
very personal opinion, not the SCCM; this is a very
personal opinion. I think you get so caught up in
the naming of the conditional strong, weak, blah,
blah. If you have the patients to not read the
summary but read through the content of what
created that recommendation, then you get an idea
of what you're talking. Based on these two groups
of this profile of patients, these were the
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1 results.
2 You can then take that away and apply it in
3 your patient or not. But we live in a world where
4 medical information triples every 10 years. So you
5 take the guideline and you take the summary because
6 you couldn't possibly be an expert in sedative
7 exposure, and mechanical ventilation, and -- you
8 couldn't. So you take it, and the problem is in
9 the summarizing of it and in the words that you use
10 in the summary.
11 DR. DEVLIN: Again, another thing with grade
12 recommendation for or conditional recommendation
13 against, or strong for or strong against. That's
14 where you're parsing this divide of risk versus
15 benefit and all the other factors that came into
16 the recommendation space. So we have some that
17 look like they're negative and then some that are
18 positive, and that's simply how --
19 DR. SKROBİK: But if it could have
20 consensus, it's artificial.
21 DR. DEVLIN: We had a comment in the back.

1 I'm sorry.
2 DR. TANG: Hi. I'm Wing Yu Tang, and I have
3 much more experience on more of the real-world data
4 on research side. So I'm very curious per a lot of
5 the comments being made about generalizability, and
6 certainly sample sizes I think comes into play as
7 well, in terms of generalizing either
8 subpopulations or small populations to a much wider
9 and generalizable audience.
10 We also talked about things like
11 productivity and absenteeism, which we capture a
12 lot as well, that are more I would say real-world
13 outcomes that aren't necessarily typical clinical
14 trial endpoints. These are actually realities that
15 I would say are limitations that sometimes clinical
16 trials can have.
17 So I'm really interested in thoughts
18 about -- we talked a little bit about qualitative
19 research, but there's obviously a really growing
20 number of real-world data, phase 4 studies, other
21 kinds of prospective works which are targeting much
22 more larger sample sizes, and the maturity of it

1 clearly is evolving quite rapidly. And I'm
2 wondering thoughts about where that falls into the
3 current discussion on generalizability.
4 DR. COURSIN: Comments on that? Claudia?
5 DR. SPIES: Maybe surely. I'm also heading
6 the whole medical society development in Germany
7 for the guideline development, and there's a lot of
8 discussion also with the Guidelines International
9 Network on the quality of the guidelines. I
10 learned a lot from our guideline from this
11 networking that AWMF is having 180 medical
12 societies included. The Guidelines International
13 Network is a huge society giving standards and
14 including all the stakeholder representatives to
15 qualify a guideline.
16 At least from my perspective and doing a lot
17 of guideline research a lot of times, I'm mainly
18 stuck in the methodology. I think it's very
19 important that we have these people who help us
20 really to qualify our guidelines and really to get
21 that implemented because only with them is it
22 possible to get that implemented.

My question is, is that moderated, all the
1 guideline development here in the U.S., by
2 Guidelines International or by a U.S. specific
3 guideline network that's really having all of these
4 people involved. One has to look at the throughput
5 model at the end, or the patients, the relatives,
6 the organizations, the system. It's very context
7 specific before an intervention goes. And because
8 it's not so easy to understand, I think it's
9 important I think to use that help people have in
10 different other guideline developments.
12 DR. DEVLIN: Yes, I can speak to maybe just
13 a little bit of that. There's a great working
14 group that obviously postulates and promotes the
15 ways clinical practice guidelines should be done.
16 Cochrane is involved as well. But there could be
17 inherent biases from those, those organizations.
18 Currently, from what I've seen talking to
19 other critical care organizations, is it's a little
20 bit fractured in terms of the societies that
21 support these guidelines have their agendas for
22 doing them. I don't think there's a lot of
cross-talk. Even within SCCM, I'll be honest,
there's varying level of methodological support and
the focus of how these guidelines are done. So
there's just an incredible amount of variability in
quality and how they're done. These are really,
really big issues from that practice guideline
thing.
The one other comment I wanted to make,
which I think goes back to the comment there is,
when we're looking at choice of sedation, this came
up a lot within our group is, we're focusing a
question on which sedative the patient is to get in
the ICU, but that patient stay obviously could be
quite dynamic throughout the ICU stay, and maybe
there's a choice of sedative that's better on day 3
than the first day they get intubated if they even
need the sedative, and that dynamic process is not
brought into the guidelines at all.

We do bring it up as a gap, but I think it's
a really important one for this group because most
of the studies, you randomize patients to one
sedative or the other, and you keep that sedative
going unless there's an adverse event, or a safety
concern, or they're extubated.

As the moderator, we're coming kind of
toward the end of this session, and a question
comes up, a very logical one, about longitudinal
database follow-up.

Frank, any comments on that as far as
creating these databases and looking at them over
time, particularly with evolving practices or
competing guidelines?

Dr. Dexter: Frank Dexter, Iowa. I
understand longitudinal databases for endpoints
such as work or something like that, but it's
really hard, if it's difficult to measure something
even in a randomized clinical trial, to begin to
think about longitudinal measurements. I kind of
find that to be very difficult. Even if you were
to say take databases that already exist currently,
if you can't in a randomized trial measure
something reliably, having more data isn't going to
make it reliable.

Dr. COURSIN: Dan?

Dr. SESSLER: Data quality also tends to be
poor in registries and controlling for confounding
is challenging. That's not to say that registries
are useless. We do lots and lots of registry
studies, but they sure don't have the reliability
of a controlled trial.

I think the point that even controlled
trials in this environment are difficult is valid
and important, and a solution to that is not a
registry.

Dr. COURSIN: Thank you. I'd like to keep
going on with that, but I have one final kind of
burning question I'd selfishly like to ask. I'm
going to direct this to Steve.

Steve, you outlined what are the problems;
where are we unhappy with things; who's going to
pay for this? It would seem to me the key action
items coming out of this meeting would center
around clearly identifying what we need, whether we
can fill the gaps in or not, but what do we need
and who the hell's going to pay for it, and who's
the advocacy group?

The force I would try to get out there, the
last data I looked at 1.4 percent of the gross
national product is spent on critical care in the
United States. That's a lot of dough. Is there a
way to leverage what we're talking about here in a
manner that we could make effective collection of
data, analysis to that data, and implementation?
Steve?

Dr. SHAFER: I'm looking up to the session
that I'll be moderating at 4:30, and that's the
same question I've had, which is when we're talking
about clinical trial designs, you can't really talk
about that in the assumption that there's unlimited
funding. And a clinical trial design has got to
identify a problem worth solving, and the worth, I
hate to say this, has got to be defined in dollars
or whatever the currency is, but it's got to be
defined.

Dr. COURSIN: We'll vote on Brexit later
today.

(Laughter.)
DR. SHAFER: Yeah.

DR. SKROBIK: Dollars and glory, no? Is it not dollars and glory?

DR. SHAFER: Somebody's going to write a check, and they aren't going to write a check for your glory.

DR. SKROBIK: No, write a check so that your finding -- so there's the academic and journal driven study; wow, we have this new thing. Nobody does granular metrics.

DR. SHAFER: That will motivate all of us to put in our time and effort, the glory part, because we don't really do it for money; we do it for the contribution we make. But in terms of funding the cost of doing a study, if we can identify -- here's the cost of not knowing. The cost of not knowing is X, and it's going to cost some number smaller than X to fill in that gap and give you this return.

So I think we have to identify the costs in that -- and as you say, 4 percent is a big number, but what is the cost of not knowing -- what are the costs of these gaps in knowledge and gaps in practice?

DR. COURSIN: Pam?

DR. FLOOD: I was just going to add to that, that in a way, it's fortuitous, even though it's sort of horrible. But at least in the ICU, there's a big pot of money. We're spending an enormous amount of money in ICU, end of life, and hopefully not quite end-of-life care. The concept that this could be done more efficiently and better means that there actually is money to be saved there.

DR. COURSIN: And again, I'm looking for how do you garner the issues and get an advocacy group.

And the real people we're looking at who seek glory that could make this happen is the political force. And what does this group see as a way to pool the data together and the conversations here and get that kind of information out there.

Well, there seem to be a few comments. We'll start here.

Rick?

DR. RIKER: Riker. I think one of the things, Steve, in response to your comment, as clinicians, I would be interested in a study -- we see this resource costs versus outcome benefit or whatever. There are four quadrants. So I'd be interested in a new approach if it got as good results for less money or less resource utilization, or if for similar costs, I got better outcomes.

Those are the kinds of things we're looking at to make decisions about what do we do with our patients. If there's not a new drug that comes down the pike that the pharmaceutical industry is going to pay for, for the research within our own societies, or our governments, or AHRQ, whatever we use for pathway, we've got to look for those kind of outcomes.

DR. COURSIN: David Brown?

DR. BROWN: I think one of the big challenges for all of us is $550 million a year is spent in lobbying in this city on healthcare.

DR. SKROBIK: How much?

DR. BROWN: $550 million is spent lobbying in healthcare. Almost all of it is spent to keep the system the same because there are so many people making so much money inside the system.

So that very idea that Rick brings up, is that generating the political will to make a change, you're stepping on so many toes.

So I think, Doug, you're exactly right. You've got to use political maneuvering, and you've got to have a face to it. There's a group here that our firm's a member of, C-TAC, Coalition for the Transformation of Advanced Illness Care. Dave Longnecker is their chief of strategy. It's focused on better end-of-life care, and there may be something for some of the critical care groups to have a little larger role in that group. It's a nonprofit spun out of AAMC.

DR. COURSIN: Dr. Shehabi?

DR. SHEHABI: The Australian Ministry of Health and the Medical Research Council, which provided a lot of funds for the ANZICS Clinical Trial Network investigating an ICU. I've recently looked into the return on its investment into the
1 clinical trials by ANZICS clinical trial group, and
2 the biggest return was learning what not to do in
3 ICU.
4 The point that Yoanna made -- I think you,
5 Doug, made that point first, that a lot of what we
6 do in ICU came to us from outside ICU and wasn't
7 actually designed for ICU. So it's really
8 important to examine what is it that we're doing
9 and what is it that we need not to do because
10 that's where the real saving is.
11 DR. WARD: Thank you.
12 DR. TANG: Just for the record, I think it's
13 important that was noted before about health
14 economics being an important player and balancing
15 that conversation so that you can translate
16 appropriately clinical outcomes to what it means it
17 health economics, I think that's definitely an
18 arena.
19 The reason I brought up earlier about the
20 ideas of real-world databases and registries is not
21 to say that it is in any way going to replace or
22 even the supplementary, but it's offering more data
points to consider when we're talking about
2 actually seeing how these patients are flowing
3 through, and if we're not capturing them, how we
4 can better capture them, and the idea of creating
5 that more as a baseline of how we look at things
6 rather than pointing at all of the concerns.
7 The idea is that we really want to make sure
8 we have as wide as data possible. And if we have
9 already these infrastructures that speak to
10 insurance with claims and we have EHR databases,
11 can we look at those as different avenues that are
12 less resource intensive to add to more of that data
13 information and system forum?
14 DR. COURSIN: Thank you. We're at the
15 little after 10 o'clock mark. I didn't want us to
16 fall behind. I wanted to thank Yoanna and John for
17 their expertise. I had told Denham I would do my
18 best to get this shy group going, and I appreciate
19 your coming through for us.
20 DR. WARD: We do try to have fairly generous
21 break times. A lot of the discussion takes place
22 not in the formal meeting setting but over a cup of
1 coffee. So I hope we can continue these
2 discussions over the next half hour and then come
3 back at 10:30, where we will continue with the
4 panel discussions. Thank you, and thank you,
5 panel.
6 (Whereupon, at 10:02 a.m., a recess was
7 taken.)
8 DR. WARD: After that nice background
9 discussion of where we are and where are the gaps
10 both in evidence and methodology, I really wanted
11 to start back to the patient's perspective. I
12 think that's one of the pieces, when you talk about
13 patient centered, that can drive a lot of parts of
14 understanding what we need to do to fill the
15 evidence gaps and what the right methodology is.
16 There was a lot of great comment of incorporating
17 patients in clinical trials, particularly using
18 qualitative research methods to understand the
19 patient's perspective.
20 We've got two speakers and a panel before
21 lunch, and I would like to start out with Dave
22 Brown.
What we're going to do today is talk about patients, and more importantly families, from what I learned, and then I'm going to share with you some heartfelt lessons that I think I take away from this.

Now, my declaration of interest, I'm the CEO of a firm called Curadux. I wanted to call that from Doc and the Family, but a Japanese guy owned the domain name, and I couldn't buy it from him, so I Latinized the English care guide, and that's what Curadux is. I'm a board member of NeuroTherapia, which is a unique molecule, a cannabinoid compound that we've worked on for 15 years that just had IND approval, and we hope to get in phase 1 trials by June for Alzheimer's. It's a very unique drug.

I'm an academic medical insider. At the time of my illness, I was one of the directors of the American Board of Anesthesiology. I sat on the ACGME's executive committee. I ran the RRC for many years. My clinical background is pain medicine and anesthesiology. So that's who I am.

Here is a graphical cartoon of where I was. I started out first in the Air Force; then went to Virginia Mason; then to Mayo, where I ran their quality program; and then to Iowa, where Frank Dexter and I worked together; then to MD Anderson Cancer Center; and then to Cleveland Clinic, which is where I had my most notable certificate, and that was with the international and multiorgan failure. Then I went on after that to do two years of graduate work at Loyola in Chicago in bioethics and health policy in preparation for what I'm doing now.

Now, I'm going to sit, and the star of this about 4-and-a-half-minute video is actually my wife. (Video played and transcribed.)

"DR. BROWN: The story goes back 35 years. I was active duty military in the Air Force. We were on the southwest side of town, and we got gunshot and knife wounds, frequently transfusing many, many units of blood. At one of those points, it's theorized that I had a needle stick, and back then we didn't know the term hepatitis C.

"The FDA approved a new treatment regimen that gave me a larger opportunity to be cured if I went through the chemotherapy.

"KAREN: The first day it was fine, and then looking at the number of pills he took every day was shocking, and they affected him emotionally, physically. He couldn't get up the stairs anymore without crawling. It was very, very difficult.

"DR. BROWN: Then as we got about 5 and a half months into the 7-month course, I developed sepsis and required admission to our surgical intensive care unit.

"KAREN: I remember the first night he was in the ICU. It was like being on Mars. They don't speak my language. The noises are very strange. I remember asking what am I supposed to do?

"DR. BROWN: Time [inaudible}. I spent 3 and a half months unconscious, had a heart rate somewhere north of 140, and I [inaudible] had pancreatitis, and my liver took a vacation. Of course, there were concerns that I bled into my head. Then I had respiratory failure. I had more than 6 organ systems out, so that predicts somewhat around 100 percent mortality.

"My family had a couple different discussions about end-of-life care and whether to do not resuscitate or should [inaudible]. I found it very interesting in a very detached professional way to watch myself dying.

"KAREN: I remember just thinking, just tell me what are the odds here? The wonderful nurse asked if I wanted to lay down with him, and I thought it was the last time I'd ever lay next to him. My decisions were based on more than medical knowledge. It was based on the hopes I have, and the prayers I have, and the faith that I have, realizing I didn't know the outcome.

"DR. BROWN: Then, late on a Friday night in one heartbeat, I became myself. I became cognitively intact. I became myself just as fast as you can snap your fingers. The first phrase I typed out was, 'I've never been more alive.' People walked with my family. That was very
important.

"KAREN: And your family is very important. Every person is different with different challenges. So I would say equip yourself before you meet a circumstance that will require tremendous fortitude and faith.

"DR. BROWN: Caring for the family, letting them know that we're going to protect their loved one, we're going to do our very best, was keenly important. To know that the family of that individual is a human being with God-given dignity that that human being has [inaudible], sometimes a patient will tell me what they're worried about, and I can put a hand on their shoulder and say, 'A year ago, I was where you were."

"There's really nothing so beneficial and almost a sacred commitment that we have with our patients, to respect them and try to relate their pain. I always considered myself very empathetic, and I thought I was, and I probably was. But this illness has raised my degree of patient-focused empathy to another level. If I followed the book on algorithms, I'd probably be dead."

DR. BROWN: This was used by the Cleveland Clinic in part of their empathy series. Just some framing for you out of the patient experience. I'm in my own ICU, so everybody in there worked for me at the time. I have a daughter that's a doc, a son that graduated from Georgetown Law. My wife's really smart. I had all the advanced directives done. Our money was in a trust. I had planned ahead. Everything was planned ahead, a real connected medical insider, and our family struggled.

So I'll tell you a little more about me. This is my hepatologist note the day I was admitted. You see in the upper left, blood pressure's 78 over 45 in his office in a wheelchair, and that's the night before I knew I was failing, so one of my buddies came over from an outlying hospital near where I lived on the west side of Cleveland. Started an IV, hung the first bag of lactate, and then I hung the next 2 bags of lactate to give me a little boost till morning. My secretary sent a car for me, and I laid down in the back until I got to the hospital. Then I was sent to the emergency department even though I was on my way to the ICU, because that's what we did at the Cleveland Clinic. You couldn't be admitted directly from any office to the ICU. Is that patient centered, 6 hours in the ED?

This is a week later. We don't know quite what's wrong with me yet. This was the day they figured it out. I had vaspressors. My heart rate was north of 140. My respiratory rate was about 40. And I also looked as if was developing a viable proliferative disorder with a node biopsy positive for a lymphoma. Oh, and by the way, my EBV titer was greater than 5 million per cubic millimeter, so I had developed from my immunosuppressed state an EBV. We don't know if it was just simple EBV sepsis or EBV hemophagocytic syndrome. That was a weekend.

So overall, you've heard a little bit from the video. I had hepatitis C for 35 years. I picked it up in the military and had done pretty well. And I thought, my family, probably I'll die of heart disease before hep C will get me, so I kind of avoided it because I'm genotype 1, which is what most of us in the U.S. are, and the cure rate was about 25 or 30 percent with the old chemo. Well, the interferon, ribavirin, and a protease inhibitor moved that up to about 80 percent. Let me tell you, if you ever get offered interferon, don't take it.

(Laughter.)

DR. BROWN: Find another way. But I had the DIC for 4 days. My platelets were about 18,000. That's why they gave me contrast through the portable CT to see if I'd bled in my head, and they knocked my kidneys off at that time with hypertension. I was delusional through much of this. I can tell you, for part of the time, I was in the ICU, delusional unconscious, for 3 and a half weeks. I was in a European ambassador's place with China plates on the wall. I've never been able to find those China plates in that ICU room.
Also, I will speak to you in a moment about a piece I wrote for Anesthesiology in the Mind section, and I'll tell more of that story.

But the most suffering I had in the ICU was every time an alarm went off in my room, it signified to me and my delusion that one more patient was entering an unethical research trial I was leading. It's not an exciting run. That actually caused more suffering than any of the physical things I had.

Intubated and ventilated, I had ARDS. I had a 50-pound weight loss, and that will become important in just a moment. My marrow wasn't working. My albumin was 1. I had what looked like a term belly that had to have ascites drained.

Having that much ascites with ADRS and a 50-pound weight loss is an exciting run.

So here's what I think I learned out of this. When you lose 50 pounds out of your core, every time these wonderful nurses turned me to clean me, because I was incontinent of anything, my shoulders and my hips subluxed. And I came up to my critical care docs and nurses afterwards and I said, "Do you guys know about that?" They said, "No. Nobody ever lives that is in that setting."

So that was painful. In this morning's discussion, I am betting that it looked like that was agitation when it was actually really severe pain on shoulders and hips. I had an 8 o. tube cut at 22 centimeters, and it's like breathing through too small a straw. If you think of an anesthesiologist intubated with ARDS, that's a bad setting because you understand it.

Then after the nurses and respiratory therapists come and suck your tube out, they suck your FRC right out into that tube. Now, you have to cough back up your FRC, but you don't have the core muscle strength to cough, so you feel like you're suffocating, and it hurts, and you're short of breath.

Nasojejunal tubes, they hurt. They're sewn in so they don't pull out. Fluid overload between dialysis. When the young nephrology fellow comes by and says, "Oh, your numbers look pretty good today; I don't think we'll dialyze you," "I just wonder why I'm short of breath?" They were going to treat my numbers rather than treat the patient.

I can tell you waking up -- I'm still in the ICU 7 years ago today. I was extubated 3 days ago. I'm in the ICU. I wake up in March Madness. There's not much better time to wake up than watching basketball from a warm bed in dialysis where they take 2 or 2 and a half liters off of you. You breathe better. They feed your graham crackers and orange juice and put warm blankets around you, and they're very kind individuals in dialysis.

Three weeks into my ICU admission, 3 and a half weeks about, I have a dream. I don't think it's a delusion because I'm an old pilot, and I flew right up until my chemotherapy. I flew the airplane you see in the lower right all over the country. I rarely flew commercially. I flew myself. But I'd had a dream over the previous decade, not flying, but they're in trouble.

I walk up, take the right seat, pull back on the stick, avoid the high line wires, squeak the wheels onto the runway. I have this dream, and as you can see there, it was actually 2:40 when my eyes opened up, and I'd been out of it for 3-plus weeks. I became myself. I became this guy, very weak, but cognitively I thought I was intact.

Here's what was going on, on that day. I had no sedation at the time I woke up. I was not on sedation at the time I woke up. But during my ICU admit, they used propofol or dex. They used some benzos early on. And that comment I made in the video, I remembered to this day, I woke up. My nurse was a former army medic from Iraq war and went to nursing school, barb wire, weightlifter; couldn't scare him at all.

Jose came into my room. His eyes got about this big, and I got the alphabet board out, and my little old tremulous fingers typed out, "I've never been more alive. Call my wife." And then it really got exciting because I became -- I talked about lobbyists here in DC. I became the principal lobbyist at the Cleveland Clinic for extubation of

...
Being extubated, I still can feel the emotion of being extubated. I was an old hurdler in college, and I actually used to be pretty fast before the neuropathy. But I still remember occasionally they'd make me run 400 meters because they needed somebody for the relay, and I had fast-twitch muscles, I didn't have slow-twitch muscles, and I needed a shorter distance. And I'd finish a 400 meter and just be gasping, and then it felt so good to stop. Being extubated is the same thing. It feels so good because they pull that tube out. Hippocrates had it right. I could sit down right now. I won't, but I could. It's more important to know what sort of person has the disease than to know what sort of disease the person has. If I have a criticism of modern healthcare -- and I have many as a patient. I get care at the VA hospital. I get care at Mayo. I get care at Cleveland Clinic. I get care at Marshfield Clinic. So I sample lots of different centers.

If you look at me in my medical record, I look like a walking dead man because they keep every comorbidity in there so they can up-code when the reimbursement structure allows them to. So I've had to create my own personal health story to share with physicians when I have to meet with them so that they find out I still get 17,000 steps a day, and my dog and I go hiking quite a bit, and I actually am pretty active.

Carl Hug, many of you know Carl. Carl sent me an email. This happened in March of ‘12 for perspective. This was in October of ‘12, we were getting ready to go to the American board. And you can see what Carl said. He said, "You screwed up my ICU lectures." He taught ethics down at Emory. He said, "I always thought after 7 days, we ought to just provide comfort measure, and you taught me something. I look forward to seeing you."

Roger Williams was a PhD biochemist at the University of Texas, and I think he hits it pretty right when you're thinking about me as the patient. Medicines for real people, statistical humans, are of little interest. What happens is we let our...
policy discussions get too close to individuals' bedsides. I'm going to tell you now about my family. I have 4400 pages of ICU records from the Cleveland Clinic. A little secret, I'm in my own ICU. I'm everybody's boss. When I was most critically ill, 10 days my vital signs were identical in the record. Do you suppose somebody was cutting and pasting? Do you suppose?

Dr. Brown: I can't validate it. My daughter, she and I have always been fairly close. I used to coach her in long jumping. She's a pediatrician and did special needs pediatrics at MCW. Here's what she posted. She's the Facebook generation. "Nurses are angels sent from God. Certain doctors can be angels when they listen to you and actually come examine your family member rather than making decisions from outside the room." If I reflect on what's most missing in intensive care units, it's time; what's missing in all of medicine, but intensive care, it gets amplified because of the critical nature of it. Text message. My children saved all their text messages. I have 20 hours of recordings at my bedside that my son used his iPhone. He worked on Capitol Hill for six years, so he's all attuned to that kind of stuff. My son, Cody, daughter, Sarah, they're going back and forth. "He's going for a pancreas ultrasound. Is this all pancreatitis?"

No."

Ten days. "It doesn't look like Pops has much more time left; supraclavicular node." She concludes, "I think he knows his lymphoma won't be treatable. I'm trying to do what dad taught me to do for a patient rather than do to a patient." And this old father doesn't even remember that I taught her that, but I take credit where credit's due. Now, my daughter is a pediatrician. What do pediatricians do? They worry about kids. I had two grandsons at that time. I now have four all out of this family. She wanted to bring the boys to see me before I died. So that you can see the punch line is she never been happier for following her gut and kind of forcing the children into my room to say goodbye.

The point I'd make here in this group is if a family member has an advanced illness, everybody in the family has an advanced illness. The ICUs often are exclusionary of -- because we're busy. I mean, we're that way. But it really was important to her. My daughter also finally said, "Can we get one doc to be the quarterback, at least in communicating? Because everybody's telling us slightly" -- it's that telephone game. You whisper to one person, and what comes back around. Family really wants to have a single individual to share the message.

Later in the course, I'm still uncertain if I'm going to live at this point. I'm really sick, and my daughter says, "I can list by name the ones who've made our stay comfortable." So if you think families don't know what it means to them, they do know. It's a very personal journey. Agitation, sleep, and PADIS guidelines, my son slept in the recliner in the corner of my IC room for almost 3 and a half weeks. He says from my nonmedical perch, he needs some peace and quiet. Every time they leave him alone, his numbers get better. I can tell you, after I recovered, I was back at work in 60 days. I'd actually showed up the first 3 weeks after my illness. I drove to the Dairy Queen 2 weeks after I was discharged. That was the test, 2 miles from our house. I was on weight gain diet because the dietitian told me eat a thousand extra calories a day. And I can tell you, if you ever get in the position I was in, I was on an apple fritter times 2 daily diet, a thousand extra calories. The only hard part of that diet is stopping.

(Laughter.)

Dr. Brown: Even now when I walk by the bakery and I see a fritter lying unattended, I struggle.

They would text ventilator settings back and forth. My daughter had to go home to her practice and her family. This was on the day that I
awakened. He says, "Dad's communicating; told the ICU doc, 'I won't fail. Extubate me.'" And I have to tell you, I had the little minimal strength to extubate myself. I refused to extubate myself because it was my unit and I wanted to set an example.

(Laughter.)

DR. BROWN: I think that's crazy, but that was inside thinking. Since this is an ICU sedation conference, my wife would send emails blast every evening. She's an introvert actually. So she would go home and sleep. My son would stay. Daughter would go. She'd send an email blast, and on this one on the 24th, the night I woke up it says, "I think he bothered his doctors so much, they put him on sedation for their sake, not for me." And I would bet you she had that parsed just about right.

So let me tell you now lessons learned, and I'll get off the stage. Algorithms aren't always expert. Physician judgment, two physicians in particular probably saved my life. Many contributed to saving it, but two in particular were not going to give up. And it's not that they beat me, but they saw further ahead than some of the busy docs did during this.

I've told you before, utilitarianism, we all let it creep next to the bedside. We all let it creep next to the bedside. Everybody needs an advocate. Often you need more than one advocate. It may be your nurse that night, it may be your family member, it may be a physician the next night, but you all need an advocate.

These thoughts are what I came up with my first week home after coming. "Care for me as a unique human being. Look me in the eye." And I say that mainly, the 7 months that I went through chemo with interferon and my hemoglobin was about 6 and a half or 7. My white count was often down in the 200 range. So I was getting intermittent Neupogen and erythropoietin.

The most meaningful experience I had was one of the laboratory techs that drew my blood weekly. She'd gone through an osteogenic sarcoma when she was 18. She was now about 28, and Gina and I, she'd always take me. She wouldn't let anybody else take me, and that was probably one of the most meaningful experiences in that illness, was having that personal connection.

"Don't harm me if you can help it. Don't let pain overwhelm me. Provide me with cutting edge care yet appropriate for me, my values and goals, and my finances." We almost never talk about that, but these were my thoughts the week after I got home at night. And I logged it in just so I wouldn't forget and start to make it sound better than it was.

This isn't my slide. This is out of the Harvard Business Review. In December '14, Drs. Mate and Compton-Phillips, Dr. Mate lost a mother at MGH, falling through the cracks after a hip fracture, I believe was what the setting was.

The problem in our healthcare system, it's fragmented. Some people said earlier, I think Denham did, that we sometimes work in silos. And for those who haven't heard me share the story, one of my mates used to say, "Those are cylindrical centers of excellence, and we all our cylindrical of excellence is the dominant one."

Advanced illness forces families and individuals to become their own care managers. Our blog this week out of Curadux is actually on healthcare coaching. The paper, Dr. Beamer is a researcher at Mayo and just published a paper on Healthcare Coaching at the Mayo Clinic.

I practiced there for seven years. They used to pride themselves on navigating anybody through the system. There were general internists that were the coordinating docs. If Mayo is starting to coach individuals to be their own care managers, the system is just about tipped. Powerful incentives, mainly revenue, top-line revenue dominates the unique values and goals and individuals. Futility and suffering rapidly increase. I can tell you that suffering is real in an ICU, but it's not all physical suffering. There's a lot of emotional suffering at that. But this is not my words. This is Mate and...
Compton-Phillips.

So with that, I thank you all for listening.

And at this point, my illness was a gift, and I see it in that fashion.

(Appause.)

DR. WARD: David, we'll hold questions till we do the panels.

Now, I think we've had the patient perspective, and now I think Dale will talk about how do we measure that patient perspective. Anecdotally is important, stories are important, but the broader perspective of multiple stories are also important.

Dale?

Presentation - Dale Needham

DR. NEEDHAM: A very hard act to follow, so I'll try my best. This is a case study not directly applicable to sedation, but hopefully there's some generalizable concepts. The work that I'm going to talk about was funded by an NHLBI R24 grant. That's a grant mechanism to create research infrastructure rather than to do original research.

With that grant, we're looking at creating outcome measures that should be used in evaluating the post-discharge outcomes of ICU survivors. We also were interested in how to retain these survivors in longitudinal research, so state-of-the-art cohort retention, and then statistical methods because these data are hard and complex, and Elizabeth Colantuoni will talk about some of that separately.

So what I'm going to focus on is one aspect of Aim 1, and I'm going to try to go through these points. I'm going to start with a scoping review to tell us the size of the nature of the problem that we're trying to address.

Within critical care, as you can see from the figure, there's a growing number of studies evaluating survivorship experience. You see the figure with the graphs going up. So we're very much interested in this, but out of the 425 papers that have been published on this topic, we're all measuring different outcomes.

Quality of life seems to be a pretty popular outcome; 65 percent of the 425 studies evaluated that, but only 6 percent of studies actually evaluated physical functioning through an in-person assessment of patients. So large variability.

There's sort of no standardization in how we think about the survivorship experience. This makes it very challenging for us to have comparable and consistent comparisons and representation of survivorship experience, and I think it really reflects that we don't know what's important, what our patient important outcomes. We're all sort of just measuring different things, but are there a core set of minimum things that we should always be measuring if we want to understand survivorship? So that's a key question.

The next question is how the heck are we going to measure these outcomes? Across 425 papers, there were 250 different measurement instruments. Within post traumatic stress disorder, for example, there are 70 papers that evaluated it. They use a whole host of different measures. This is like if we're going to measure temperature and somebody's going to use Celsius and somebody's going to use Fahrenheit and 10 other instruments with no crosswalks between them. We really can't bring the field forward if we're going to continue this.

Also, there's a big chance that important outcomes will simply get missed when we don't have a consistent minimum approach. It's difficult to compare results and to meta-analyze. These are our big issues, so the scoping review helps us understand the nature of this problem.

Now I'm going to talk about one approach to addressing these core sets and a number of subpoints, so a little bit of jargon. A core outcome -- and this isn't my idea. This is something that's happening across all fields of healthcare that lots of people are interested in what are called core outcome sets. A core outcome is a concept, health-related condition, or aspect of health that always must be measured within a field, so it's what you should measure.
1. measure it, so how should we measure it. So the
2. what and the how, those are two different questions
3. but related. Then the core outcome sets that
4. minimum set of outcomes that all of us agree to
5. measure as a minimum within a specific field of
6. study, and a core outcome measurement sets the
7. minimum collection of measurement instruments.
8. Importantly, this doesn't restrict
9. investigators from measuring a hundred other things
10. if you want. This is supposed to be a small,
11. feasible minimum set that we all agree to do.
12. Within critical care, this work that we did in our
13. grant is not telling researchers that everybody has
14. to measure patient outcomes after the ICU. Lots of
15. people got sort of upset about this. This is just
16. saying if you choose to do this, if this is
17. relevant to you, would you consider measuring this
18. minimum set of core outcomes with these measurement
19. instruments? That's sort of where this is trying
20. to address things.
21. To do this, we're going to need to
22. understand a few things. We're going to need to

1. tendency to forget a little bit more. My brain's a
2. little bit more scattered," so thinking about
3. cognition; a 67-year-old male at 6 months talking
4. about mood, "I'm a useless person and basically a
5. parasite. I have this emptiness inside. You
6. wonder why I should even wake up," then a 63-year-
7. old woman at 6 months -- or 9 months, still having
8. difficulty with swallowing and talking about how
9. she needs to relearn how to swallow her food so she
10. didn't choke. This is just a little bit of
11. examples.
12. The key findings to synthesize in a slide is
13. that patients' experiences seem to fall within
14. these categories, having physical impairments,
15. problems with mobility, pulmonary symptoms,
16. stamina, having mental health symptoms that we
17. thought fell into depression, anxiety, and concerns
18. around getting sick again; and then social health,
19. which really hasn't been looked at so much in the
20. empirical literature, but changes in employment,
21. and changes in being able to do your valued
22. activities.

1. understand, first of all, what are patient
2. important outcomes, how we might measure them, and
3. how we might make decisions. I want people in
4. critical care to stop saying we don't understand
5. patient important outcomes. I'm going to present
6. you a series of arguments to tell you that I think
7. we do.
8. I'm going to go through each of these points
9. and start with a qualitative research study that
10. our group did sampling patients from across the
11. U.S. We wanted to understand this experience of
12. acute respiratory failure survivorship. We had
13. 48 survivors recruited from 35 hospitals. They're
14. followed up around 9 months after follow-up,
15. starting with open-ended questions, and then
16. probing after the open-ended questions using the
17. PROMIS framework, that I'll talk about a little bit
18. later, to make sure that nothing seemed to have
19. been overlooked.
20. These are some of the experiences that
21. survivors reported to us in their qualitative work.
22. A 34-year-old man a year later said, "I have the
1 impairment across a lot of different domains, that
2 some survivors had a positive impact, and that
3 social health was important such as return to work
4 but not often captured in quantitative studies.
5 Then we want to take a different angle to
6 understand patient important experiences. We
7 wanted to understand these measurement instruments
8 that we commonly use, are they capturing what
9 patients think are important experiences. Here we
10 had a unique opportunity. We'd done that
11 qualitative study, and those same ARDS survivors
12 happened in a separate study to have had standard
13 patient-reported outcome measurement instruments
14 performed.
15 What we did is we independently looked at
16 these qualitative findings and tried to
17 characterize what some of the themes were from
18 those, and then compared these patient-reported
19 outcomes in those with and without symptoms that
20 were self-described in the qualitative research.
21 Patients may have described something that
22 sounded like mobility impairment when two

1 independent people looked at the qualitative
2 research. And we said for example, those that that
3 qualitatively described a mobility impairment, how
4 did their objective scores or their
5 patient-reported scores look differently? We did
6 the same with mental health and cognition.
7 For example, those patients that endorsed
8 having problems with mobility had much worse scores
9 when it came to two different measures of physical
10 functioning, the SF-36 physical component Score,
11 the EQ-5D mobility score. Those seemed to capture
12 the patient's experience.
13 Again, patients that qualitatively described
14 what independent people thought were anxiety or
15 depressive symptoms also had worse scores on
16 objective measures, HADS anxiety score, HADS
17 depression score, and ISR score for PTSD. So those
18 measurement instruments, again, seemed to have
19 captured the patient experience. But then when it
20 came to cognition, interestingly, patients
21 endorsing memory impairment compared to those who
22 didn't had virtually identical median scores across

1 objective performance-based measures of cognition.
2 Common measures that are used and actually
3 happened to be part of the core outcome measurement
4 set seemed to reflect patients’ experiences of
5 mobility, anxiety, depression, and PTSD, but when
6 patients are reporting cognition, they're reporting
7 something different than what we pick up with
8 objective cognitive testing.
9 So I think we need to think very carefully
10 about that. Patients may have objective problems
11 on cognitive testing, but not actually have any
12 insight into that, and vice versa.
13 Now we're going to move and think about what
14 clinicians perceive. Here we have two independent
15 Delphi consensus projects. These were sort of test
16 runs for our big Delphi at the end. Here we took
17 an international audience in the United States. We
18 had a hundred clinicians that responded to a poll,
19 and 44 of them were able to come to an in-person
20 meeting for a second round of voting. And after we
21 finished that, this exact same Delphi project was
22 completed in Australia, mainly with PTs, but the
domains to ask about.

This compares the American-based Delphi work with the Australian based. Importantly, there were signals across two different continents, two different populations, that these clinicians’ perceptions were that research studies should always be measuring survival, physical function, cognition, and health-related quality of life. We ask patients in a whole bunch of different ways. We now ask clinicians in a whole bunch of different ways to figure out these core outcomes.

Then finally, I'm going to talk to you about a survey that we did. We had 279 respondents. We had about 80 survivors from across the United States of ARDS and acute respiratory failure. We had 80 family members and 55 pairs of patients and families from across the U.S., and then we had 121 clinical researchers in this field from around the world, predominantly from Europe, some from North America, and Australia.

We all asked them the same question. We gave them those exact same 19 domains, and we asked them, should these be measured as a minimum measurement in every single ICU survivorship study?

Interestingly, the patients and family members thought 18 of the 19 outcomes are really important and should always be measured, so these have a lot of face validity with them.

Of course the researchers recognized that that probably wasn't feasible in terms of response burden, and universally researchers, except for survival, thought all of the outcomes were a little less important than patients and families. But if we triangulate and say what did they both agree on, they both agreed on physical function, cognition, mental health, and return to work or prior valued activities.

So this is a whole program of research with lots of different lenses to figure out what seemed to be important outcomes.

To triangulate across every single study that's been done, then, over several years, it seems like important outcomes are survival, physical function, cognition, mental health, return to work, and quality of life, across a whole series of different kinds of studies and different perspectives.

So we've maybe got some thoughts around that, but we're also going to need to think how are we going to measure these if we're doing quantitative, empirical research? We actually did another systematic review, and we found that there are only 20 studies ever published in critical care that looked at the measurement of any instrument for ICU survivors.

There's a dearth of data, and most of the studies using COSMIN reporting weren't high-quality studies or high-quality reporting. That spurned us because we had this grant from the NIH that allowed us to do at least a number of other psychometric studies, really aimed to help populate and provide data for the upcoming Delphi across a number of mental health fields and physical fields. We at least gave some more data to inform the field, and probably maybe almost doubled the number of studies that had been published ever before.

All of that's leading up to an international Delphi consensus process. All of that is just the prelude for the main thing. For people that don't know what this Delphi process is, it's a way of achieving consensus among experts when there is no empirical data or inadequate empirical data. We're just trying to get expert opinions and expert consensus.

To do this, we have to have a panel of informed experts, which we strongly believe needed to be patients and family members, as I'll talk about. Everybody in the panel needs to remain anonymous. The panel members didn't know who else was on the panel because we don't want one person to influence another person. What makes that different than maybe this meeting is the loudest voice or the most influential person has the same say in a Delphi as everybody else. We feed back iteratively results of the Delphi after rounds, and people can reconsider their results if they want, but it's all anonymized, and then we have an a priori criteria for what consensus is.
What this figure shows is, first of all, who's going to be on this panel. We used a lot of different things to figure out who might be on the panel. The way we finalized it is about half of the panel -- there is I think 77 members -- half of them were clinical researchers who were our target audience, but a quarter of them were patients and family members. A quarter of them were clinicians, and then a few were U.S. funding bodies.

We defined consensus such that one of those minority groups, patients and families or clinicians, could totally veto us reaching consensus. Even a portion of those family members thought that we're out to lunch, that we could not reach consensus. So they were about a quarter each and strongly empowered.

Because we used the InFACT umbrella organization, we had an official representative from every InFACT member group around the world. That means that the Asian critical care trials group, the African group, the Latin American group, the Greek group, whatever; every single organization provided a representative to give us some international coverage in terms of clinical researchers.

We also recognized that not everybody's part of a clinical trials group, so we also had some key leaders in outcomes research, and we randomly sampled corresponding authors from that database from the scoping review. We had federal U.S. funding bodies. And then we had patients and caregivers from Canada, Australia, the United States, and the UK.

We also had official representatives of critical care nursing, critical care medicine, and critical care PT from the same four continents. In the U.S., we also had international critical care groups, an official representative from the SCCM, CHEST, ATS, et cetera.

Those were who were part of this Delphi panel. We then presented to them outcomes. I gave all this stuff, but then we went to the panel with all that information I just presented and said, okay, here are 19 different outcomes. Are there any missing?

So they suggested 8 others, but as it turned out, none of those 8 others made it into the consensus. And we asked them to vote using all the data that I've just presented to you on what they thought were the core minimum set of outcomes that should always be measured, and they voted without thinking about any measurement properties of an instrument.

There might've been an outcome that had no instrument because the focus was what are the important outcomes? There may not be an instrument; there may not be a valid month. Let's just talk about what's important as an instrument.

Then, there are 2 rounds of Delphi for that around core outcomes, and we're so fortunate to have 97 and 99 percent response rates across the 2 rounds for the core outcomes, even with patients and caregivers.

We went on and did three more Delphi rounds to look at the measurement instruments, and what we did there was we presented to them 38 measurement instruments. The panel then suggested, well, there's 37 additional ones that they thought we should think about, so they got put into the mix for voting.

Every single one of those measurement instruments were summarized in a standardized way that we hoped were understandable to patients and caregivers as well. They often had videos showing how you do a 6-minute walk test, how long it takes, what's involved, what's the cost, and what are the psychometrics of the instrument.

Here for these 3 rounds of voting, we asked them to specifically look at feasibility, cost, measurement instrument, measurement properties, et cetera, and we had 91 to 97 percent response rates across the 3 rounds there.

How did this all turn out after this 5 years of work? The Delphi panel agreed on these 8 outcomes as outcomes that should be measured in every single critical care survivorship study: survivor; health-related survival; health-related quality of life; mental health; pain; pulmonary.
 Then for cognition, there is data showing feasible in large-scale studies. Should be made mandatory because they wouldn't be walk test, but the group didn't feel that those testing, grip strength testing, and the 6-minute consensus around standard manual muscle strength able to do in-person testing, the greatest wasn't going to be feasible, and we shouldn't make that was the best way to do it but felt that it wasn't going to be feasible, and we shouldn't make that a mandatory minimum measurement. So there was no consensus, but if people are that was the last date and a location of death rather than dead or alive at 90 days. No; you measure the exact date of death so you could do survival analysis if you want.

Health-related quality of life, they agreed on the EQ-5D measurement, which is small and easy. For those that want more detail, they agreed on the SF-36. They reached consensus; two different measures for mental health, hospital anxiety and depression scale, and impact of events scale revised that specifically measures PTSD. For pain, their consensus was don't have a new pain instrument; use the EQ-5D pain measure. On the bottom row, they reached consensus that there is no feasible way to measure pulmonary function. They didn't think surveys were appropriate, and they didn't think that we could mandate spirometry for instance so that every study had to include spirometry. We all know that that really isn't so feasible. So the consensus was there is no appropriate way to measure it. For physical function and muscle or nerve function, I read every single comment from every single participant, and there's this big tension between people wanting to do performance-based measures. So you have to have the patient in person, and you measure their strength physically, and you have them do a walk test. People thought that was the best way to do it but felt that it wasn't going to be feasible, and we shouldn't make that a mandatory minimum measurement. So there was no consensus, but if people are able to do in-person testing, the greatest consensus around standard manual muscle strength testing, grip strength testing, and the 6-minute walk test, but the group didn't feel that those should be made mandatory because they wouldn't be feasible in large-scale studies. Then for cognition, there is data showing that in our population of acute respiratory failure survivors, the mini mental status is very poor measurement characteristics, so there's no consensus reached. The greatest interest was in the instrument called the Montreal Cognitive Assessment scale, which has had very little valuation and didn't reach consensus because there's not a lot of data. There's a little bit of preliminary data that's come out that shows us that it may have some challenges. To put this in an easy to understand way, the Delphi panel agreed on measuring using these three instruments: EQ-5D, HADS, and ISR. This would be 42 questions, take 12 minutes in ICU survivors, and cost about a $1.50 per assessment. If people want to add on cognition, which we didn't reach consensus, it could add the MoCA BLIND, take a little bit longer, go on to deep dive and quality of life that could add in the SF-36, which would increase the cost, and the time, and the questions. If they want the Cadillac version, then they could do all of those at a cost of around $3 and about 26 minutes of time. All can be done by phone. It can be done in 15 different languages. All of these instruments happen to be available in 15 different languages. There are lots of other research agenda that I won't get into for the sake of time, but there's lots of other things. We recognize this as a very early start. There's a whole years and years of research to make things better. We also are actively seeking input from research participants, once they've gone through the core outcomes set, what did they think of the experience, and the same from the research staff. You just administered this small battery; how do you think it went?

This is the article that I talked about, the full-text article. We've got lots of information at our website if you're actually interested in this kind of research. And importantly, that website, if you're interested in measurement, this website has lots and lots of different measures, these standardized instrument cards.
I get emailed most days of the week with,
"Dale, how might you measure this? I'm interested
in doing a study of ICU survivors. I want to
measure cognition. How might I do this?" This
website gives all sorts of guidance on that. And
if you want to do your own core outcome measurement
set in Delphi, this gives resources.
If you're doing these longitudinal studies,
how the heck do we keep patients in these studies?
Again, there's lots of free tools. We've got a
database with more than 600 ideas for cohort
retention strategies based on unpublished studies.
We've got lots of tools that are free. This is all
funded by the NIH, free, everyone can use. We've
got checklists how to search for patients that have
become lost to follow-up, and then we've got lots
of statistical things that have been published that
Elizabeth will talk about a little bit later.
So lots of things out there. Hopefully this
is -- really, it's a case study. I know this isn't
directly related to sedation, but gives one way of
thinking about consensus, and one way of trying to
think about measurements. So hopefully that helps
inform things a little bit. Thanks.

Q&A and Panel Discussion

DR. WARD: We'll take some questions and add
Ingrid to the panel.

DR. SKROBIK: Dale, thank you a very nice
summary of a complex topic. Do you know if there
is a relationship between all of the elements that
you captured and societal impact and cost?

DR. NEEDHAM: Yoanna, is the question, if
somebody has problems in mental health, is there an
association between that and societal impact?

DR. SKROBIK: If I could take issue with
mental health as a term, I think psychological
wellbeing might be -- sorry for the -- because
you're traumatized beyond belief, and then you
recover, right? I don't think it's a mental health
issue. It doesn't make you schizophrenic. But I
think -- sorry for the -- I think we as physicians
don't talk about psychological wellbeing, our own

DR. FLOOD: It's an important aspect. I
just want to jump in, Denny [ph]. I'm Pamela
Flood. I know many of you personally. Denny asked
me to give you kind of a quick summary of -- I'm
here as a patient, of my experience as a patient.
I became ill around the same time as David
did, and I was working. Mervyn was my boss at
UCSF. I was the director of OB anesthesia and had
a background in preclinical and clinical research.
I'd been a plenary lecturer in Hong Kong the night before, and like an idiot, flew back, and I was on call the next night. I felt awful. I thought I had a sinus infection. But nonetheless, I showed up to call as good anesthesiologists do, but I was vomiting uncontrollably in the sink, and my very wise colleague said, "Sorry. You can't take call if you can't stop vomiting." (Laughter.)

DR. FLOOD: So brought me down to the ER where I was vomiting and had a small fever. They thought I had some sort of virus; maybe SARS because I had been in China, so they kept me aside from everyone else, and then shipped me over to Mount Zion, which is the less acute care hospital. But I had a severe headache, and a stiff neck, and a fever. And my husband showed up and insisted that they do an LP, which they did, and I had no cells but very, very high protein. So the long and the short of it is I had an autoimmune encephalitis. I was intubated for about a week. I have some memory of being lightly and deeply sedated with propofol. I have an amazing memory of my extubation on dex, and I have to say, Mervyn, it's a great molecule; I love it. I remember very, very clearly, very specific details. I remember Mervyn coming by. I remember Ted Eger [ph] coming by. I remember Larry Saidman coming by. I remember wondering if Mervyn was mad because I had missed some calls. (Laughter.)

DR. FLOOD: I remember feeling my chest go up and down and thinking, "Wow! That's so interesting. I'm on positive pressure ventilation." I remember I had some amnesia. I have a master's degree in neuroscience, and I remember, even intubated, thinking, "Wow! I have plastic hippocampal amnesia." It's really very short-term memory loss. But I didn't care. I did not care at all. None of this was worrisome to me at all. I found it intellectually fascinating, but I did not care. My experience, I was never -- well, I guess

I told my husband -- they told my husband I might die, but as soon as I woke up, I knew I wasn't going to die. So perhaps my husband should be here to give you a family perspective because, frankly, I had my own struggles coming back to work and recovering. But I think he has PTSD, and I think that's an important consideration. So just a quick summary to put my being here in context.

Mervyn?

DR. MAZE: Yes?

DR. FLOOD: By the way, were you mad at me for missing call?

(Laughter.)

DR. MAZE: No.

I have a question for Ingrid, and this follows on something I mentioned early to a couple of people, which is that you guys have done such a good job with these guidelines assessing the evidence, that you'll be taken over by machines pretty quickly, i.e., machine learning will do this for you or do this for subsequent generations quite well. But I worry about the patient qualitative aspect of it, where the evidence and measuring the quality of the evidence is going to be so challenging, yet so important, and something machines will not be able to do.

So I'd like to get your perspective of whether the qualitative behavioral aspects of the work that you're doing, will it achieve a level at which we now look at RCTs and meta-analyses, and so forth?

DR. EGEROD: Thank you for that question. I was very happy to be invited here because I have felt for the last 20 years, as a qualitative researcher that I'm a nurse and that very few physicians would ever read something written by a nurse. So I think it's tremendous that you're even asking the question because I've experienced that some doctors say, well that's interesting, but it's overwhelming that there is very little interest in the kind of research, asking the patients how they do -- if they want to have that kind of research, they want someone else like an anthropologist or some real scientists to do it.
So anyway, I'm very happy that there is concern about that. I definitely feel that it should reach status, maybe not equivalent to RCTs, depending on what is your measurement. I'm very aware that basically survival is number one, and you don't learn about survival necessarily from qualitative research, but I think it is so important.

Also, I feel that your whole study, Dale, shows that, yes, you can do these big triangulated studies where you do get something generalizable from a qualitative research, but it might not always be the goal. I think the human reaction is so individual that you always have to have somewhere in there that there is something that cannot be generalized and that has to be seen and understood in context.

So I think the two things should always go hand in hand. They're important in different ways, but they're definitely important to understanding why we want to survive.

DR. BROWN: If I could just weigh in, I think Ingrid has said it very well. It's both/and. We need the narrative pieces in here, but we need the algorithm to know where to fit a narrative in. But if there's anything I wished the health care system would do right now is put my values and Goals as a unique human being in the chart. You can't find it. You cannot find my values and goals in an electronic health record of Epic or any of the other commonly used ones. I'm just like everybody here, and you're just like I am, and we're very clearly not.

DR. FLOOD: I don't know how you would put your values and goals until an electronic health record.

DR. BROWN: You'd actually ask a question.

DR. FLOOD: I don't know how you would put your values and goals until an electronic health record.

DR. BROWN: Mona Hopkins at the back.

DR. HOPKINS: I want to go back to Yoanna's comment about the link between our outcomes and social outcomes, employment and funding. We don't have a lot in ICU. We have some hints there are interrelationships across these domains. But we shouldn't ignore the huge literature in traumatic brain injury that shows cognitive impairment is directly related to return to work and your financial status.

We shouldn't ignore the work and caregivers, and how that impacts family values, and we have some of that in the ICU and impacts their financial income. And we shouldn't ignore the work that comes out of our veterans and other people with PTSD, showing that that directly affects their ability to return to work and affects their financial outcomes.

DR. FLOOD: Steve?

DR. SHAFER: In terms of looking at the long-term outcomes, a lot of it is clearly based on reaching people by phone and by following up. I'd just like to ask you if that's becoming increasingly difficult. This is sort of a nuts and bolts question, but I watched Pamela, who's doing some phone outcome studies, curse at the number of people who won't answer their phone because it's going to be another spam call. And it seems that that's actually really consequential in trying to pursue this.

DR. NEEDHAM: So you're right. This is Dale Needham; a couple of methodologic things. With our studies -- and Mona Hopkins was a principal investigator with me on a lot of the work I presented -- we would have 2 call centers, for example, in Utah and in Baltimore, for phone, and then we would have a subset of the entire research network where we do in-person assessments as well.

I think they're both complementary and they're both necessary, but in-person assessments aren't feasible to do across a thousand patients with our current funding budgets. They're feasible. It's just people don't have enough money.

DR. NEEDHAM: Then how do you get people to answer the phone?
DR. SHAFER: So that's actually why, when I created this grant almost, whatever, 8 years ago or something, I insisted that aim around cohort retention methods. Peer reviewers weren't keen on it, but having done so much of this, I knew it was absolutely critical.

So we have lots and lots of different approaches to doing it. It takes an awful lot of work. For example, one of the key things is collecting contact information at the beginning of the study and making sure the contact information actually works.

We've got a study going on right now. We were given 3 numbers for a patient in Nashville. Two of the 3 numbers didn't work, then we were down to a single lifeline to connect to that patient. Two of the numbers didn't work to start with all because the patient had memory problems, and when they provided them to the research staff, they gave them wrong numbers.

So there are a number of best practices.

And in the studies that Mona and I've done that have enrolled more than a thousand patients from 48 hospitals across the country, we've had cohort retention rates of 97 percent at 6 and 12-month follow-up. So it is possible, but it takes time and persistence.

JP Kress was talking about it last night with follow-up work that they're doing in Chicago, and in-person follow-up work in disadvantaged communities that there are safety issues, and challenges, and things as well. But it is possible when we treat it like a science. We also design research strategies and budgets for doing this and hire the right kind of people.

The staff that do in-patient ICU studies are often not the same kind of staff that should be doing follow-up. They just don't have the mindset, and it's just something that most of them find uncomfortable, which is why we found that centralized call centers with specially trained staff often are a much more successful approach.

DR. FLOOD: I've already downloaded your deadlines and cohort retention.

Tony?

DR. ABSALOM: Tony Absalom from the Netherlands. A chap in the Netherlands has developed an app that allows patients to do longitudinal, quality-of-life assessments. It sounds attractive to me, but I'd be interested in your opinion because for myself, I worry which patients would be the ones that would respond and how many would. How many would respond to an email? How many would even look at email?

DR. NEEDHAM: I think it's very challenging. I think there's a huge selection bias. I think that our patients -- as JP and I were talking about last night, some of our patients that are the hardest to contact often fall into two categories. Some of them are completely great, back to work; "Why are you bothering me? I'm fine." And they don't even appreciate that the vast majority of survivors are not fine. They don't recognize they're an outlier, and they're busy, and they're back to their normal life.

The others are patients that have an awful lot of challenges. We've had patients say things to us like, "I just couldn't pick up the phone. I felt so down in the dumps that I just couldn't." But we are persistent, and then say, "Thanks for not giving up on me." After we've done our 50th phone call, rather than saying this to us, cursing at us, they say thanks for not giving up on me, or I knew it was important because you didn't stop calling. When we get trained in our social interactions, we believe that somebody is going to curse at us, right? But in fact that almost never happens, and it's the exact opposite.

So there's a huge selection bias around that. For each patient, we do need to take an approach that will work. Some are email responses and some use apps. In our experience, most don't use any of those things, and we found phone is the best way to -- and then you've got an idea of how much time and effort people are putting into the answers and are they understanding it. You're having a human connection. So we found that much more successful than an app, or email, or trying to
1 mail a questionnaire out to people.
2 DR. FLOOD: Yoanna?
3 DR. SKROBİK: I just wanted to ask all of
4 you what you thought of the value, the therapeutic
5 value, of the narrative in follow-up studies and
6 how to capture that. I was surprised when I did
7 the Towards RECOVER study with Margaret Herridge in
8 Canada, that patients were grateful for the
9 capacity to tell the story. And I
10 learned -- because, like most people, I knew
11 everything at 30 -- that if you tell the story in
12 your own words, that's part of the journey back.
13 I'm curious about people talk about the
14 burden, and in the Canadian critical care trials
15 group that I belong to with Lisa and others, the
16 nurses always worry about burdening patients with
17 follow-up studies, whereas my observation is that
18 some of them don't care, don't mind, but there's a
19 spectrum. Who are we harming, who are we
20 burdening, and are there any that we're helping in
21 those evaluations? I respect your thoughts.
22 DR. EGEROD: I think one problem we have

1 with a lot of the kind of narrative responses and
2 other interventions we do to try to help the
3 patients, like ICU diaries and other kinds of
4 follow-up, is that we often measure it on SF-36 to
5 get the quality of life, and they always show
6 nothing. It's very distressing, that we know
7 there's something out there. We know there are
8 some values out there. We know it's good to tell
9 your story, but we can't find the instrument that
10 shows the value.
11 DR. FLOOD: There are a couple of hands.
12 DR. BALAS: I think to follow up on that
13 question -- Michele Balas -- I'm wondering is it
14 safe, Dale, to assume that the core outcome
15 measures that you're suggesting for the long-term
16 follow-up, would those same measures be applicable
17 to use, like the pre-ICU, before ICU. I wonder if
18 we have that core set of measures because that's
19 obviously one of the challenges that we have. How
20 do you know this is different from their baseline?
21 DR. NEEDHAM: Yes, and that's a very tough
22 issue. We didn't tackle it at all, so I don't know

1 what the answer is. I can give you an opinion.
2 Sometimes we try retrospective recall using the
3 same -- a couple of the psychological instruments,
4 you can't use that, but the SF-36, you can say
5 think back to before the onset of the illness that
6 brought you in the hospital and score it.
7 We have some results that show that proxy
8 and patient results are quite different, so we
9 generally rely on patient rather than proxy. And
10 we've got some results that showed dramatic
11 differences that seem to have face validity, but of
12 course it's tainted by recall bias, and your
13 current state may influence how you see the past.
14 But I think that's sort of a starting point,
15 but I think it is a really big problem and issue.
16 I think there are some innovative studies happening
17 where there are ongoing large-scale prospective
18 studies -- Lauren Ferrante is one of many people
19 doing these -- where they're just prospective
20 studies and things are measured. And some of the
21 patients happen to end up in the ICU, and therefore
22 you have a truly valid prospective. But that takes

1 large-scale studies. You need to enroll an awful
2 lot of patients to get a few that go into the ICU.
3 DR. BALAS: Then I guess the question also
4 comes up with the validity and reliability of the
5 recommended core outcome measures in terms of a
6 patient that has known or preexisting cognitive
7 impairment. So now you have patients that have
8 cognitive impairment, and are the anxiety and the
9 depression tools valid and reliable to use with
10 someone with cognitive impairment? We always get
11 this by reviewers, and I don't know how to answer
12 it.
13 DR. NEEDHAM: Yes, exactly. I know that
14 there are no data, at least based on our systematic
15 review, in ICU survivors around that. I guess
16 whether they're preexisting, and then certainly
17 many patients have post-ICU cognitive impairment,
18 it becomes a judgment around the answers
19 consistent, and it becomes sort of judgment, which
20 stresses the importance of training the people who
21 are doing that, having lots of contact with Mona
22 and I working together -- Tim will chime in, in a
second -- when Mona and I talk together, if there are things that we're not sure about, we'll have a conversation as PIs and say what do you think of this?

DR. GIRARD: Tim Girard. I actually didn't have a comment but a question. I feel like it probably will sound like a loaded question, but it's not, and this is for Dale and Mona and anyone else. You've alluded several times to the lack of psychometric data on many of these measurements in this population. Can you tell us -- and when I hear that, I feel like you're implying that it needs to be done and that the measurement qualities may be different.

DR. NEEDHAM: I think a classic one -- and Mona can chime in; she's more expert than me -- is the Mini-Mental Status Exam is the world's most validated, most used screening question and seems to work well in lots and lots of populations. We then administered it in ARDS survivors against a reference standard cognitive testing and found that the performance characteristics were very poor. That's one example.

DR. HOPKINS: Yes. When we look at the MMSE, these were developed for elderly patients to identify dementia. And if you look at the ICU outcome studies, with one or two exceptions, the mean age in those studies is 52, which does not anywhere near meet the criteria of elderly. Certainly, most of the people who are 52 that are healthy and have no other disorders don't have cognitive impairments.

DR. FLOOD: David, I know you had a comment, and then a question from Richard.

DR. BROWN: I'll make it very brief. Yoanna had asked a question about narrative, and another personal experience. I think I wrote about my illness a lot. I think that was very helpful, but I can tell you, having watched my wife who I think...
still has PTSD because she thought she was going to
have to take me to dialysis for the rest of my
life, she finally, 6 years after the event, wrote
about it. And I can tell you, it was quite
liberating to her to get her feelings out about it.
So I think there's some healing that goes on
in those narrative descriptions.

DR. FLOOD: Richard?
DR. RIKER: Yes. A question for David and
Pam. You both implied a little bit the difference
in the sedation quality between dexmedetomidine and
propofol in a manner that I don't think we would
ever capture with a RASS score or time to
extubation. I wonder if you can embellish your
descriptions a little bit, or in physicians, how
would we capture this? What is it and how would we
capture it?

DR. FLOOD: Well, propofol, of course, it
depends how deeply sedated you are. While I was
deeply sedated, I have no memory at all. While I
was lightly sedated, it wasn't that it was
unpleasant, but I was very aware, for instance, of
time now, and I was very aware that I was not
sleeping. I appeared to be sleeping, and no one
could tell that I wasn't sleeping, but I was not,
and I wished I could go to sleep. In fact, I felt
fatigued.

Then on dexmedetomidine, I felt that my mind
was much clearer, and in fact I was even aware in
which ways my mind was not normal and not clear.
So I much preferred that feeling. In some
settings, a patient might prefer to be unconscious.
Something truly awful might be happening to them,
and they might have 5 million tubes coming out of
them, and that might be a period that would be
better to forget.

FEMALE VOICE: It depends on the person.

DR. FLOOD: Yes, it very much depends on the
person.

DR. EGEROD: We have a non-sedation regime
at one of our Danish hospitals, and we invited one
of the patients there to tell her story. She
happened to be a nurse from the same department, so
she also knew both sides.
1 absolutely think this is so important. Our
2 patients have a legacy of problems from their
3 critical illness. Some of it they bring in, some
4 of it’s their comorbidity, but some of it is
5 related to what we’re doing.
6 DR. NEEDHAM: There’s so much that goes on
7 in the ICU, and sedation is a small -- analgesia is
8 a small piece of it. Is there a detectable signal
9 in these measurements given everything else that
goes on in the ICU, or are we just going to pick up
10 noise and we’re not going to be able to
11 differentiate propofol versus dexmedetomidine
12 versus something new coming along in these?
13 DR. FLOOD: Pratik?
14 DR. PANDHARIPANDE: So going back to the
15 guidelines, when we are creating the guidelines and
16 creating the priority list as far as outcomes and
17 as a result of which we have a lot of the
18 conditional recommendation and low evidence, all
19 the outcomes that were deemed important align very
20 similar to the outcomes which were in the core
21 outcome group; not the set of instruments but the
22
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1 basic teams of cognitive impairment, mental
2 illness, et cetera.
3 So that’s one point. I feel that there is a
4 lot of similarity between what was identified as a
5 priority area in not a formalized Delphi method,
6 but a prioritized scoring that the experts and
7 patients did in the PADIS guideline.
8 So that was one point. I feel that there is
9 a fair amount of similarity, and there should be
10 little reason why we have to go far away from some
11 of the things that Dale presented.
12 The other thing is, looking at Dale’s
13 outcomes, which are related with acute respiratory
14 failure, if you look at one of the strongest
15 indication, at this point at least, that people
16 tend to use, they all seem to be linked. The
17 majority of patients in the ICU who are
18 mechanically ventilated are sedated, and they are
19 mainly in the ICU for respiratory failure.
20 So I think they’re all, again, hand in hand
21 with that regard, that these are all related, so
22 there should be very little reason I think for
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1 having very different outcomes versus what was
2 presented by Dale.
3 DR. WARD: We’ll go to lunch. We need to be
4 back here at 1 o’clock.
5 DR. FLOOD: Comment?
6 MALE VOICE: I’m sorry to interrupt. I just
7 wanted to extend a real thanks to Dr. Brown and
8 Flood for sharing these very personal stories. I
9 think to the extent that we can incorporate these
10 kinds of really deeply personal patient
11 perspectives into our research activities, we can
12 try to approach this aspiration we had as medical
13 students to be the kinds of doctors that are taking
14 care of real people. Those stories were really
15 thought-provoking, and I just want to thank you for
16 sharing them.
17 (Applause.)
18 DR. WARD: Back at 1 o’clock.
19 (Whereupon, at 12:07 p.m., a lunch recess
20 was taken.)
21
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1 AFTERNOON SESSION
2 (1:06 p.m.)
3 DR. WARD: I’ve asked Rich to -- there have
4 been a lot of great studies out there already done,
5 and there are some lessons that we can learn
6 different than the lessons from PADIS this morning,
7 but lessons really in the methodology on the great
8 studies that have been the foundation for
9 recommendation; and then Marti [ph] from the FDA,
10 who can help us a little bit with the FDA
11 perspective on the stuff we’re doing, because some
12 of this does end up on the desk of the FDA.
13 As Bob talked about, one of the initial
14 ideas at the FDA head to start ACTTION was how can
15 we improve the quality of the clinical trials that
16 are coming to us that we have to look at to make
17 the approval or disapproval for a new drug or
18 indication for that. So this is all about
19 improving the quality of clinical trials. Then
20 we’ll have a panel to kind of put this together and
21 talk about the current controversies and unmet
22 needs.
Rich, if you'll start us off.

DR. RIKER: Sure. Thanks, Denham.

Well, I've got the unenviable task of taking us from lunch, so hopefully I can try to keep you awake. It's a little bit daunting to give this talk. We all have very different perspectives, and there are some things that we're going to agree to disagree on, but I think we all carry a lot of evidence that it guides our decision making and also our study design approach.

What I'm going to try to do is to summarize not so much what the results were but maybe some things on the second or third level that may have confounded or potentially confounded some of our outcomes or our ability to interpret some of the studies.

So I'm going to go through some of the older studies and some of the more recent ones, tell them what you're going to tell them, tell them, and then tell them what you told them kind of thing. The control group is critical. Targeted level of sedation is important. Sedative versus other drug therapy, timing is everything, and then in the anticipation of the FDA holding the microphone next, I want to ask some provocative questions.

This is an old summary systemic review by Ostermann. The thing I want to have you look at, it's hard to read, but about the fifth or sixth column is mean percent time at sedation target level. If you follow that down through the rows, you can see that every study has some of that information. But if you look further to the right, time to extubation, length of ventilation, ICU length of stay, the majority of the studies don't have that.

So if we think back 15 or 20 years, the standard primary outcome for sedation studies was how often are you at that target level of sedation. If we look at some of the more recent studies, I think Pratik in their MENDS study was really one of the first to look at something more meaningful perhaps. So they looked at 12-day delirium-free, coma-free outcome. In SEDCOM, we kind of fell back to the percent time and target. MIDEX and PRODEX, the combined dexmedetomidine versus midazolam or propofol studies, looked at percent time and target but had a noninferiority design. Then Yahya in his SPICE study took the real leap and looked at 90-day all-cause mortality.

So we've seen a wide range of primary outcomes that have been targeted for these sedation studies, and I think it prompts a fair discussion about what should the primary outcome be as we move forward. So I want to back up now to one of the real pivotal studies. It's a little bit daunting to stand here and tell JP what he learned in his study, but I'll do my best.

This was really a groundbreaking study that randomized patients to either daily interruption or standard sedation, and also randomized to midazolam or propofol starting 48 hours after enrollment. The target sedation level, which is Ramsay 3 or 4, and in the group that was in the intervention arm, midazolam and propofol and morphine were interrupted daily. The patients were awake following 3 to 4 instructions or became agitated. If they did become restless or agitated and sedation needed to be restarted, it was started at half the previous rate.

I go through that in agonizing detail because many follow-up studies use this same approach, so I'll refer back to JP's study as the methodology for some of the other studies that we're going to talk about.

As you all know, daily interruption prompted a dramatic reduction in duration of ventilation, median ICU length of stay, and the need for diagnostic testing. One of the important things for this study now looking back is that if you look at what percent of the days on study patients were awake, in the intervention group, that was 85 percent of the day. But in the control group, it was 9 percent. That means that 91 percent of the days on study, the control group was never awake. That's an important control group aspect that we need to keep in mind when we look at these outcomes.
Interestingly, the drug doses were dramatically lower, intervention group with the daily wake up compared to the control group for midazolam, but there was no difference in drug doses between propofol, maybe reflecting to some degree the duration of effect that we see with those two drugs.

Now contrast that study, where the conclusion was clearly daily sedation interrupted improves outcomes, to a more recent study that used the exact same type of intervention. The study drug was interrupted. Drugs were not controlled.

The main difference in the study was that the targeted level of sedation was much lighter. Instead of a Ramsay of 3 or 4, it was a SAS of 3 or 4 or a RASS of minus 3 to 0, but the interruption protocol was exactly the same.

As you can see, the outcome here is the number of patients or the proportion who are extubated, and you can see those curves overlap.

The sedation scores, the mean scores were exactly the same in both arms of the study. There was no time to extubation difference, no difference in any of the other outcomes, but there was a difference in the amount of doses of drug that were given and the number of boluses that were given, and the workload for nurses was greater.

The conclusion from this exact type of study was the opposite; sedation interruption doesn't make a difference. In fact, it makes it more drug doses, more work for the nurses, and more bolus doses. So how do we reconcile those two things; same intervention to different conclusions? It's the control group. We need to really be thoughtful about designing a study and incorporating that control group. Is it the standard of care? How do we really want that comparison to look?

We know that there are a lot of studies out there in critical care where the control group difference made a big difference for the study. For partial liquid ventilation, remember the control group did much better than expected. For early goal-directed therapy, the control group did much worse than any other study of sepsis. So incorporating those kinds of concepts as we design these studies I think is important.

I think another component we need to be thoughtful about is the level of sedation. This is Pratik's wonderful study, MENDS study, where they randomized patients to either lorazepam or dexmedetomidine; allowed bedside clinicians to determine the level of sedation as was the standard of care at that time; and then post-study, grouped them into deep with a RASS of minus 3, 4, or 5 versus light, and found that the dexmedetomidine patients had more days free of coma and delirium or just of coma, but there were no differences in ventilator-free days, ICU length of stay, and almost but not quite 28-day mortality.

This is just the median and IQR bar graphs for the coma-free days, delirium-free days, or both. One of the findings of this study, which was different than the prior phase 3 and other dex studies that had been published up to that time, was that the dexmedetomidine group actually got a lot more fentanyl than did the control group. Many of the prior studies had suggested that dexmedetomidine was actually a fentanyl sparing type of intervention.

Pratik and his colleagues did probably one of the best graphs I've ever seen -- oh, how did that get in there? I'm missing a slide here; oh, it's here -- one of the best graphs I've seen, where they looked at the light sedation group, RASS of minus 2 to 1, and then on the bottom half, it's the deeper sedation group.

This compares the fentanyl doses in the two arms. It's a little bit hard to see, but the round dots to the left of each number study, day 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, are the dex patients and their fentanyl dose. The one to the right in triangles are the lorazepam patients and their fentanyl doses. And if you look at the bars that represent the median across the top there, they're very similar for the light sedation group, whereas for the deep sedation group, you can see a dramatic difference in that the dexmedetomidine patients were getting much more fentanyl.
1 I think the interpretation you guys had was  
2 that it was primarily -- because it's hard to get  
3 patients on dexmedetomidine  
4 deeply sedated, and the fentanyl was being used not  
5 so much as an analgesic but to try to get them into  
6 that target level of sedation.  
7 Is that fair?  
8 DR. PANDHARIPANDE: I think a little bit of  
9 both.  
10 DR. RIKER: Yeah. I think the take-home  
11 here is that although the study was randomizing for  
12 two different medications, the range of sedation  
13 targets may have affected the dosing of some other  
14 medications.  
15 So let me go back here because I think I got  
16 things a little bit out of sequence. Within the  
17 SEDCOM study here, one of the things to take note  
18 of is the stuff in blue. There we didn't let the  
19 bedside clinicians identify the level of sedation.  
20 We said it's going to be a light level of sedation  
21 in both arms of the study, so a RASS of minus 2 to  
22 plus 1.  
23 When we look at that, those patients were at  
24 that level of sedation to the same degree in both  
25 arms of the study. So because this was our primary  
26 outcome, it was a negative study. We didn't have a  
27 higher degree of compliance or time and target  
28 sedation in one arm or the other. It was ideally  
29 the same in both.  
30 It turns out that that was probably one of  
31 the best things that could've happened because then  
32 any future differences in outcomes -- time on the  
33 ventilator, incidence of delirium, any of those  
34 kinds of things -- could not be blamed on a deeper  
35 level of sedation, more coma in one arm than  
36 another. In fact, because they were sedated to the  
37 same degree in both arms, any of the outcome  
38 differences would better be explained by the drug  
39 itself or some other factor that we didn't take  
40 into account.  
41 So if we look at this, and with that same  
42 level of sedation in both arms, the dexmedetomidine  
43 group get extubated about 2 days faster and they  
44 had some other outcome benefits as well. So we  
45 went through that already.  
46 I want to talk about another trial where  
47 maybe it wasn't so much sedation; it may have been  
48 other things. And that's the study we all know  
49 well, the Strom No Sedation protocol. Remember  
50 there, patients were randomized to either standard  
51 propofol or midazolam versus no sedation.  
52 The no sedation group had some resources  
53 that are quite uncommon in the U.S. They had 1 to  
54 1 nursing. If the patient was not calm or  
55 comfortable with that, they could have a bedside  
56 sitter in addition. They could receive as much  
57 morphine as needed. They could receive as much  
58 haloperidol as needed.  
59 If they were still restless or agitated,  
60 they could get continuous propofol for 6 hours and  
61 get that up to 3 times. And if that happened, if  
62 they needed that 3 times, they would go on  
63 continuous infusion propofol. About 20 percent of  
64 the patients in the intervention group actually  
65 ended up back on continuous sedation.  
66 I think that's an important take-home for  
67 this model. They may have traded sedation for  
68 human resources to keep those patients calm and  
69 other medications, besides the sedative, to keep  
70 those patients calm. The outcomes were quite  
71 striking, more ventilator-free days, shorter ICU  
72 hospital length of stay, and almost a mortality  
73 benefit.  
74 Interestingly, I think this was not ideal  
75 from my standpoint. They excluded 27 patients who  
76 either died or were extubated in the first 2 days.  
77 Those are kind of important outcomes. I wish they  
78 had left those patients in. The whole  
79 intention-to-treat analysis is critical, but why  
80 did some of the patients get extubated and why did  
81 some of the patients die? I think those are two  
82 outcomes we don't want to exclude patients for.  
83 Yahya I think in his series of SPICE studies  
84 has shown us that timing is critical, the timing of  
85 sedation when we look at what kind of sedation  
86 we're giving and when in the ICU stay are we  
87 talking about. Almost all of the studies that I  
88 talk about up to this point have been done with
enrollment starting somewhere in the 24, 48, maybe even 72-hour time frame after being intubated. SPICE looked very early at these patients. Data started within 4 hours and really looked at during that first 48 hours in the ICU, a time that most of the other studies had ignored or not enrolled, was deep sedation a significant problem? They treated deep sedation as a continuous variable, the number of deep sedation events you had, and showed that time to extubation, time to delirium, time to hospital death, and 180 day mortality were affected by that incidence of sedation. This is a very similar analogous study done in a very different population of patients, which basically showed the same thing. If we look at the bar graph in the lower left here, the black bars are the first 48 hours. You can see there's really a trend to the right where many more patients are deeply sedated in that first 48 hours. The gray bars are the rest of their ICU stay, and you can see there a greater shift towards a RASS of zero where those patients are awake. I think Yahya really showed us that targeting a specific level of sedation after 48 or 72 hours may be missing a critical interval in those patients' care, so I think we'll have time to talk about that. There was another study that was designed very differently but also looked at that early time frame. This is Gerald Chanques study where they took a group of surgical patients, primarily abdominal surgery, coming to the ICU and randomized them within 2 to 4 hours of arrival in the ICU to either standard care with sedation, which turned out to be light sedation, versus immediate interruption of their sedation. When they interrupted sedation, they used a protocol very similar to the one that JP had designed and that Geeda Macha [ph] had used in the sleep study, where they only restarted the sedation if the patients were restless or uncomfortable. If they needed that, they could get on continuous sedation for 6 hours. If that happened more than twice in a 24-hour period, they left them on continuous sedation till the next day, and then they started over again. That interruption was associated with a dramatic reduction in time to extubation, 8 hours in the interruption group versus 50 hours in the standard care group, a dramatic reduction in the incidence of coma and a reduction in the incidence of delirium as well. So I think this early time frame in the ICU is something that we need to be cognizant of as we move forward and design these studies. I think we could draw some possible conclusions from these findings. Number one would be that the control group is critical to our understanding about the impact of intervention and we really need to look carefully at that standard care, or alternative drug, or whatever we want to design. I think a second important take-home may be that the targeted level of sedation may alter those outcomes in that this day and age, light sedation is probably the standard for many ICU patients. The concept of deep sedation in the ICU and who needs it is an area we've got very little evidence to guide us. I think we all have our biases about who we want to keep deeply sedated and why, but the evidence supporting that is not very great and probably is another area we need to do more investigating in, not so much with RCTs perhaps, but with other design approaches. The third point would be that the protocol must prevent or monitor bailout medications to avoid confounding our conclusions and perhaps even our outcomes. Then lastly, timing is everything. That first 48 hours is pretty critical. So I want to finish up, and I don't know if we're going to do questions now or do that after. DR. WARD: We will bring up the panel. DR. RIKER: Yeah. A couple of provocative questions, and I target these to each of us in the audience and also to the FDA who will be coming up next. One would be can we take placebo-controlled
ICU sedation studies off the table?  This is a
standard, embraced, religious almost approach to
study design that doesn't work in the ICU.  It's so
cumbersome to try to do a placebo-controlled
sedation study.  It has its own problems.  It's
nowhere close to the standard of care we provide.
So if we're going to include a
placebo-controlled group, I think there are many
issues with it we need to consider.  And I would
pitch -- again, I'm being a bit provocative here,
not necessarily telling you what I think.  I would
propose that we take that off the table.
Are we beyond time in target sedation zone
as the primary outcome?  I think we probably are.
I think that's no longer a reasonable primary
outcome.  It's not all that important.  It's an
important secondary outcome.  We need to know how
compliant people were with the various sedation
strategies, but by itself as a primary outcome, I
don't think we're there.
This one is maybe a little bit more
controversial.  Is mortality too high a bar for a
sedation study in the ICU?  I would pitch that it
is, that if we have a negative study with mortality
as the outcome, there may be many, many more
meaningful outcomes that we could consider
advantageous to us as clinicians, to patients and
their families, that we lose if that's our primary
outcome.  I don't know what the other alternative
right one is, but I would pitch to you that maybe
mortality is too high a bar.
This is another controversial one.  Does ICU
sedation really impact late outcomes?  Our patients
are so complicated with sepsis and renal failure
and a bunch of comorbidities that they come in
with, and various complications that are occurring
during their ICU stay that might or might not be
related to sedation.
How much of poor long-term outcome, poor
functional status can we blame on sedation?  Some?
All?  None?  I don't know the answer to that, but I
think it's worth asking the question.
I think to challenge the FDA a bit, is
resource utilization meaningful?  I've heard them
say at this meeting in the past that they don't
view it as a meaningful outcome.  I think it is a
meaningful outcome to us as clinicians.  I think it
probably is to patients and families.
So if we can get patients off the ventilator
or have greater ventilator-free days, similar for
ICU length of stay, discharge to home or rehab
versus death or skilled nursing facilities, those
are maybe more functional types of outcomes;
looking at short-term functional outcomes.  Then as
we talked about this morning, the great range of
patient-focused outcomes and priorities that we
need to consider probably need to be included
there.
I'll stop there.  Thank you.
(Applause.)
DR. WARD: The perspectives from when all
this stuff ends up on your desk.
DR. SKROBIK: Can I just ask a clarification
question, Rich?  When you pleaded for no studies
where the control group gets placebo, you didn't
mean that each should necessarily get a
pharmacological intervention.
DR. RIKER: If a patient doesn't need a
pharmacologic agent, I don't think they should get
one.
DR. SKROBIK: This can be part of what
you consider a no-placebo group.
DR. RIKER: Yes.
DR. SKROBIK: Thanks for clarifying.
Presentation - Martha Van Clief

DR. VAN CLIEF: Well, it's an honor to be here.

I found the conversation and the presentations very challenging to me on an intellectual basis. It's an incredible group of people, so thank you for letting me come here today. I'm an anesthesiologist by training. I don't have a huge ICU background, and it's been a while since I was in training. I'm here to give you a regulatory perspective, and I hope that I can add something to this conversation.

This is my disclosure statement that's required. This presentation reflects the views of myself and should not be construed as representing the views and policies of the FDA.

Just as a brief outline of what we're going to discuss today, I want to start off with some regulatory concepts, and then we'll move into talking a little bit more about defining the effect. After that, we'll talk a little bit about measuring the effect, and then we'll finish up with some requirements for marketing approval.

What does the FDA regulate? Obviously, you know that we regulate drugs. In addition, we regulate medical gases, which is kind of an interesting segment that we control, and also devices.

This is actually a timeline. I thought it was an interesting timeline because it gives you a perspective from the late 1960s to roughly around 2000 as to what drugs were approved that are used for sedation. A lot of these are used for sedation off label. The only drugs that are on label for ICU sedation include the propofol, the midazolam, and the dexmedetomidine, which are highlighted in red.

Obviously, since 2000, we're almost two decades later and we're still -- we haven't come up with any new options. We would love to see some new drugs come out to address the ICU sedation challenge as well as just sedation in general.

Among the compressed medical gases, there are gases called the designated medical gases, and these gases include the list there that you can see. The interesting thing is that nitrous oxide is the only agent with properties that might be useful for sedation, however, it's typically used for short-term procedural sedation, and that's an off-label use of that drug.

As an anesthesiologist, I was amazed when I first arrived at the FDA and started learning about these medical gases, that inhalational anesthetics are not medical gases; they're actually drugs. I thought that was a unique perspective.

With respect to devices, the FDA also clears devices for uses, and these devices would potentially provide an objective measure of brain function that might be helpful in the setting of ICU sedation. An example is the BIS monitor, which was cleared in 1996, primarily for use in sedation. It's been around for quite a while, and it's been studied in several different settings. I did find one publication in 2018 that looked like in patients with severe traumatic brain injury, that the BIS had some benefits over the RASS.

When we look at the FDA, the indications that have been used that incorporate the concept of sedation include the sedation, anxiolysis, and amnesia during therapeutic and diagnostic procedures, and that's the procedural sedation that's already been addressed through this organization, and also the sedation of intubated mechanically-ventilated patients for treatment in the ICU setting.

Let's skip this slide because you guys already know that. So I'm going to go on now and talk about defining the effect. This is a slide from probably -- most of you have seen this. It's the sedation continuum. It's like what we were taught as anesthesiologists about sedating patients for therapeutic or diagnostic procedures. Of interest, it's a pretty simplistic looking diagram.

It's like, okay, it make sense, but again, how do you define minimal, moderate, or deep? The FDA has never really even evaluated a medication for minimum, moderate, or deep. And as you mentioned before, a lot of these agents came...
out of anesthesia that were then used in the ICU.
That's another, I think -- I think there was some bias early on because they were using this type of approach.
Thank you, Denham. I know that I'm using the slide you used earlier, but I found this slide incredibly fascinating and a bit overwhelming.
What I did want to point out from this, which I thought was very interesting, is that this author described this triad of pain, agitation, and delirium as the ICU triad. He also made analogies to the anesthesia triad. So I liked that aspect, and I thought it was worthwhile to kind of think about that in terms of how to manage ICU sedation.
The goal of the anesthesia triad was to develop a balanced anesthetic. We were taught to basically always think of amnesia, analgesia, and muscle relaxation when we were planning an anesthetic for a patient. There are lots of different ways to achieve those things, but you want to have each element to actually provide a balanced anesthetic.

I had a colleague -- this was quite a while after I was out of training -- who decided to do a short-term case with just remifentanil in a young guy, and the anesthetic -- the vital signs were perfect, however, the patient remembered everything. So that was a good lesson in making sure you have everything covered.
The ICU triad that was mentioned in this paper includes the pain, agitation, and delirium with the goal of a coordinated approach. I know we're not really talking much about delirium, that's not a high priority, but I felt like it was worth putting into this -- just for the concept of the triad.
Pain is typically opioids, however, if a patient has neuropathic pain, you may be adding in different medications to help address that. Regional anesthesia is actually becoming quite a prominent option for pain management. Every since ultrasound-guided regional anesthesia came about, we've been putting a local anesthetic in the [indiscernible] plane we can find. So it may have a greater role in the ICU setting.
Agitation is really a normal brain in an abnormal situation, and that's where we've been using dex and propofol mostly. The delirium becomes a little bit more complicated because there's an underlying pathology of the brain. The problem with that of course is that there are risk factors associated with some of the drugs that we normally would give for sedation. Fortunately, dex has probably the lowest prevalence of delirium associated with it, but it's not without its own problems.

We're going to talk a little bit now about measuring the effect, and I think some of these were already mentioned, but I'm just going to go through them quickly. Challenges to ICU sedation sedation trials would be what will be the comparator. As was mentioned in the previous lecture, we're talking about will the comparator actually be the current practice since the combination drugs are usually what are utilized.

How will the patients be randomized? Will they be already on a sedation regimen or will it be something newly initiated?
How will you create standardization and protocols? This I think is kind of tricky because you want to standardize as much as possible, but you have to give people a certain level of flexibility because everybody has their own bias or own comfort level I should say with certain medications. How do you deal with discontinuations? Also, some of what's been obviously a very important part of the discussion today is how to measure long-term patient outcomes. Trial design, superiority has always been kind of the gold standard for the FDA because it's easier to interpret. But there are some other options. Besides just the placebo-controlled trial, you could use a placebo in an add-on trial and you could also use an active control. It seems like noninferiority trials are becoming more prominent; at least I've seen more of these lately. I know you guys probably already know what a noninferiority trial is, but the point...
is that the new treatment may have similar efficacy as a standard drug, however, it may offer some additional advantages such as fewer side effects and easier to administer.

Desirable attributes of an endpoint that we look for are the endpoint should be clinically meaningful. Does it give us a direct measure of how the patient feels, functions, or survives? Does it provides clinically relevant and convincing evidence directly related to the trials primary objective? Is it reliable, which means consistent and reproducible? Is it sensitive, which allows you to detect changes in the treatment effect? Is it readily measurable and does it reflect accepted norms and standards in the field? The endpoint should be carefully defined in the protocol with its rationale just to make sure that you're really measuring what you're planning on measuring.

What are the considerations when defining an outcome measure? These are also known as clinical assessments, and we want to know is the COA appropriate for a clinical trial intended for drug development? Is there an appropriate target population? Can it identify signs and symptoms that would constitute a clinically meaningful benefit in the target population if improved? And will it allow you to establish the magnitude of change in the score that will provide convincing evidence of a clear benefit?

One thing I've learned a lot at the FDA is statistical significance and clinically meaningful or not the same thing, and we are much more interested in seeing case reports that show us really a clinically meaningful benefit.

I went back and looked at our previous marketing approvals. It was pretty slim. Midazolam was approved in 1985. Diprivan, again, was initially approved in '89 primarily for anesthesia, but then it was approved in 1993 for ICU sedation. Precedex was our most recent approval, which was 1999.

Of interest, the assessment tools for the most recent approvals, Diprivan and Precedex, they used the Ramsay scale. However, as you are well aware, there are limitations to these drugs. Propofol has accumulation as well as the risk of PRIS. Dex can cause tachyphylaxis and adrenal suppression, and midazolam also has a problem with accumulation, and it may be a risk factor for delirium, so we're really in need of some new drugs.

I wanted to talk a little bit about the Precedex trial to give you an idea of how this was approved. Sedative properties of Precedex were evaluated into adequate and well-controlled trials. It was dexmedetomidine compared to a placebo control, and they evaluated the manner of rescue medication required to achieve a Ramsay sedation scale of greater than or equal to 3. One of the trials they used midazolam for rescue; the other, they used propofol. The duration of the trial was 24 hours.

We think that probably 24 hours is too short of a time; 48 would probably be more appropriate.

Obviously, I'll talk a little bit more about the Ramsay scale on the next slide.

What was interesting to me, when I looked at this Ramsay scale and what their criteria was, which was great than 3, I thought, wow, that's like a broad swath of sedation. It didn't seem to be very patient driven.

The other thing to determine was the fact that level 6 is comatose like we discussed, so really, what value is that, unless you need a patient absolutely still and unresponsive.

Fortunately, the scales have improved. As some of the studies that were previously discussed, there's a lot more granularity in this scale for two reasons. One, the Ramsay scale just has one number for agitation, whereas this gives you greater options for determining agitation. In addition, I like the fact that there are levels that respond to verbal stimulation, and then those that need a heavier level of sedation.

So I think that this obviously is a more effective tool, but I'm not going -- I think that
I'm not going to say that this is the effective tool. It's just a newer tool than the Ramsay, so obviously it was designed to give more information.

I'm not going to talk about this very much because you all know about all these assessment tools, and I've just created not a comprehensive list but just an example of the tools that are currently available.

Now, we'll talk a little bit about the requirements for marketing approval, and I want to talk about the CDER Clinical Outcome Assessment Qualification program to finish up. Marketing approval typically involves these elements, a robust clinical program; adequate and well-controlled trials, and typically it's two trials; to provide independent substantiation of the results. However, if it's not a new molecular entity, we may be okay with a single trial if it's a repurposed drug. We would just need a rationale for that, but what's going to be your clinical outcome assessment and is qualified? Qualified, we'll talk about in just a minute. If you do create a unique scale, that's fine, but you might want to consider getting it qualified through the program that I'll discuss in a minute. You'll need an adequate safety database, and this again will depend on whether it's a well known drug that we are familiar with or if it's a new molecular entity that we have to get more information on.

I'm going to talk a little bit now about the Clinical Outcome Assessment Qualification program. This is actually the website where you would go to get some information about this program. There is even an email address there that you can communicate with people at the FDA. I know this writing is rather small, but this tells you a little bit more about what the program does. It manages the qualification process, it works directly with the requesters, and it encourages collaboration and multidisciplinary interactions. Just to know, the COA qualification is basically a regulatory conclusion that whatever assessment tool you're putting forth, that it actually has psychometric features that we're looking for. This particular program, like I said, we're willing to let you design your own, but if it's not qualified, then it may take a little bit more work for us to agree with your study. That's all I have today. Thank you.

(Applause.)

Q&A and Panel Discussion

DR. WARD: I suspect there are going to be lots of questions, so I'd like to get a group up here on the panel who have had some experience of putting clinical trials together.

DR. SKROBIK: I have a question for Dr. Van Clief. I am heartened that an institution like the FDA would care about patients and their experiences. Do you ever invite people to -- in critical care, one of the challenges we've had over the years in doing trials is that ethics committees will often view ICU patients as being extremely vulnerable, and therefore forbid doing any kind of research rather than ask a question of these most vulnerable people. We've really been effective, across Canada anyway, in militating for having at least an ICU person come and pitch why it's so important.

Is there a process for that kind of clarification at the FDA? I mean it, because here you are. You adjudicate the fate of things that are game changers for people who want to implement whatever. I'm curious what your outside input is, if any.

DR. VAN CLIEF: Well, we evaluate studies that come in sometimes before -- they're called IND exemptions, so investigators take advantage of that approach. If they have a supportive IRB that feels like it's a safe study and we evaluate and we agree that it's something that we don't need to do under an IND, then that may be one pathway. But the other pathway I think that more addresses your concern is if you submit your protocol under an IND, we have an opportunity to give feedback and see how we can work with you to maybe make that protocol safe enough to go forward.
DR. SKROBIK: I apologize. I wasn't clear enough because I talked about two things.

DR. VAN CLIEF: Okay.

DR. SKROBIK: When you decide whether you're going to approve a molecule for use, you have an inside panel of experts like you and there are rules that you can go by.

DR. VAN CLIEF: Yes.

DR. SKROBIK: Do you ask anybody from the outside?

DR. VAN CLIEF: Yes, we do. We have -- I'll let my boss answer.

(Laughter.)

DR. ROCA: Hello. I'm Rigo Roca. I'm from the FDA and the deputy division director in the review division. So to answer your question, yes, definitely. Particularly, if we have questions about a new product, we're trying to figure out what it means, we definitely go through the development program with the sponsor and all that. But at the very end, we also have the opportunity for advisory committees.

Within the advisory committee, we have a panel of experts, but there's also a patient representative there.

There's also a section in the open public hearing where patients can come up and share their experiences, so what's important for them. The panel takes all that into consideration. The panel, the advisory committee members, then give us their thoughts and recommendations, and we assimilate the patient's information, the patient representative on the panel, as well as the committee.

So we definitely do that. But then there's also something else that we do, and recently, that you may or may not have heard is patient-focused meetings. These are actually listening sessions. We've had a couple. Most recently there was one for opioid-use disorder, which was interesting to find out what is important for a person who's suffered from opioid-use disorder. And as you can suspect, sometimes it's different than what we thought was important.

MALE VOICE: Gilles, I think you're moderating.

DR. COURSIN: Well, I think someone with a bow tie looks very professorial.

(Laughter.)

DR. FRASER: You'll notice there are lobsters here. That's no coincidence since I come from Maine.

Today we've had a wonderful series of presentations about the guidelines that we've presented and the primary data that were formed as a part of the guidelines, or actually the guidelines were formed from the primary data. We've looked at the methodology, and we've also looked at the outcomes and the metrics that were involved in getting those outcomes.

What I would like to open up with in this particular session is where do we go from here? What do we need to know in order to further the science?

DR. SKROBIK: Thank you.

MALE VOICE: Gilles, I think you're moderating.
1 DR. WARD: A question for Marti. I just
2 went on your website and looked at your COAs, at
3 least the PDF file that's up there. There aren't
4 any for any sedation. There's some for pain, which
5 is just a numerical rating scale or a visual analog
6 scale, but there's none that would apply to the
7 things we've been talking about through ICU
8 sedation.
9 Is it worthwhile to get some of these scales
10 that we've been talking about qualified? Should
11 the Ramsay scale be a COA, and is that worthwhile
12 to help future clinical trials to have that done?
13 DR. ROCA: I'm being told to say yes, but
14 actually the answer is yes. I think there are a
15 lot of advantages of having a qualified. As the
16 slide mentioned, it is a multidisciplinary team
17 that comes in and addresses it from all different
18 aspects. We have ongoing discussions with whoever
19 it is that is proposing to have a particular tool
20 or scale qualified.
21 So there is that ability, and then the nice
22 thing about it afterwards is that if a tool is
23 qualified, as you are indicating, then it's
24 actually something that we have already looked
25 through and vetted as being a tool that could
26 potentially be used in different kinds of clinical
27 trials. Obviously, as the last sentence in there,
28 it depends that it's been qualified for a
29 particular use and a particular population, et
30 cetera, as most tools are, but still it would be
31 something that would be useful.
32 Now, the other thing that was mentioned was
33 that if you have a tool and you haven't gone
34 through the qualification process, you could
35 potentially still use it. We would use the same
36 multidisciplinary team to do that and assess it,
37 but then it's a little bit more within the review
38 time clock, and therefore we may not be able to
39 have as much interaction.
40 Furthermore, it's already a done deal, and
41 there's a possibility that at the end of that
42 assessment, at the end of the review clock, we may
43 end up concluding that it probably was not a tool
44 that could have generated the data that they felt
45 it was generating. But that doesn't mean that you
46 can't use it; it's just that it might end up not
47 being as positive an outcome as you would have had
48 otherwise.
49 DR. MAZE: Can I ask a more structural
50 question or rather a foundational question? When
51 you have a scale like the RASS scale, which
52 obviously, as you said, is more granular, are the
53 biological foundations, neurobiologic foundations,
54 for those elements in the scale different?
55 In other words, when you're producing
56 sedation, you possibly need some different neural
57 pathways involved versus producing agitation, yet
58 you've got them in a continuum. Is there any
59 benefit in having a scale that is actually
60 continuous with respect to the neurobiologic
61 pathways that are involved?
62 DR. VAN CLIEF: That would be interesting to
63 entertain as a scale. I use that scale just as an
64 example of where we've come from the Ramsay to that
65 level. But I do think that whatever scale is
66 selected, you just really want to make sure it's
67 going to measure what you're interested in looking
68 at and studying. I think the scale you're
69 describing might be difficult to develop, but it
70 would be very good to have.
71 DR. MAZE: I was kind of surprised at the
72 acronym PAD and PADIS, that sedation isn't
73 mentioned there, as if they are the same thing. I know Yoanna is
74 going to say --
75 DR. SKROBIK: I was going to say the amount
76 of discussion around the acronym was subjective,
77 more energy than I would ever want to admit. We
78 didn't have Dr. Dworkin around --
79 (Laughter)
80 DR. SKROBIK: -- for cued acronyms, so this
81 was the compromise that had to do with branding
82 with the similarity of the PAD. But just briefly
83 to speak to the point of the sedation scale and its
84 validation, the FDA metrics don't reflect the
85 previous guidelines effort, where we actually went
86 through all the psychometric elements of all of the
87 scales.
We would take that into our review process, and we would know, to say, well, here's what we know; would you like to integrate it just now; the things that we have brought forward and that we have discussed and agreed on? I think that might be one.

DR. ROCA: One of the things of a meeting like this is that my role here is actually to listen, and my role would be to help facilitate the discussion, particularly if you have a question regarding the process of how do we do things, what do we need, and that I think might help the discussion. But with respect to a decision, yeah, this is what we need and this is what we should do, I don't think I can do that.

There are particular reasons for that.

Number one, this is not really an all encompassing audience, so therefore it would not be appropriate for me to indicate what would be regulatorily agreed on? I think that might be one.

DR. SKROBIK: You're talking about the scales.

DR. ROCA: Definitely, scales as well. It depends on what the company is proposing to have their drug do. And they come to us, and they have often asked us which scale we should use, and as you can suspect, we really don't have one that we can say, yes, this is the one you should use because it really depends on what it is that they're trying to have their product demonstrate its efficacy for.

So we usually tell a company that they can choose whatever scale they want, but they're going to have to be able to provide supporting information as to what that scale, or two, is the most appropriate one for the patient population, the indication, the drug, and all of those things. We would take that into our review process, and

One is we are you clinically achieving the effect that you want from what you can measure in the ICU, and that would be something like a RASS scale perhaps.

The other is then a more patient-centered thing; what was the sedation experience like? And as we heard from the earlier presentations from Dave and Pamela, that can be quite different with different drugs, and that would perhaps be an orthogonal scale that might be captured as well.

DR. FRASER: In order to get to that point, I think what you'd have to do is allow for wakefulness so that you can gain some feedback from your patient. And that is what I think is the next step in terms of the sedation scales. They really don't evaluate wakefulness, and they don't gather data or feedback specifically from patients.

So I would ask this group at some point in time, if there's appetite for revision of RASS or revision of SAS, to include a wakefulness algorithm such as what JP Kress actually developed in the New England Journal of Medicine.

DR. SHAFER: You don't need a different
scale on access. This is an orthogonal access to
assess something quite different.

DR. FRASER: Right. So you could use RASS
and then supplement it with wakefulness.

DR. EGAN: Talmage Egan. It seems that one
of the problems with these sedation scales that
have arisen for use in the ICU is that they don’t
seem to have methodologically as rigorous a
foundation just in terms of how they were
validated. In the procedural sedation domain,
although it’s got problems, the Modified Observers’
Assessment of Alertness and Sedation, the so-called
MOAS scale, has really sort of become the main one
used in clinical trials.

The reason is simple. There’s quite a
rigorous methods paper that quantified the
inter-observer variability, and there are also some
training materials that are available -- this was
alluded to earlier -- that one can use to train the
study personnel.

I’ve seen that there’s some room for that
here. There are these various scales. They seem
to be used because it's what other people have used
and there's lots of clinical experience with them.

But perhaps some quantification of the
inter-observer variability and some training
materials would be useful, especially as it relates
to quality controlling of the studies for
regulatory purposes.

DR. RIKER: There is data available for both
of the scales. The 2013 PAD guidelines highlighted
some of that, then there was a separate publication
that looked just at the psychometrics of the
sedation scale piece. There have been a number of
inter-rater reliability studies and some validation
studies. There are educational things out there.
So it may not be at the level of the MOAS scale,
but there certainly are things out there.

DR. EGAN: Experts in the area that do these
trials, are you guys satisfied with the overall
robustness of the scales? Are they missing some of
these attributes? What's the key piece that's
missing?

DR. RIKER: I'll give you my opinion. This
can give them a computer game, and can they flip
cards quickly and tell us they have 21? Can they
make executive decisions?

That again also morphs into what Steve's
referring to, which seems to be, I'm awake, but I'm
delirious, and that seems to have two factors I
want. Ultimately, in the ICU, we don't want you
jumping out of bed and hurting yourself. We don't
want you in bed if you don't have to be in bed.
And we don't want to be giving you something if you
don't need it.

Now, those are three simple statements, but
I'm not sure how to put them into a MOAS type
scale. Clearly, just tapping somebody's glabella
and having them blink was pretty simple; never
particularly well validated. That's Ramsay, which
had been the gold standard. I think the RASS and
SAS scores are a good stride beyond that, but I'm
not really quite sure either what we want by saying
wakefulness or whether we're necessarily going to
be able to quantify what we want.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 241</th>
<th>Page 242</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 DR. KRESS: I think Doug spoke to the same</td>
<td>1 different assessments of wakefulness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 question I was going to ask, is wakefulness a</td>
<td>2 Tim, excuse me, and then Pam. Tim, you had</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bivariate outcome or shades of gray? So I don't</td>
<td>3 a comment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 need to reiterate that.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 I actually have a question for Rich. You</td>
<td>4 DR. GIRARD: This is Tim Girard. I agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 talked about the importance of the control group in</td>
<td>5 with what Rich just said. Just to take that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 your review, and I think it's really important. As</td>
<td>6 thought even further, I feel like one area that we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 we move forward, of course the competition with the</td>
<td>7 have a gap is the relationship between all of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 control group continues to get tougher and tougher</td>
<td>8 various ways that we're describing, looking at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 because we learned things. That's good.</td>
<td>9 wakeupfulness or consciousness and the various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 As we think about moving forward, should we</td>
<td>10 outcomes that we and patients care about.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 think about control group as a regimented approach</td>
<td>11 For example, I think, Gilles, you're</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 or some people talk about this so-called wild type</td>
<td>12 referring to the process that JP used in his early</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 where you just basically let the care providers do</td>
<td>13 [indiscernible] sedation trial following commands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 as they wish. I wonder if you have any thoughts</td>
<td>14 There's definitely a lot of value in being able to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 about that.</td>
<td>15 follow a command. But for example, if your</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 DR. RIKER: It's a great question, JP, and I</td>
<td>16 decision is whether or not to extubate a patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 think the idea of pragmatic trials or adaptive</td>
<td>17 and if they're alert enough for that, I'm not aware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 trials, I hope we're going to talk about that later</td>
<td>18 of any data that suggest -- even though it's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 on in the meeting. I think it looks like we will</td>
<td>19 sometimes used at the bedside, I'm aware of no data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 be. But the old intervention control, RCT, power</td>
<td>20 that suggests that your ability to follow commands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 sample calculation, I think we're really bumping up</td>
<td>21 predicts your likelihood of passing and extubation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 into the limits of that for our population.</td>
<td>22 Alternatively, there may be other very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 You look at the complexity of our patients,</td>
<td>23 important patient-centered outcomes that are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 the varying populations we have, and I think it</td>
<td>24 related to your ability to follow commands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 makes it really hard to -- the concept that a</td>
<td>25 Certainly, a patient who is delirious often does</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 general ICU patient is interchangeable with another</td>
<td>26 not follow commands, and there are a lot of data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 general ICU patient, I don't think that works as</td>
<td>27 suggesting that delirium is related to both short-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 well anymore. So splitting, lumping, which is the</td>
<td>28 and long-term outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 right approach? It's pretty darn complex, but I</td>
<td>31 So the issue is quite complex, as we all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 think you're right on target that we have to ask</td>
<td>32 said, and I doubt that there's a single, easily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 that question. I don't know what the right answer</td>
<td>33 applied scale that's reliable that can capture all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 is, but I think we have to ask that question.</td>
<td>34 of this, the content of consciousness, the level of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 I want to say one other thing. Wakefulness</td>
<td>35 arousal. It's unlikely, in my opinion, that a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 may mean different things depending on how we want</td>
<td>36 single scale would do that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 to use that information. In other words, if we</td>
<td>37 However, the two scales that are recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 want to see is our patient awake enough to tell us</td>
<td>38 by the SCCM guidelines -- and I was not on any of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 how much pain they're having, or is the patient</td>
<td>39 the guideline panels, so I don't have any, I don't</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 awake enough to do a delirium assessment, that</td>
<td>40 think, bias in this respect. But both of those</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 might be different kind of wakefulness assessment</td>
<td>41 scales were very well validated. The reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 than if I keep my patient above a certain level of</td>
<td>42 has been studied in numerous environments and in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 non-wakefulness, do I reduce their long-term</td>
<td>43 numerous studies, and it's been shown that both the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 outcome problems? So different issues may need</td>
<td>44 SAS and the RASS are very reliable and that they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 different levels of wakefulness and potentially</td>
<td>45 are valid in terms of measuring the constructs that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>46 they were intended to measure against multiple</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 other reference standards. So I think at least for
2 what those tools are supposed to do, which is
3 measure level of arousal, then they are valid in
4 that context.
5 
6 DR. COURSIN: One thing from Pam as well is
7 the question of, okay, we want wakefulness. What
8 about restorative sleepfulness? I'd like you to
9 comment.
10 
11 DR. FLOOD: I'll answer that second. Not to
12 make matters more complex, but I was going to speak
13 to cognition because I don't think anyone really
14 wants to play 21 in the ICU. Well, maybe if
15 they're intubated, it's something to do. But
16 there's pleasant cognition and unpleasant
17 cognition. There's being peacefully sedated and
18 being aware of your surroundings, and then there's
19 being frightened, and distressed, and so on and so
20 forth.
21 So you might think of that as being
22 described with the continuum of sedation versus
23 agitation, but that's only the behavioral
24 manifestation. You might not know what the -- it's
25 very hard to know what the patient's feeling. I
26 think David and I both spoke to the feeling that
27 everybody thought we were asleep, but we weren't,
28 and we weren't able to sleep, and we were very
29 fatigued.
30 
31 So getting to your question, the more and
32 more I know about the nature of sleep makes me
33 realize I know less and less about it. But getting
34 real sleep in an ICU setting, at least from what I
35 understand in terms of people who study sleep, this
36 is next to impossible. So I think a better
37 question is what can you do to do the best you can
38 with that and to limit fatigue.
39 
40 DR. COURSIN: Denham?
41 
42 DR. WARD: In your discussion, you get a
43 little bit on inclusion criteria and exclusion
44 criteria. Well, one -- let's see if I'm quoting
45 this right -- would be that the first 24 hours is
46 important to the outcomes. For most of the studies
47 that you looked at it and I've looked at, too,
48 that's usually not an inclusion criteria; usually
49 it's after 24 hours. So it would seem like one of
50 the concepts that we're coming to is that patients
51 should be included much earlier into a sedation
52 study that is within the first 24 hours.
53 
54 Are there other inclusion/exclusion criteria
55 that -- I reviewed a number of studies just to
56 educate myself, and one of the things that I rarely
57 saw was a history of drug or alcohol abuse as an
58 exclusion criteria, that is, is withdrawal going to
59 be complicating the other measurement of these
60 things? But most studies never mentioned
61 opioid-use disorder as a premorbid condition or
62 alcohol-use disorder as a premorbid condition.
63 
64 What's your thinking about
65 inclusion/exclusion criteria?
66 
67 DR. FRASER: The more we exclude to try to
68 provide homogeneity in our cohort, the less
69 generalizable that information is. Maybe efficacy,
70 effectiveness, there are a lot of issues that go
71 into what you're trying to accomplish with your
72 study.
73 
74 I'm speaking way over my head here, and I
75 hope when Dan gives his presentation or our other
76 future discussions about design, we'll get to this.
77 But we've heard of adaptive responsive kinds of
78 studies and platform design studies that may allow
79 us to recognize specific risk factors and emphasize
80 them or better understand the role they play.
81 
82 Hopefully, as we move into the future, we
83 get away from this black and white intervention
84 control thing and more into design that allows us
85 to try to answer some of these questions, not by
86 excluding those patients but perhaps by including
87 them and building that into the design, so I don't
88 know.
89 
90 DR. COURSIN: Sir, in the back?
91 
92 DR. DWORKIN: Rich, my recollection is that
93 you and I first met at an FDA meeting on sedation
94 about half a dozen years ago -- it's a long time
95 ago -- that discussed both procedural and ICU
96 sedation. My recollection is that one of the
97 conclusions of that FDA-sponsored meeting -- this
98 was before ACTTION had anything to do with
99 sedation -- is that in the ICU setting, the target,
100 if you will, that patients would find most
101
1 desirable is calm and comfortable.
2 So being from outside the field and sitting
3 here all day, I'm a little surprised that that
4 meeting six years ago ended up with calm and
5 comfort being objective of ICU sedation. I haven't
6 heard that so far today. I've heard a lot about
7 sedation and a lot about agitation, but nothing
8 about calm and comfort.
9 Is that a reasonable measure to think about
10 developing, ICU calm and comfort?
11 DR. RIKER: Yes. I think everybody in this
12 room is going to give you a little bit different
13 answer, but I think from my perspective, the
14 evidence, especially six years ago, that supports
15 that claim is quite thin. It's a thing that makes
16 sense. We know the evils of deep sedation; we try
17 to avoid those. We have a little understanding
18 about the evils of not enough sedation, and
19 probably for the majority of patients, we err more
20 on the side of too much sedation rather than not
21 enough sedation.
22 But I think we've heard even within our two
23 patient representatives today how complex that
24 issue is and that there may be patients who are
25 awake and don't want to be that awake, or patients
26 that are calm but not cognitively intact enough to
27 be comfortable and want to be more awake, and our
28 ability to assess that and understand that is quite
29 limited right now.
30 So it's a great question, but I don't know
31 how much evidence there is supporting that concept.
32 DR. COURSIN: Dale, you had a comment?
33 DR. NEEDHAM: Just as a clinician, not sort
34 of an expert, I want to reflect back what I'm
35 hearing or my biases. I think that we've talked a
36 lot about sedation scales, but I think most people
37 agree that they're not patient-centered outcomes.
38 I think I've heard people say that we probably need
39 development of a patient experienced measurement,
40 which would be totally patient centered around the
41 type of sleep that would be complex to develop and
42 acquire time to develop, and think about, and
43 validate, and reliability.
44 But then we need to reflect on what is
45 patient centered. And for FDA or other purposes,
46 are we okay with something that's health care
47 centered? There may be something that there's no
48 patient-centered impact, but it reduces our
49 mechanical ventilation duration length of stay.
50 Are those four accurate?
51 DR. RIKER: One of the things I really liked
52 about what you said is that patient-centered
53 assessment tool. And ideally, that would be a
54 real-time assessment tool as well, not a
55 retrospective how was your stay in the ICU, so that
56 we could respond to that answer.
57 DR. NEEDHAM: To give you an example, we've
58 got an R01 from NINR looking at laryngeal injury,
59 and in fact when patients are awake, we're asking
60 about symptoms related to potential laryngeal
61 injury. And we've had to take other instruments
62 and figure out how can you do it in a patient with
63 an endotracheal tube in order to try to understand
64 the symptoms that patients are feeling and whether
65 those symptoms are then relevant to a subsequent
66 outcome; so I think a little bit about a process
67 there and how we may need something like that
68 perhaps to understand patient experience.
69 DR. COURSIN: Tim?
70 DR. GIRARD: Tim Girard. In theory, I agree
71 completely, Dale, but in practice, I think there's
72 a huge problem, which you, and I, and Elizabeth
73 have discussed extensively, which is that to
74 measure something like that in the setting that
75 we're discussing, you will have a huge amount of
76 missing data because there will be patients who
77 cannot respond at various times, and that missing
78 data may very likely be differential between
79 different treatment groups.
80 So I would agree that using a
81 patient-centered, real-time response would be a
82 helpful adjunct to understanding what the effects
83 of the different therapies that we're studying are,
84 but I would argue that it could not be a
85 stand-alone because you would end up with too much
86 missing data, and that that different data would be
87 differential.
88 DR. COURSIN: Michele?
DR. BALAS: I'm going to have to agree with that comment as well. I think it would be wonderful to have such a measure, but we're doing a small study right now, and we're just trying to measure anxiety -- again, the reason people give for giving sedation -- and we're missing it on over 85 percent of the patients because of their level of arousal. So to have a patient-centered outcome report, the patient would have to have some level of arousal, some level of consciousness, however we define that part, just to measure these other symptoms or to get their perspective. And what we're finding in clinical practice and with our work with the SCCM ICU Liberation outside of clinical trials, patients aren't at that basic level. Even though everybody's charting our goals, 0 to minus 2 right now, when you go in and you do those direct observations, they're charted minus 1, minus 2, and they're still deeply sedated. They're still in a coma, most of them.

DR. COURSIN: Dale?

DR. NEEDHAM: I would agree with everything. I think it couldn't be a primary outcome. It may be something that allows us to get some insight into that. I was talking earlier around meeting for mixed methods study so we actually get a qualitative experience, and I think it's maybe a tiny bit like delirium, where there may be a group of patients where we can't assess it and then there's a group that we can, and then we need to figure out what is the statistical method to look at these two different -- like where one group of patients can't even have it assessed, and that may mean something in whether it's compensated, or a two-part model, or I don't know what.

DR. COURSIN: John?

MALE VOICE: I don't think it could ever be a primary outcome because of that problem.

DR. DEVLIN: The other quick comment I wanted to make was in our PAD guidelines, we, obviously as everybody knows, found widely divergent restraint use, highly prevalent in the United States, very low in Europe. So I think that kind of plays a role; and with that, the nonpharmacologic things that could affect agitation, I think being certainly rehabilitation or mobility, and that whole interface that has really nothing to do with what we're giving for a sedative or could drive sedative use.

DR. COURSIN: Steve, you have a comment?

DR. SHAFER: It's a question actually. I'm having a little bit of a challenge here. It's a question for the entire panel. Let's say that I'm a magician and I can actually produce a drug that does anything you want. I'm trying to figure out in terms of what we're talking about here, what claim would you want that drug to be able to make to actually give you a better patient-centered outcome for sedation? A lot of ICU trials look at survival, which is a great thing to look at when you're in the ICU, and that's a wonderful thing. A lot of stuff in the area of sedation looks at surrogate endpoints, time to extubation, extubation-free days and things like this, but those are surrogates. What claim -- you've done all these clinical trials, FDA, introduced dexmedetomidine. What claim would a magical drug that I could give you make that you would actually study and then take to the agency, and the agency would say, yes, this is a valid claim to make for a product?

DR. COURSIN: I'd like to be 25 again, I'd like to know what I turn out, and I'd like to have a full head of hair.

DR. MAZE: In the dex trial, all we set out to do was to show that it was a sedative in the ICU patients by virtue of the reduction in risk of medication. That's not a very good endpoint as we...
now know. It just demonstrated that this drug falls into a particular class but didn't tell us anything about the effectiveness versus other drugs.

For example, the lack of that placebo-controlled group -- rather, the use of a placebo-controlled group with rescue medication was what we used rather than a more comparative effectiveness type of trial, comparing it against perhaps midazolam or propofol at that time. So I don't think we did a great job at defining the endpoint. It wasn't my idea, so I can criticize it.

DR. RIKER: I'll throw something out as a straw man, and then everybody else can weigh in. Maybe it allows you to be calm and responsive so you can say I'm having pain, I want to be more deeply sedated, there's an IV sticking in my left hip that hurts a lot, and doesn't have adverse effects like hemodynamic compromise, cognitive impairment, doesn't make your platelets --

DR. COURSIN: But it's not fair -- all the classics; it's not fair --

DR. MAZE: It sounds great, but we had a name for that. Remember, we called that cognitive sedation.

DR. SHAFER: But then how do you get that to become an FDA claim on a label?

DR. FRASER: You can measure the degree of participation in care that influences outcomes like early mobility for example. I think that's a measurable metric.

DR. COURSIN: Avery, do you have a comment?

DR. TUNG: Taking a page from the anesthesia playbook where most patients would prefer general anesthesia if you gave them a choice -- and in fact, we're finding in our hospital satisfaction with general greater than satisfaction with regional.

Here's a claim: allows deep sedation without any of the length of stay, long intubation, delirium, and outcome drawbacks of deep sedation.

There's a claim you could make.

DR. RIKER: But do you think families would buy into that? Would families want you to be in a box for 3 days or 4 days, and not awake and not responsive?

FEMALE VOICE: I'm not sure all patients would want that either. I wouldn't.

DR. TUNG: If your entire ICU stay would pass by and you wouldn't even know it was there, then that might not be so bad. There have been daily sedation interruption trials stopped because the families didn't like them.

FEMALE VOICE: It depends on the stress.

DR. VAN CLIEF: I just want to make a comment about the indication that goes into the label. It really is a description of what the drug does. And if you go beyond that and say, well, it provides a deep level of sedation and x, Y and Z happened, we won't necessarily accept that because those are promotional claims, and we're not there for promoting, but we want to describe what the drug does.

DR. SHAFER: That's what I'm sort of asking, for the outcome. What outcome that they can define and you can falsify; it either happened or didn't happen in the trial.

DR. VAN CLIEF: Right.

DR. COURSIN: Claudia, did you have something?

DR. SPIES: Yes, I have several comments. The point is I fully agree with what Timothy said also about the scores and all those things. I think that's validated, it's globally used, and I think in many settings it's validated. That's the first part.

The second part is I think it's not so easy to say that the scores are really those that, at the end, are the relevant thing because you haven't -- if you aim a RASS score, that doesn't mean you achieve it. This is one of the points.

Even if you try to achieve it, it's context sensitive. That means all the nurses, all the staff, 24-7 has to agree on that.

That means, also, if you have a sedation procedure that's really adapted to awake,
cooperative, calm, not anxious, whatever people, I think if you're really take that serious, I think you also have to do other things. That means other groups need to be involved, like physiotherapy for example. So if you don't use your muscles in the first 3 to 4 days, you also lose muscle strength. So it's a lot of composites that need to be defined, and I think what we need is a protocol violation of all studies. I think that's something I will try to have in all of the studies, how many protocol violations do you have due to all that noise you have, and then you make a decision how you can improve that. That's nothing that's bad for the study. I think that's very good if you do that.

I think I'm probably trying to convince my colleagues to do it. It's not so easy, but I think it's the way to be honest to the patients, and then not to get reimbursed at the end for the outcome. The outcome is a measurement. I think what's better is if we really stick to that what we researched. Then at the end, if we really do that, what we think we should do, and then at the end, we measure an outcome, and then we see if the patients really have these outcomes, and then we need to change the studies. But I think that's something -- the majority of the studies, at least what I read from all IPEC journals is that the point is that the protocol violations are not given. I know from my studies at least that it's not so easy to do it, and I can tell you I'm fighting with that all the years, and I need help for that.

I researched. Then at the end, if we really do that, what we think we should do, and then at the end, we measure an outcome, and then we see if the patients really have these outcomes, and then we need to change the studies.

But I think that's something -- the majority of the studies, at least what I read from all IPEC journals is that the point is that the protocol violations are not given. I know from my studies at least that it's not so easy to do it, and I can tell you I'm fighting with that all the years, and I need help for that.

DR. COURSIN: Yoanna?

DR. SKROBIK: I think there's a dichotomy in what I'm hearing over the last several points that were made between the wish to find one dichotomous administration and the need to individualize, and to individualize not only based on patient preferences. I would consider being sedated deeply a violation of my personal rights, and I know 50 percent of my patients would disagree with that.

How do you then choose one answer if the population's that different?

The technology assessment unit at McGill has just gone through the exercise of asking the question, what should determine what you consider standard or the best, as decreed by the technology assessment unit, but it also applies to drugs. And they've come up with a very interesting model that doesn't actually look at the evidence in specific populations but integrates the contextual elements that you talk about.

You have a donor in one institution that wants you to study fear and anxiety. Well, maybe you're going to add that to your questionnaire in that institution because then it will be reliable because you're going to have an extra $19 million to do it.

So with the adaptability, considering the inter-individual variability between the patients receiving the intervention, the carers giving it, and the specific institution -- I can't get my head around the dichotomy between the one model, what would the FDA recommend, as if there were one model, and what I'm hearing about there being many -- the personalized approach, whether for the individual recipient or the individual place.

DR. COURSIN: Mervyn, you had a comment?

DR. MAZE: I actually have a new question if you don't mind.

DR. COURSIN: All right.

DR. MAZE: We've spoken exclusively, really, about symptom mitigation versus disease modification. I presume in the ICU that is a problem because you're dealing with a plethora of diseases. But I would hazard a guess that inflammation is consistently present in your ICU patients, and I'd like to hear an ICU patient that doesn't have that.

So to what extent are their attempts to modify the disease in order to mitigate the symptoms?

DR. COURSIN: Well, there's a huge trail of tears of failed therapies that have attempted. And one of the major problems was everyone was a single magic bullet, anti-tumor necrosis factor;
interleukin 1; complement this, complement that.

It also speaks to the fact we've had one drug in my lifetime approved primarily for ICU use, and I'm still waiting for the first therapy that we can absolutely say was developed in the ICU that made a bit of difference. But older, sicker people survive in the ICU. We don't know why.

DR. MAZE: Right. I think my view of where the immunology, inflammatory response field is going is that this magic bullet, this anti-inflammatory, whether it be anti-TNFα, or Cox inhibitors, or whatever it is, is that that approach is in fact not the correct approach because it interferes with some of the repair processes that have to occur. And what's more, you often don't know where the patient is in the inflammatory response at any one time.

So I think the problems with that TNF-alpha sepsis study could be that there was such a heterogeneity of the patients at where they were in their SIRS or non-SIRS. But the field now has gone to inflammation resolution rather than anti-inflammatory, and that's a big difference because what you're saying is we're going to trigger a new response in the patient or we're going to enhance the existing responses in the patient's recovery from that inflammatory process.

DR. COURSIN: A lot of food for thought.

I'm getting a signal from the boss that we are at a break time, and we will have to get to the question I have about controls later. But thank you, everyone.

(Appause.)

(Whereupon, at 2:37 p.m., a recess was taken.)

DR. WARD: The last session, for lack of a better term, will be kind of a deeper dive into the clinical trial design, both for drugs but also for protocols. That's why I wanted Leanne to participate, because it's not just about trials for new drugs. Protocols in the ICU are an important part of improving care. It may not be something that ends up at the FDA, but it is something that is important to having a repertoire.

We'll start out with Dan. Presentation - Daniel Sessler

DR. SESSLER: My assignment was to talk about protocol design or trial design. Of course most of you do trials, so my challenge was to think of something that wasn't completely obvious to everyone in the room.

What I'd like to talk about is five major trends in clinical trials. One of them is towards large size, and this is a recognition that small studies give fragile results that often prove to be wrong. The second is towards composite outcomes rather than having a single outcome, and there are two reasons for this. One is that it reduces sample size, and perhaps a better reason is that a composite can better characterize the totality of an intervention's effect.

Third is factorial design, which is an efficient way to do studies and allows you sometimes to do two or even three things at the same time at very little additional cost. Then adoptive designs, which are essentially ways to incorporate information that becomes available during this study, either externally or from the trial itself, into the trial design, and therefore to make sure that the trial fully addresses all available information rather than following a protocol that might have been designed years ago.

Then finally, I want to talk a little bit about novel trial designs that require altered or waived consent.

Let's start with large trials. How big a trial is really matters. I'm going to give you two examples here. These are only slightly disguised real studies. They were both published in the New England Journal of Medicine granted 20 years apart, and these were both studies of interventions to reduce myocardial infarction after non-cardiac surgery.

The first study had 200 patients. There was one infarction in the treatment group, 9 in the placebo group that gave a relative risk of 0.11, and the p-value was 0.02. The second trial had 4,000 patients. There were 200 events in the...
This trial while statistically significant, no effect whatsoever. Biologically implausible -- to almost 1, which is 0.25, which is a factor of 4 reduction -- this is unthinkably high.

Yet, the confidence intervals range from about 0.05 to 0.95, which is a factor of 19 reduction. This is a huge trial. I suspect there are not many people in this room who have done a 500-patient trial.

In the first lowest one, N equals 500. This is statistically significant result. 500 is a large trial. I suspect there are not many people in this room who have done a 500-patient trial.

Yet, the confidence intervals range from about 0.05 to 0.95, which is a factor of 19 reduction -- this is unthinkably high.

In the first lowest one, N equals 500. This is statistically significant result. 500 is a large trial. I suspect there are not many people in this room who have done a 500-patient trial.

Yet, the confidence intervals range from about 0.05 to 0.95, which is a factor of 19 reduction -- this is unthinkably high.
1. of the values will be more extreme, that is the p-value will be smaller, and you will consider those to be replications. But half the time, you will have less extreme values and a larger p-value.
2. So a p-value of 0.05 means that you have a 50 percent chance of replicating the study. That is a coin flip. That's not actually very helpful.
3. A reasonable question then is how extreme a p-value do you need to actually have a 95 percent chance of replicating the study? You get that answer by sliding this bottom curve to the right until only 5 percent is less than your original observation. Then what you do is you take the peak of that and you trace it back up to your original, and you read off the p-value. It turns out to be p = 0.0003. It's really small.
4. So why on earth do we use a p-value of 0.05 as our criteria for significance? It's a mistake of history. It came from a misunderstanding of what p-values really mean. It never should have been the p-value. The p-value probably should have been 0.001, and if that were the p-value, it'd be a lot harder to get a positive result, it'd be a lot harder to publish papers, and our literature would not be crammed with rubbish the way it currently is.

(Laughter.)

DR. SESSLER: Next, composite outcomes.

Composite outcome is any group of outcomes; for example, a cardiac death, myocardial infarction, nonfatal cardiac arrest. These are usually used for dichotomous outcomes, and the reason people use them is that it allows a smaller sample size. The reason it allows a smaller sample size is that the number of patients you need for a study with dichotomous outcome depends mostly on the treatment effect -- but that of course is beyond your control -- and partially on the baseline incidence of whenever you're looking at.

So if you have a composite outcome and you're looking at lots of things, the incidence goes up. The incidence of a composite is always higher than the incidence of the components of a composite.

1. Now, that's not actually the best reason to use a composite. The real reason to use a composite is that it better characterizes some intervention. Take for example a drug treatment for diabetes. It doesn't really make sense to say I'm going to do a study of an intervention for diabetes, and I'm going to make blindness my primary outcome and amputation secondary, and renal disease tertiary.
2. These are all important outcomes, and anybody who had diabetes would be interested in all of them. This is a perfect example of when it makes sense to have a composite of blindness, amputation, renal disease, and heart attack, the four major things maybe that diabetics worry about because it characterizes the disease well.
3. Now, one thing you have to be careful of with composite outcomes is heterogeneous results.

A perfect example of this was the original POISE trial of beta blockers, which had a composite of myocardial infarction, and stroke, and death.

Well, myocardial infarction went down with beta blockers, significantly; stroke went up. So the two components of the composite were going in opposite directions.

When you have that, you have an interaction term, and it doesn't make any sense to average them together. It doesn't make any sense at all to average an increase in stroke with a decrease in myocardial infarction. So when you have that, you have to split it apart. And the trouble is that most trials are not powered at that point because one of the reasons you used the composite was to reduce your power. So if you have heterogeneous results, it's very likely that you'll end up with an underpowered trial.

The most common way of dealing with a composite is a so-called collapsed composite, which is a fancy way of saying all are none; that is if any one component is positive, one or more components is positive, you say the composite is positive. If you take that approach -- and it's by far and away the most common approach -- then there are two rules you have to worry about.
The first is that the incidence of each component has to be at least roughly comparable, because if you have one component that, say, is 10 times as common as all the others combined, effectively that becomes your outcome. That's all you're looking at, so you can't do that. The second thing is that the severity of the components has to be roughly comparable. So it does not make sense to have a composite of, say, sternal wound infection, abdominal abscess, wound dehiscence, and urinary tract infection.

You see this all the time. This has been published lots and lots of times, but it makes no sense. Urinary tract infections are 10 times as common as the others, and they're about a hundred times less serious. That essentially is saying a urinary tract infection is the outcome, but that's not what people care about, so that's a bad composite.

Now, you don't have to use a collapsed composite or an all or nothing composite. You can evaluate the number of components that are positive. It's not a common approach but it's one that you can use. A better approach, at least to take care of different incidents, is to use something called the average relative effect, which was popularized by our statistician in Cleveland at MASHA [ph], and that's a way of looking at the average effect of each component independent of incidence.

You can also weight the components. So if you have some components that are far more serious than others, you can essentially clinically weight them and say, I'm going to conclude urinary tract infections, but I'm going to count them as 100th of a deep sternal wound infection because I don't think it's very serious.

Third trend is towards factorial randomization. Factorial studies are really powerful because they allow you to evaluate two or more outcomes with only slightly more effort and patients than you would have for a single one. It also allows you to evaluate the interactions between different interventions.

Suppose you're looking at two different sedatives. You would like to know if each sedative is effective, but suppose you show that each sedative is affective? Any reasonable clinician would turn around and say, "Okay, what about if I combine them? Do I get better efficacy with less toxicity?"

Well, let's say you did a 500-patient trial of one sedative, and it shows efficacy and not too much toxicity, then you do a 500-patient trial of the second sedative; again, efficacy and not too many complications. The clinician asks you, what if I combine them? Do you have any information? You have no information whatsoever because these are separate trials, but suppose instead you had done a factorial trial where patients were randomized to the first sedative, the second sedative, to the combination of the two sedatives, or to nothing? Then you could evaluate independently what each one does and what the combination does. If you have enough patients, you can evaluate the type of interaction; specifically,
in each group. But in fact there's absolutely
nothing wrong with looking at the clonidine plus
aspirin versus placebo plus aspirin. Aspirin drops
out of the equation here. It's like being over 60.
It just drops out of the equation. And by
definition, by the way it's randomized, you have
exactly the same number of people with aspirin in
each group. So in fact, you can do your analysis
across all clonidine patients and all placebo
patients, 5,000 of each.

Exactly the same thing applies for aspirin.
Again, the most logical thing would be to do
aspirin plus placebo, but there's absolutely
nothing wrong with doing aspirin plus clonidine or
aspirin and placebo, and that allows you then to
look at clonidine plus placebo -- aspirin with or
without clonidine versus placebo with or without
clonidine. You don't care about the clonidine; it
drops out. It's a baseline factor. So you can use
all 5,000 patients for your analysis.
The trial with the most factors that I know
of was Christian Apfel's study of PONV. In this

trial, we actually had 6 different factors, but
I'll present just three of them here, the three
drug antiemetics.

This is an example of how you can study the
interactions. On the top, you have the amount of
nausea and vomiting with no intervention, and then
you have the effect of any one intervention, any
one antiemetic, and it turns out that they all
provide a 25 percent risk reduction. But then you
can go on and look at the combinations. You can
look at all three combinations of the antiemetics,
and again, we had almost exactly a 25 percent risk
reduction, and then you can look at all three, and
again, it's a 25 percent risk reduction from the
previous condition.

So large factorial randomized trials are
powerful, not only because you can look at multiple
things simultaneously without much increasing
sample size, but you can look at the interactions
and determine whether they are additive,
antagonistic, or synergistic.

DR. SHAFFER: What was on the left?

FEMALE VOICE: I was going to say, why
Marilyn Monroe?

DR. SESSLER: Oh, yeah. The risk factors
for nausea and vomiting are female gender, opioids,
nonsmoking, and a history of motion sickness.
(Laughter.)

MALE VOICE: She under-fits in that picture.

DR. SESSLER: Next up is adoptive designs.
Adoptive designs are relatively new, and there's
been a shift in thinking. Until fairly recently,
the thought was that you should design a protocol
and it was essentially written in stone. You
registered the protocol, and even if the trial took
9 years -- and I would hate to tell you how many of
our studies have taken 9 years -- you couldn't
change anything. You had keep everything exactly
the same.

There is now increasing recognition that
things happen during trials. Things could be
external, for example, other people publish
relevant work. Maybe somebody else publishes a
trial that's almost identical to yours, or it's

similar to yours in a different population, and
they get some answers, and the answers might be
about efficacy, but they might be about toxicity
also, and it might be about toxicity in a specific
population.

Well, if you now know that a certain subset
of the population of your trial is especially
sensitive and especially likely to have
complication, it would be unethical to keep
enrolling them, so you have to make changes.
But similarly, suppose you know that a
certain subset is more likely to benefit? You
might well say, okay, I did start with something
different five years ago, but now I know more. Now
I'm going to change my trial to target a group that
seems to especially benefit from whatever
intervention I'm evaluating.

So you could alter the study population.
You could restrict enrollment, or perhaps broaden
enrollment, or somehow change the enrollment
criteria to enrich the population for efficacy and
reduce the risk of complications. You can also do
1 things like adoptive randomization. You can change
2 the treatment ratio. You could give more people
3 the drug; fewer people placebo. But if you’re
4 testing two different drugs, you also could say,
5 I’m going to focus on the drug that’s looking best,
6 and it might be data for internal for your trial.
7 From an interim analysis, you can say, okay,
8 one of these treatments seems to be far better than
9 the other one. I’m going to play the winner, and
10 that might be just dropping one of them, but it
11 might also be saying I’m going 2 to 1
12 randomization. So instead of having 1 to 1 to 1,
13 you might have 2 to 1 to 1 type of randomization.
14 An example of adoptive design that’s common
15 in anesthesia is the Dixon up-and-down method for
16 determining volatile anesthetic potency. The way
17 those studies are done is that you start with some
18 essentially random dose. You give it to the first
19 patient, and at skin incision, you see whether the
20 patient moves or not. The movement is unconscious.
21 It doesn’t hurt the patient, although it looks
22 spectacular. If the patient moves, then you

1 increase the concentration. If the patient doesn’t
2 move, you decrease the concentration.
3 So it doesn’t matter whether you started too
4 high or too low, you very quickly move down to
5 about the average anesthetic potency and then you
6 start bouncing around there. This is classic
7 adoptive design, and it’s been used in anesthesia
8 for a half century, but we’re beginning to use it
9 in other contexts as well.
10 Another thing you might change is sample
11 size. When you start a trial, you do a sample size
12 estimate, and you use best available information in
13 estimating sample size. But the most important
14 contributor to sample size is treatment effect,
15 which of course you don’t know because the whole
16 point of the study is to determine the treatment
17 effect.
18 Very often you’re wrong, and mostly people
19 are overly optimistic about guessing what the
20 treatment effect is or they adjust the treatment
21 effect to get a sample size that they can do before
22 the end of their fellowship or what have you. The

1 trouble is that biology doesn’t care. Treatment
2 effect is whatever the treatment effect is going to
3 be, so it’s not uncommon to get most of the way
4 through the trial, and it’s absolutely obvious that
5 your trial is underpowered.
6 It is not really very logical to sort of
7 slavishly go ahead and say, okay, well I said I was
8 going to study 239 patients; that’s what I’m going
9 to do. There’s a certain logic in getting to 150
10 patients, picking what data you have, re-estimating
11 sample size, and saying I’m going to go to 325
12 patients, which is what I’m actually going to need
13 to make a reasonable conclusion.
14 Now, of course it has to be transparent and
15 you have to disclose this. Ideally, your protocol
16 would have this in the statistical plan. So right
17 from the beginning you would say we are going to do
18 interim analyses. We will re-estimate the sample
19 size as necessary and increase treatment effect, and
20 should be done somewhat independently from the
21 investigators. We always do this on a group
22 A/group B basis. We do it without knowing which
getting routine care. You only get consent in
patients who are randomized to the experimental
treatment. The danger of course is that some won't
consent, and they may consent non-randomly and with
bias.

The final type of novel design, which I
think we developed, so I'm fond of this, is an
alternating cohort study. This is like a clustered
trial, except that the clusters instead of being
randomized in space are randomized in time. And
basically what you do is you do some treatment for
a period of time, like 2 weeks, and then you switch
to the alternate treatment, and then you switch
back again, and you keep doing this for, say, a
year.

Since there's no reason that patients would
be in any particular 2-week block, it is a
controlled trial; you're controlling the exposure.
Even though the exposure periods are not randomized
and certainly the individuals are not randomized,
it's a trial design that's easy to implement. It's
inexpensive. It allows you to enroll very large
numbers of patients. We've done a bunch of these
now with thousands of patients. It costs almost
nothing, and they have a lot of the protections of
a randomized trial at a tiny fraction of the cost.
I'm going to skip the rest of this, so thank
you much.

(Applause.)

DR. WARD: We've been talking a lot about
drugs, but protocols are very important. So
Leanne's going to fill us in a little bit more on
design for protocols.

Presentation - Leanne Aitken

DR. AITKEN: Thank you.

Yes, so my thought is very much that we have
spent all this time talking about drugs, and
absolutely we need to find the right drugs, but we
need to look at how we're giving the drugs because
the best drug in world, if we're giving it in the
wrong way, we're not going to achieve the outcome
that we want to achieve.

Largely, what I was asked to do was to talk
about some of my experience in doing predominantly
these Cochrane reviews, although I have done a
couple of studies in the same area, so I'm
obviously informed by that, and I'm informed by
some of the more recent work that I'm doing in
looking at some of this sedation as well, and I'll
bring that in later in the time.

Bearing in mind that the first of these
Cochrane reviews was done six or seven years ago,
so the protocol was written eight years ago. And I
look at it now and think I'd write it very
differently now to what we did back then. We just
did the revision, which was published last year.

My learning from that is that if you end up
in the situation where most of your studies are
individual patient randomized studies, and then
there's one cluster randomization trial that needs
to be included, run as far as you can. Don't hang
around or pay a statistician a large amount of
money because it becomes a nightmare when you've
got one cluster randomized study to go in the
review, which was the situation in this case.

When I'm talking about protocols directed
sedation, what I'm talking about is where the
sedation has been ordered by a physician and is
implemented by nurses, pharmacists, or others.
That was our provision, but the reality is all of
the sedation protocols are implemented by nurses in
the review that we've included.

The protocol should contain information on
the sedative agent or agents to use, and when to
commence increase, decrease, or cease sedative
agents. It should be in some way based on patient
assessment, and it might include other
interventions such as daily sedation interruption.
It's similar to but distinct from a weaning
protocol, so there are other studies that look very
specifically at weaning protocols that are not
included in here. The likely mechanism for
improvement of a sedation protocol is simply
through reducing the individual variations, so
getting people to work more consistently towards a
target.

This is the bit that I now look at and
think, yes, I'd probably choose some different
outcomes if we were starting afresh at this point,
but these are the outcomes that we identified about
eight years ago based on what was available in the
literature at that point and where our thinking was
at that point. So some of them are still not
consistently in the literature, but this was the
drain list at that point, where the primary
outcomes were either duration of mechanical
ventilation or mortality, either within the ICU or
within the hospital.
The secondary outcomes -- and I've got no
idea why that's appearing in both. Oh, no, that's
length of stay, not mortality; sorry, I'm reading
wrongly. The secondary outcomes were length of
stay, total dose of sedation, adverse events within
the ICU, incidence of delirium, incidence of
tracheostomy, some post-hospital outcomes along the
lines of memory, psychological, or cognitive
function, and quality of life. And I'll talk just
a little bit about how often we found those
outcomes in the studies.
In the review that we published last year,
we included four studies, and in those four studies
were a total of just over 3,000 patients. The
study that bumped up the numbers, because that's a
fair size patient number for four studies, was the
pediatric cluster randomized protocol study that
Martha Curley led that was published about three
years or so ago, so that is a big study sitting in
the middle of this.
But you can see that all of the studies had
measured duration of mechanical ventilation in some
form, and I'll talk about that in a moment. Two of
the studies had ICU mortality; three had hospital
mortality. All of them had ICU length of stay;
three of them had hospital length of stay. Two had
self-extubation and one had reintubation. And
obviously, they're getting at the same concept but
are slightly different. And then one had
tracheostomies in there.
When I said duration of mechanical
ventilation, one of the challenges that we had to
deal with was that in the various studies -- and
there were only four, but duration of mechanical
ventilation was defined either as duration of
mechanical ventilation, or time to extubation, or
ventilator-free days in the first 28 days, and that
obviously created a huge problem for us.
Now, fortunately we were able to get from
the authors some consistent data that we could then
do a meta-analysis, but it wasn't necessarily the
format that was published in the study in the first
place. So I think we do need to think about what's the
right version.
To this point in time, there's been no
sedation protocols that have studied, that have
looked at, total dose of sedation or any of the
risks of that list that's there. Obviously, those
outcomes have been measured in lots of other
studies, but not many studies that's been comparing
different versions of sedation protocols. It's
worth reminding you that this is a Cochrane review,
so it was only RCTs. There are some other
observational studies that do have some of these in
there but not much.
Total dose of sedation is an interesting one
1. Absolutely no benefit and if anything harm, whereas other studies are a long way on the benefit side.

2. This was the original Brook study. Now, particularly given my background is the one study that does go on the harm side, is the study done by Trace Bucknell in Australia, and we have a setting that is very well known for having 1 to 1 nursing at every bedside, having 70 to 80 percent of our nursing staff with post-graduate qualifications in critical care, probably a different environment to the other three studies that are done in the North American setting. So it raises the question a lot about context, which I’ll speak about in a moment; so certainly inconsistent results across those contexts.

3. Some of the factors that we think affect this are things like what’s the usual practice; how much implementation was there of the intervention?

4. In other words, it’s all very well and good that we’ve set out what the intervention is meant to consist of, but was that actually achieved. And as I said, what were the staffing types and levels.

5. Earlier today, I mentioned that I’m a co-app on an RCT for dexmedetomidine versus clonidine versus usual care. My role in that is to lead the work strain for process evaluation. So even in an RCT of a drug, we have a whole work strain that’s looking at how are we implementing this drug, how are we actually achieving what we think we’re achieving? I guess on reflection, I realized that that’s very UK oriented language in thinking about process evaluation, but it’s in essence how well implemented was the intervention.

6. So I don’t think of things like total dose of sedation as being an outcome measure. I think of that as a process measure now. So particularly for something that is a behavioral intervention like the sedation protocols are, I think it’s vital that we have some detail process measures about what the context is and what the intervention fidelity is; in other words, how well implemented was the intervention.

7. What was the dose of sedation that we achieved? One of the things that we’ve noticed in looking at some other work around depth of sedation is that there’s no agreement on how we should be measuring depth of sedation. So is it the average daily dose of various drugs? Is it what sedation measure was achieved? Or is it some sort of calculated measure? And there are a couple of variations on sedation index that you can find.

8. I’m not sure at something like percentage of time at sedation target because achieving a sedation target of a RASS of minus 4/minus 5 versus achieving a sedation target of zero to minus 1, both of them are completely achieving the target but very different sedation states. So I’m not sure it tells us much about the depth or the dose.

9. Certainly, talking about coverage or rate, how many of our patients got the intervention that was intended? Did we get to all of our patients, and did we get to them in a timely manner?

10. Just recently, Lydia Emerson, she’s about two seconds of finishing her PhD, but she’s developed a model for process evaluation in critical care studies, including RCTs of drugs, but critical care studies more broadly. I know that’s a bit difficult to see from the size, but she’s talked about there being elements that you need to look at during the baseline period of the study, the exploration period, and then during the study. And then to clarify at the end of the trial with the thought being that these data will help us better implement the study as we go, but perhaps more importantly, help us to explain the results at the end of the study.

11. The elements included in her model are context, attitudes and perceptions, fidelity, dose, reach, recruitment, and then level of
1 implementation. In one of the recent ICU studies that's just been finished in the UK, which was the POPPI study, which was a nurse-delivered psychological intervention within the ICU.

5 They applied this model to that, and on first analysis, which is all that's available at this stage, it looks like those sites that had a higher level of implementation had more effective benefit, even though the study as a whole didn't find benefit on the straight RCT. So they're going to do some more analysis to see if that measure of implementation is valuable. We're applying it to the A to B dexmedetomidine versus clonidine study to see if that can help us there. So I raise that as many of the elements that particularly in a behavioral intervention like a sedation protocol I think is absolutely essential.

My thoughts in moving forward -- I've raised a lot of the questions as I've gone through, but I think in thinking about the patient-centered outcomes, that we need to be obviously thinking those that are ICU focus but then those that are hospital focused and those that are long term. And in sedation studies, we're going to be thinking across all of those.

6 My strong emphasis is that whatever outcomes we have, we also need what I've referred to as process measures to help us explain the variation in outcomes that we get to at the end. That's interesting that Lydia said in one of the ventilation studies, where she was leading the process evaluation, most of the co-apps on the study couldn't work out what the process evaluation was all about and couldn't really see the benefit until they got to the end and got no difference in the statistical analysis and said, "Oh, now we need to look at the process evaluation" and work out what was going on. So it wasn't quite the right way around, but that's certainly what she's found in getting to the point where those measures became important. So I'll leave it there.

(Dr. Ward: Before the panel and we get to ask all the questions, my reading of the literature is one of controversial statistical measures that people use, particularly when you get to things like composite outcomes. Hopefully, they're going to enlighten us.

22 DR. WARD: Before the panel and we get to ask all the questions, my reading of the literature is one of controversial statistical measures that people use, particularly when you get to things like composite outcomes. Hopefully, they're going to enlighten us.

5 Presentation - Elizabeth Colantuoni

6 DR. COLANTUONI: I hope so. Do you guys want to stretch, a 4 o'clock stretch before the statistics talk? Highly recommended. Feel free to stand while I'm talking.

10 I should just start by saying that sedation trials is somewhat out of my wheelhouse. I've been involved much more with long-term observational studies and randomized trials within ARDS populations, and now getting a little bit more into trial setting within the context of delirium.

16 Leanne gave such a nice summary of the literature.

17 I was reading up into the published trials, so I'm going to highlight some of the outcomes that she just mentioned.

20 But here's just a schematic of the standard design. Intubated and mechanically ventilated patients are enrolled and randomized to receive one of two pharmacologic agents representing sedatives and then administered those drugs through extubation, and typically followed through ICU discharge and perhaps through hospital discharge, at least accumulating length of stay.

6 The whole time that the patients, then in the ICU and moving through hospital discharge, death is a potential competing risk. In my reading of the literature in these sedation trials, it looks like death is 30-day mortality, ranging from anywhere from 15 to 30 percent, so a pretty high rate of mortality in these populations.

13 Identified endpoints from my quick look -- and many of these just popped up on in the prior presentation -- is that primary and secondary endpoints are highly variable. They range from proportion of time; reaching the sedation target and goal; duration of mechanical ventilation; ICU and hospital length of stay; and mortality and delirium. But there's a lot of inconsistency even in just primary endpoint definition across trials, let alone a wide range of variation in secondary
endpoints.

Today I'm going to talk about how to operationalize delirium as an endpoint within this setting, so that will be the first part of the talk. Secondly, in reviewing some of the protocols and ongoing trials, you see some additional duration of follow-up in the sedation trials, maybe perhaps extending to 3 months or 6 months post-randomization, where we're looking at longer term mortality, but we're also starting to measure functional outcomes similar to what Dale described earlier today.

These could be measures of physical function, either self-reported measures of physical function or actual, like hand-grip strength -- those sorts of things could be included here -- mental illness or mental health measures, and then quality of life.

So my talk is going to talk a little bit about how we operationalize delirium as an endpoint and the statistical challenges there, and then separately I'm going to talk about the challenges in evaluating these longer term functional outcomes, particularly within the context of this competing risk of death.

I want to highlight here before I move on, the competing risk of death is not just affecting delirium and these longer term functional outcomes. Our evaluation of duration of mechanical ventilation, ICU, and hospital length of stay are also endpoints for which mortality has to be considered.

This paper that I'm highlighting here is a paper from a bunch of colleagues at the School of Public Health at Hopkins. It's just a nice review of the differences in the statistical methodology available to compare relative hazards versus relative risks when there's a competing risk of death. I find myself going back over and over again to this manuscript to remind me of all the definitions.

Delirium as an endpoint, up until a few years ago, my primary exposure with delirium was thinking about delirium as an exposure and correlating delirium with subsequent outcomes in patients. Dale approached me a few years ago and said I need you to write a statistical analysis plan. The endpoint is delirium, and I had no idea what to do with proposal. So we were evaluating an ancillary study to the SAILS trial, which was a multicenter randomized trial evaluating the use of rosuvastatin versus placebo, looking at patient mortality and duration of mechanical ventilation in patients with sepsis-associated ARDS.

The data we had was an ancillary study, so within a small number of sites. Delirium was measured daily up to death, ICU discharge, or 28 days. Our goal was to try to operationalize delirium as an endpoint, and then make a comparison between delirium as an endpoint across the two treatment groups.

I'm going to walk through my thinking around developing this statistical analysis plan. We utilized statistical approach that was different than what was the predominant approach in the literature at the time. Our paper appeared, the actual analysis appeared in Lancet Respiratory Medicine in 2016, in January, and then there was a subsequent series of commentaries, for which I responded to one where I just had a highlight of some of the statistical challenges.

Delirium, as many of you in this room are experts in delirium, so talk correct me where I get off course. But this is a state that's in constant flux of change. Your delirium outcome can change over the course of hours or days. Here I have a hypothetical patient. Time zero is enrollment, randomization, and then we're following the patient for 28 days. The zeros and 1's above the time scale are just indicators of when the patient was evaluated and whether they were observed to be delirious.

Second, delirium occurs along a continuum of
1. severity, and you cannot assess delirium when a
2. patient is severely impaired. When a patient is
3. comatose, we're not able to do a delirium
4. assessment. For this particular patient, we see
5. the first 2 days, the patient is comatose and
6. unable to be assessed for delirium. Once the
7. patient is not in a comatose state anymore, we have
8. 0-1 indicators for their delirium state, so that's
9. a challenge.
10. Third, delirium evaluation is often stopped
11. when patients are transferred out of the ICU, so
12. stepping down from the ICU to the hospital ward,
13. but delirium may persist. Some of the data that we
14. have available when patients are evaluated during
15. the last day of their ICU stay, anywhere from 15 to
16. about 50 percent of the patients are positive for
17. delirium at that time. So how do we treat delirium
18. as an endpoint where we're only observing it, a
19. half of it or a potential small portion of the
20. delirium process? And lastly, death, death is a
21. common occurrence in these ICU studies. The whole
22. delirium process is truncated once the patient
23. dies.
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1. The approach that had been taken in the
2. literature and continues to be used as calculation
3. of delirium-free days to X days. This statistic or
4. composite is based on ventilator-free days to X
5. days variable that's used commonly in studies of
6. mechanical ventilation. This composite endpoint is
7. composed by assigning zero to patients that die
8. prior to day X. Among survivors through day X, you
9. count up the number of days where the patient is
10. off the ventilator; take that composite variable,
11. and you compare it across treatment groups
12. typically using a rank-based test and/or present
13. prespecified quantiles.
14. Over the years since this was proposed in
15. 2002 by David Schoenfeld and others, there have
16. been a lot of publications trying to identify and
17. just bring to attention that there are some
18. challenges with using this endpoint. Recently, a
19. French group from Inserm last year published
20. another paper on some of the drawbacks to using
21. this as an endpoint.
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1. How has this endpoint been translated into
2. sedation trials? Well, first thing is how do we
3. define X. Just in my reading of sedation trial
4. literature, there's quite a bit of variation in how
5. we're defining X. It's 7 days, 12 days, 28 days.
6. Ideally, you want X to be specified such that the
7. vast majority of the patients would either have
8. died or have been extubated prior to your time
9. point. That would be a target to try and figure
10. out how to set X.
11. How do you deal with coma days? You can
12. change the endpoint from delirium-free days, to X
13. days, to coma and delirium-free days to include
14. coma within the continuum of the delirium process.
15. I'm sure there would be a heated argument here
16. about whether that's part of the process or not.
17. In the ABC trial, they counted days of CAM-ICU
18. positive but when non-comatose. So there are
19. alternative ways to treat coma.
20. In death, do we set delirium-free days to
21. zero if a patient dies? In the protocol for the
22. SPICE 3 trial I was reading, they're counting the
23. days free of delirium prior to death as part of the
24. composite, so there is another twist to the
25. variable definition. But universally, most when
26. we're defining this as an endpoint, almost everyone
27. assumes that once the patient leaves the ICU that
28. they're delirium free.
29. As an alternative approach, we're going to
30. suggest that you can directly model both the
31. delirium and the competing event process by using a
32. joint model sometimes referred to as a shared
33. frailty model in statistics. In the first model,
34. you would build a survival model for being positive
35. or absent of delirium on any given day. This is
36. like a recurrent event survival model. The second
37. model is a survival model for your competing
38. events, ICU discharge or death.
39. The two models are linked by a random effect
40. or what's referred to as a frailty term in the
41. survival analysis literature. The frailty term
42. appears in the first model as a way that we can
43. link the repeated daily observations of delirium
44. within a person over time, and then that frailty
There could be alternatives to both of these approaches that we haven't thought of. One thing that I didn't talk about along the way is the complications introduced by missing data, so missed delirium assessments on any given day add another layer of challenge.

I just started an NIA funded R01 that is specifically looking at delirium as an endpoint within preventative and therapeutic delirium RCTs.

I'm going to be doing some systematic reviews of the methodology applied across delirium trials and then also a series of extensive simulation studies and try to identify where these endpoints can work and where they can't. Then there includes a whole aim for statistical methods development, so try to improve the joint model by allowing for separate approaches.

Now I'm going to shift from thinking about delirium to talking about the functional outcomes.

When I mean functional outcomes, I'm thinking of something that's not defined as a survival endpoint, something that you evaluate the patient and you get a measure of their physical function or their quality of life; so something that's a scaled or quantitative variable.

Everything I'm going to discuss here you can find in this BMJ paper. This was with Tim and Dale as co-authors. This was a culmination of the third aim of the R24 that Dale described earlier today.

I'm going to have a little bit of mind games at 4:30 in the afternoon. I'm going to introduce this idea of potential outcomes to the group just as a way for us to organize our thinking around how we can identify the causal effect or identify a treatment effect.

First, I want you to imagine you're in a setting. Your goal is to evaluate 90-day cognitive function in patients, and there's no mortality.

There are two interventions, an intervention and a control. Under the potential outcomes framework, you're imagining, or we organize our thinking to say, that any given patient would have a measure of...
cognitive function if they had received the intervention. Similarly, they would have a measure of cognitive function if they had received the control. The individual causal effect is the difference, then, between those two potential outcomes of cognitive function, one under intervention and control, and the marginal or the average treatment effect is the average of all those individual causal effects over the population of interest.

How does this change when we have mortality as a complicating factor? Now I'm going to imagine, first, that I have potential mortality experiences in each two groups, so I'm going to imagine that I can know the time of death in days and an indicator of whether a patient survived to 90 days both under the intervention and the control arm. In addition to knowing this information, then I can also start to categorize people into their potential survival experiences. Always survivors would be a subset of patients that would survive to 90 days regardless of the treatment they received. These are likely the most resilient patients in the trial. Mortality benefitters would be those that would survive under intervention but would experience death by 90 days if they received control, so these would be less resilient patients. Always diehers, these would be our pretty severe patients. These are patients that would experience mortality regardless of the treatment they received. And then there's this category called the specials. These would be patients that might die under the intervention but survive under the control group, and I'll talk a little bit more about these in a couple of slides.

Now we can think about when we actually get to observe cognitive function at 90 days based on these potential outcomes. I only have cognitive function declined if a patient would survive to 90 days. Once you die, the cognitive functions no longer are evaluable. Here now I see that under intervention, I only get to see 90-day cognitive function for the always survivors and the mortality benefitters. Similarly, I only get to observe 90-day cognition under always survivors or specials. The only group of patients for which I can identify or even define an individual causal effect is the always survivors. In the statistics literature, the survivor average causal effect, which is also known as the SACE, is the average of these individual causal effects but only among the very specialized subset of the population, and the specialized subset is those who would survive regardless of what intervention they received. You immediately think that there are some problems here because in practice, we don't get to observe those states; we only get to observe one. So in the end when we're analyzing the data, we don't know who's an always survivor or not. There are ways in which we can estimate the SACE by making additional assumptions. We can get an upper and lower bound for the survivor average causal effect if we're willing to assume there are no specials, so that there would be no one who would survive under control but die under the intervention. If you want to get a point estimate for this causal effect, you have to make additional, more restrictive assumptions, and none of the assumptions are verifiable by any observed data that you have in the trial.

In practice, that survivor average causal effect is very rarely reported in the literature. What's more often reported is just the survivors only analysis. There you should just take all the survivors data, take the average of your cognitive function measure under intervention, and compare that to the average under your survivors in the control arm.

The only time in which the survivors only analysis reduces to an actual estimate of a causal effect is when the mortality is not different across the treatment groups. So if there's no mortality difference across the groups, there's no mortality benefitters or specials, so the survivors...
So now we have this composite variable, functional endpoint. This allows us to differentiate times of death from the functional outcome plus some constant just to allow interest, 90 days, and then is equal to the calling it \( W \) -- which would be equal to the time of death.

Let's imagine that we all agree that earlier is better. There are other advantages and disadvantages of them, but that's kind of a primary one. What could we do as an alternative to these approaches where we might be able to utilize all the patients that were randomized? One approach is to utilize a composite endpoint. Most of the composite endpoint approaches require that we've ranked the patients in terms of severity. One example is a proposal by Lachin in 1999 that utilizes a ranking of patients that incorporates the timing of death, not just an indicator of when patients die, and then information about the scale of interest or the functional outcome.

Let's imagine that we all agree that earlier death is worse than later death, and remember, these are longer term outcomes, so it might make sense for us to be willing to compare survival. 3 months post-randomization is worse than survival. 180 days post-randomization. Also among survivors, poor functional outcomes are worse than good functional outcome.

Then we define a new variable -- I'm just calling it \( W \) -- which would be equal to the time of death for those who died prior to the time of interest, 90 days, and then is equal to the functional outcome plus some constant just to allow us to differentiate times of death from the functional endpoint.

So now we have this composite variable, which is just a variable that's happening on continuum with higher values indicating better function. It doesn't make sense here to compare the means across the treatment arms in this composite; it would be better to compare the distribution of a composite endpoint like this, so you could do like a rank-sum test or you could compete various quantiles from the distribution of this composite.

Just as an example, I just made these numbers up, if you targeted the median of this composite endpoint, you could compare the interventions like this. So you could say under the intervention, 50 percent of the patients receiving the intervention survived to 90 days with cognitive function scores that were less than 30, compared to under the control group, 50 percent of the patients had experienced death by 50 days. This is a useful metric as a way to rank experiences across the two intervention arms.

In terms of recommendations, when mortality is involved, there's no real solution that doesn't have a disadvantage. The approach that you choose is going to depend on the assumptions that you're willing to make within the context of the problem. There are a couple of recommendations I would make. If it's biologically unlikely that the intervention is going to impact mortality, then you're safe with the survivors only analysis. The survivors of the intervention to a particular time will represent a random sample of the original randomized patients, so you should be fine. When mortality is a primary endpoint, as it is in many of the trials that we do in critical illness, you're hypothesizing that there is a difference, so you should build into your statistical approaches the potential that there is a difference.

You should have some step-down approach or specification that any analyses of functional outcomes would consider mortality, so by using the composite endpoint approach and/or one of the causal inferential approach the SACE.
are most familiar to me, and then here are some other observations I made while I was reading through the sedation trial literature. It looks like there's limited use of group sequential designs within this setting. I found one trial, the NONSEDA trial that performed a single interim analysis after 350 patients were recruited. Choice to use a group sequential design depends on a lot of things, but mainly on your projected rate of recruitment and the duration of follow-up. There also was no mention of utilizing baseline covariate adjustment. If you're collecting baseline variables that are prognostic for your outcome of interest, you can include those variables in your analysis to improve precision and to estimate your average treatment effect, so get this in power. There's a whole host of adaptive enrichment designs, which were alluded to in the prior talk, and then other novel designs. One of which that came to mind today in our discussion particularly around how patients are changing rapidly over time, there are these micro randomization trials that are developed by Susan Murphy at Harvard beyond my scope, because it requires a lot of interesting optimization problems. The idea is that patients our originally randomized to a treatment. If the patient responds to that treatment, they remain on the treatment, but if the patient doesn't, then they're re-randomized again to other different conditions. Then that happens sequentially in time until the patient ends up in an optimal treatment category. Along the way of those micro randomized designs, there's constant assessment of the patients. So when the patient is identified to not be performing well under the current randomized treatment, you can do the randomization again to move the patient into a more optimal condition. There's also POP [ph] trials and pragmatic trials that have been used in other critical illness settings that might work in this setting as well, so that's all I have.

Q&A and Panel Discussion

DR. WARD: Before I have a couple of other people to join us, [inaudible - off mic] to get a deeper dive into how we should be designing those clinical trials.

DR. SHAFER: I'm going to be moderating this session, and I want to start off by just repeating something that Dr. Colantuoni said a second ago. Everybody stand up and stretch. It turns out that -- we were talking about patient-centered outcomes. I'm actually in a category that hasn't been discussed so far. You've heard from my wife, Pamela Flood. I'm an ICU survivor-survivor -- (Laughter.)

DR. SHAFER: -- and when Pamela was hospitalized at UCSF, I spent literally every night sleeping there by her side. And then when she needed to have the care advanced to intubation and sedation, I quite fortunately advocated for this, and you won't be surprised to know that I advocated that she get propofol. She was on that for a couple of days, and then Mervyn Maze, the chair, said, "You know, what do you think about dex?" So Mervyn had a strong role in the suggestion that we move to dex, which of course since it was Mervyn's suggestion, we did. And I want to share that as an ICU survivor-survivor, it was very consequential because it was when I knew that she was going to make it. She had been unresponsive on the propofol for about 3 days. We went to dex for about 8 hours, and Mervyn and Marty Bogetz came into the room. Pamela has been completely unresponsive this whole time -- and she knows what I'm going to say here -- and I said to her, "Pamela, two stud muffins have just walked into the room, Mervyn and Marty." DR. FLOOD: Hoping it would wake me up.

DR. SHAFER: And Pamela was -- when Pamela was hospitalized at UCSF, I spent literally every night sleeping there by her side. And then when she needed to have the care advanced to intubation and sedation, I quite fortunately advocated for this, and you won't be surprised to know that I advocated that she get propofol.

She was on that for a couple of days, and then Mervyn Maze, the chair, said, "You know, what do you think about dex?" So Mervyn had a strong role in the suggestion that we move to dex, which of course since it was Mervyn's suggestion, we did. And I want to share that as an ICU survivor-survivor, it was very consequential because it was when I knew that she was going to make it. She had been unresponsive on the propofol for about 3 days. We went to dex for about 8 hours, and Mervyn and Marty Bogetz came into the room. Pamela has been completely unresponsive this whole time -- and she knows what I'm going to say here -- and I said to her, "Pamela, two stud muffins have just walked into the room, Mervyn and Marty."
conscious of every day is that I have to take care
of my -- I've never had to take care of somebody
like that before. And I have to take care of
myself so that I can take care of my wife. It
changes one's perspective on these things.
We've had a wonderful discussion here, and
I'd like to open this up for questions and thoughts
about clinical trial design and some of the ways of
moving this field forward.

DR. RIKER: Riker. Yahya, you haven't had a
chance to really tell us much about what you've
learned in your SPICE series of studies and what
you would do today if you were designing SPICE 3.
I'm eager to hear your thoughts as far as RCTs
versus other alternatives or where you are.

DR. SHEHABI: Thanks, Rich. I will start by
what Steven just alluded to about Pamela being
unresponsive for 2 days, and then suddenly becoming
awake and doing this [gestures]. I think this is
really a part that will end very early in the SPICE
program, that the first 2-3 days of the acute phase
of critical illness is very different to the days
from day 3, day 4, and onwards. You are kind of
like in the eye of the storm in the first 2 days,
and then the storm will pass, and you're now
cleaning up.
I think clinical trials ought to accommodate
for that, and perhaps we need clinical trials that
tackle the early part of critical illness where
it's very hot, very dynamic, and everything's
happening, procedures, imaging, dialysis, to go to
theatre and come back; all that stuff is happening
and it's very different from when the dust has
settled and we're now in a recovery phase.
I think trials so far has ignored that first
2 or 3 days mainly for logistic reasons because we
could not consent people in time to get them into
these studies. The only way you could do it with
SPICE is to have a deferred consent where the
patient would be randomized, and then once their
legal surrogate becomes available or they wake up,
then they will consent to continue part as a
patient, or say, no, I don't like this. I want to
get out.

DR. SHAFER: Anybody want to respond?

DR. RIKER: Other comments?

DR. SPIES: Maybe one additional, I fully
agree with Yahya. The point is I think one thing
treated them both as the same patient.
I think we have to stratify going forward in
clinical trials by age because we are definitely
dealing with two different biological systems
between a younger adult and an older adult.
The third point, which we've also realize,
is that particularly early in the course of
critical illness, clinicians use a combination of
drugs. While we do go and study X versus Y, even
in the guideline we say we're going to look at
whether propofol is better than dex or dex is
better than this. But in real life, clinicians use
a combination of things. At one stage, they use
propofol, then they move to dex, and then they add
some midazolam. They add morphine. They add
fentanyl.
That combination pharmacotherapy is what
happens in real practice. For trials' conclusions
and results to be generalizable, it needs to
accommodate for that combination of usage.
DR. SHAFER: Other comments?

DR. SPIES: Maybe one additional, I full
agree with Yahya. The point is I think one thing
is vulnerability, so many patients have
different -- so chronological age is difficult
because usually people can be very frail when they
go into that setting. For example, if they have
cancer, prolonged cancer, they are much more frail
to what we are doing. I think that's something
that needs to be also considered, the physiological
reserve of the patients.

DR. SHAFER: Anybody want to respond?
DR. SHEHABI: If I could just add to your comment, Claudia, I think when we do clinical trials, having a large sample size would allow you to have adequate power to look into those different subgroups and make meaningful results from doing that. I think earlier Rich was talking about having mortality as a primary outcome. We use primary outcome primarily to sample size studies rather than find what it's going to show. We just want to know whether it's going to show different or not but primarily to sample size for a study.

I think if used mortality, for example, as a primary outcome, your sample size is with a large sample, but that allows you a lot about clinically relevant outcomes with a lot of power and a lot of precision.

DR. SESSLER: Absolutely I support large trials. If you know in advance that you're interested in a particular subgroup, consider stratifying so that you end up with a good balance across your groups of interest. It essentially cost nothing. With electronic randomization, you can add lots of stratification, and it will give you good balance for free.

DR. COLANTUONI: I agree.

DR. SHAFER: Talmage?

DR. EGAN: I don't want to derail the discussion too far afield, but at some point I think this is worth discussing, and I don't see that there's another point in the agenda where it has an obvious place to come up, and that is the question of using target-controlled infusions as part of the study design.

I think if we look at this very broadly, these kinds of studies are both pharmacodynamic studies and outcome trials, so on an hour-to-hour basis, it's a pharmacodynamic study. You're trying to make some assessments about where the depth of sedation is. And then you've got the sort of broader question of what the ultimate outcomes are, which is obviously the more important endpoint.

But in any case, at least for the pharmacodynamic part of this study, controlling the kinetic aspects of the study is so that you don't have drug levels jumping all over the place, so that you're giving the drug in a very precise way where you're getting some approximation of a known plasma level. And more importantly, you are locking in a relatively steady state of the drug, and I think improves the overall design to some degree.

As you'll recall, Steve, you and I collaborated on a trial that used TCI as part of the study design. So I just wondered our panel thinks and what some of the audience thinks about how that might improve these trials.

DR. SHAFER: Let me just follow up on that. Quite specifically, that was one of the registration trials for propofol.

DR. EGAN: Right.

DR. SHAFER: So propofol registration for the ICU was done using TCI, and without knowing your doses and your concentrations -- which is one of the other things TCI can do, is it can capture what you've actually done as well as allow you to target things, which otherwise is very hard to capture what drugs were used. You can take a trial and say, hey, drug A works better than B, but A is just 20 percent more propofol. You can't really identify it without actually getting the kinetic dynamic model involved in the outcome analysis. Anybody want to comment on this?

DR. GIRARD: This is Tim Girard. I think that's a great idea. I think probably we need even back up further because the pharmacokinetics of most of these drugs is poorly understood, if not completely un-understood. That's not a real word, is it?

(Laughter.)

DR. GIRARD: I think you get my point. Many of these drugs have had very little, if not any pharmacokinetic studies, in this population. Our group has done some work looking at pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics, and found that actually plasma concentrations of many of these drugs did not correlate well, or at all, with the observed clinical response to the drugs.

DR. SHAFER: Mervyn, wasn't dex also done...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 337</th>
<th>Page 338</th>
<th>Page 339</th>
<th>Page 340</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 with TCI?</td>
<td>1 DR. MAZE: No, it wasn't done with TCI, but</td>
<td>1 DR. SESSLER: You get more stability.</td>
<td>1 MALE VOICE: And you're looking at an acidic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 DR. MAZE: No, it wasn't done with TCI, but</td>
<td>3 we had very specific infusion criteria.</td>
<td>2 MALE VOICE: And you're looking at an acidic</td>
<td>end-stage renal disease population for which we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 we had very specific infusion criteria.</td>
<td>4 Dan?</td>
<td>3 have no data as to what the pump is actually going</td>
<td>4 have no data as to what the pump is actually going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Dan?</td>
<td>5 DR. SESSLER: Dose really matters, and it's</td>
<td>5 to have in the body and the multiple compartments.</td>
<td>5 to have in the body and the multiple compartments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 DR. SESSLER: Dose really matters, and it's</td>
<td>6 something that we've a little bit ignored here.</td>
<td>6 DR. SHAFER: So what are you going to do;</td>
<td>6 DR. SHAFER: So what are you going to do;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 something that we've a little bit ignored here.</td>
<td>7 Talmage and Steve could speak to this better than I</td>
<td>7 just pick dose? That's going to be better?</td>
<td>7 just pick dose? That's going to be better?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Talmage and Steve could speak to this better than I</td>
<td>8 can, but we're often comparing two different drugs</td>
<td>8 MALE VOICE: Titrate to an end effect.</td>
<td>8 MALE VOICE: Titrate to an end effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 can, but we're often comparing two different drugs</td>
<td>9 at essentially random doses, but if you use</td>
<td>9 DR. SHAFER: And if you're going to titrate,</td>
<td>9 DR. SHAFER: And if you're going to titrate,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 at essentially random doses, but if you use</td>
<td>10 slightly different doses, you could get completely</td>
<td>10 use TCI.</td>
<td>10 use TCI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 slightly different doses, you could get completely</td>
<td>11 different results. It's very easy to do a trial</td>
<td>11 Other questions?</td>
<td>11 Other questions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 different results. It's very easy to do a trial</td>
<td>12 with two drugs and conclude one is better than the</td>
<td>12 DR. BALAS: I have a question. I'm</td>
<td>12 DR. BALAS: I have a question. I'm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 with two drugs and conclude one is better than the</td>
<td>13 other. It's not actually better than the other,</td>
<td>13 wondering if anybody in the United States has been</td>
<td>13 wondering if anybody in the United States has been</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 other. It's not actually better than the other,</td>
<td>14 you just didn't give enough of the alternate drug.</td>
<td>14 successful at getting an IRB through with a</td>
<td>14 successful at getting an IRB through with a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 you just didn't give enough of the alternate drug.</td>
<td>15 DR. SHEHABI: I think the TCI model is based</td>
<td>15 deferred consent.</td>
<td>15 deferred consent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 DR. SHEHABI: I think the TCI model is based</td>
<td>16 on computer modeling in relatively healthy</td>
<td>16 MALE VOICE: With what?</td>
<td>16 MALE VOICE: With what?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 on computer modeling in relatively healthy</td>
<td>17 volunteers, and I think transferring that into the</td>
<td>17 DR. BALAS: Deferred. As Yahya was</td>
<td>17 DR. BALAS: Deferred. As Yahya was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 volunteers, and I think transferring that into the</td>
<td>18 critical care population I think is not a</td>
<td>18 saying -- is it true for the SPICE trials? They</td>
<td>18 saying -- is it true for the SPICE trials? They</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 critical care population I think is not a</td>
<td>19 straightforward phenomenon.</td>
<td>19 enroll the patients, randomize, start the</td>
<td>19 enroll the patients, randomize, start the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 straightforward phenomenon.</td>
<td>20 MALE VOICE: Where are we going to get the</td>
<td>20 intervention, and get consent later.</td>
<td>20 intervention, and get consent later.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 MALE VOICE: Where are we going to get the</td>
<td>21 devices as well? Because wouldn't they be</td>
<td>21 DR. GIRARD: Are you specifically asking</td>
<td>21 DR. GIRARD: Are you specifically asking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 devices as well? Because wouldn't they be</td>
<td>22 investigational? They're not approved in the U.S.</td>
<td>22 about sedation trials or any trial?</td>
<td>22 about sedation trials or any trial?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 investigational? They're not approved in the U.S.</td>
<td>1 DR. SHAFER: Interestingly, for AstraZeneca,</td>
<td>1 DR. BALAS: Anything in the ICU.</td>
<td>1 DR. BALAS: Anything in the ICU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 DR. SHAFER: Interestingly, for AstraZeneca,</td>
<td>2 it was just part of the trial, and the whole thing</td>
<td>2 DR. GIRARD: Yes, It's been done for</td>
<td>2 DR. GIRARD: Yes, It's been done for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 it was just part of the trial, and the whole thing</td>
<td>3 was approved. And it was ironic because the FDA</td>
<td>3 non-sedation related trials, yes.</td>
<td>3 non-sedation related trials, yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 was approved. And it was ironic because the FDA</td>
<td>4 device division would say, &quot;Oh, we can't do these,&quot;</td>
<td>4 MALE VOICE: I think it's been done in</td>
<td>4 MALE VOICE: I think it's been done in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 device division would say, &quot;Oh, we can't do these,&quot;</td>
<td>5 but CDER was quite happy to use the data from TCI</td>
<td>5 emergency settings like seizures out in the field</td>
<td>5 emergency settings like seizures out in the field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 but CDER was quite happy to use the data from TCI</td>
<td>6 in approving propofol for ICU administration.</td>
<td>6 and that sort of thing, but I think your point is</td>
<td>6 and that sort of thing, but I think your point is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 in approving propofol for ICU administration.</td>
<td>7 But let me just address that specific point</td>
<td>7 it's almost impossible.</td>
<td>7 it's almost impossible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 But let me just address that specific point</td>
<td>8 because I know what Talmage and I would both say to</td>
<td>8 MALE VOICE: I mean, there's an ethic model,</td>
<td>8 MALE VOICE: I mean, there's an ethic model,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 because I know what Talmage and I would both say to</td>
<td>9 that. That is, what TCI allows you to do is at</td>
<td>9 so I think that's with cardiac arrest and those</td>
<td>9 so I think that's with cardiac arrest and those</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 that. That is, what TCI allows you to do is at</td>
<td>10 least hold a more or less steady concentration</td>
<td>10 things. And there's a community consent, and there</td>
<td>10 things. And there's a community consent, and there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 least hold a more or less steady concentration</td>
<td>11 around which one titrates. If you're just talking</td>
<td>11 there's a process. We've actually had three trials</td>
<td>11 there's a process. We've actually had three trials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 around which one titrates. If you're just talking</td>
<td>12 about giving boluses and infusions and randomly</td>
<td>12 that we've done, none of them sedation trials, but</td>
<td>12 that we've done, none of them sedation trials, but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 about giving boluses and infusions and randomly</td>
<td>13 going up and down, you're assuming that the</td>
<td>13 we talked about doing it in a cardiac arrest model</td>
<td>13 we talked about doing it in a cardiac arrest model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 going up and down, you're assuming that the</td>
<td>14 infusion rate, in and of itself, is going to</td>
<td>14 with early antibiotic therapy and doing ethic for</td>
<td>14 with early antibiotic therapy and doing ethic for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 infusion rate, in and of itself, is going to</td>
<td>15 instantaneously translate to what's going on in the</td>
<td>15 that.</td>
<td>15 that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 instantaneously translate to what's going on in the</td>
<td>16 patient's brain. At least the target has got a</td>
<td>16 We didn't do the study because we didn't get</td>
<td>16 We didn't do the study because we didn't get</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 patient's brain. At least the target has got a</td>
<td>17 better shot at giving you something and holding it</td>
<td>17 funded, but ethic is a pathway where you can</td>
<td>17 funded, but ethic is a pathway where you can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 better shot at giving you something and holding it</td>
<td>18 steady so you can then make your adjustments.</td>
<td>18 proceed. You try to get consent if you can. If</td>
<td>18 proceed. You try to get consent if you can. If</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 steady so you can then make your adjustments.</td>
<td>19 DR. SESSLER: Even if you don't know the</td>
<td>19 there's no family or no surrogate around you, you</td>
<td>19 there's no family or no surrogate around you, you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 DR. SESSLER: Even if you don't know the</td>
<td>20 absolute.</td>
<td>20 enroll the patient if they haven't excluded</td>
<td>20 enroll the patient if they haven't excluded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 absolute.</td>
<td>21 DR. SHAFER: Even if you don't know the</td>
<td>21 themselves in advance, and then when the family</td>
<td>21 themselves in advance, and then when the family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 DR. SHAFER: Even if you don't know the</td>
<td>22 absolute, because you'll measure it.</td>
<td>22 arrives, you inform them and go from there. So</td>
<td>22 arrives, you inform them and go from there. So</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
there is a model.

MALE VOICE: There's a second thing you have to do with those patients, is when they become at a state where they can consent, you have to approach them, and they can obviously withdraw at any stage.

DR. SESSLER: Cluster randomized trials automatically have waived consent because you're randomizing an entire facility to something or something else, and they're used typically for system-wide interventions.

Let's say electronic records. Electronic records are not something you can turn on and off on a patient basis, but if you want to assess the effect, the only way to do it rigorously is either cluster randomization where you have whole facilities that start, or don't start, or a step-wedge, which is similar to cluster. Neither of those has individual patient consents.

We've also done half a dozen of these alternating cohort studies, which are good for comparative intervention studies, so when you're comparing two perfectly reasonable standard clinical interventions that are done all the time.

For instance, isoflurane versus desflurane, lactated ringers versus saline; two different title volumes. These are examples of trials that we've done with waived consent, so there certainly is a precedent for doing some sorts of studies with an altered or a waived consent.

DR. AITKEN: I've got a feeling that I remember Martha Curley telling me that in her cluster RCT, they could obviously allocate the sites to the intervention, but they couldn't collect any data in the intervention sites until they had consent. I don't remember the details, but I remember her having a real problem.

DR. AITKEN: I've got a feeling that I remember Martha Curley telling me that in her cluster RCT, they could obviously allocate the sites to the intervention, but they couldn't collect any data in the intervention sites until they had consent. I don't remember the details, but I remember her having a real problem.

DR. AITKEN: I've got a feeling that I remember Martha Curley telling me that in her cluster RCT, they could obviously allocate the sites to the intervention, but they couldn't collect any data in the intervention sites until they had consent. I don't remember the details, but I remember her having a real problem.

For the second thing I wanted to make a comment about is the waived consent. There is a regulatory process in Australia to do that. There is a regulatory framework to do that. Essentially, it varies from state to state, and it changes by whatever the parliament thinks on the day.

In Victoria for example, if the two interventions are considered within usual accepted practice, then waived of consent or deferred consent is acceptable. In New South Wales, the same trial, which is FOSTERI [ph], the same trial, the guardianship board, which is like the body that makes the law, said, "No, no, you can't do that." And we said, "No, we disagree with you." We have to take the guardianship board to the Supreme Court to change their mind, and now they're changing the law in New South Wales to say, yes, when things are similar, yes, you can do a deferred consent.
DR. SESSLER: All localities allow at least deferred consent for emergencies, say out of hospital cardiac arrest. That was actually on hold for about a decade worldwide to everyone's detriment. Now everyone allows that.

MALE VOICE: Not everyone. Sweden doesn't do that.

DR. SESSLER: Okay.

MALE VOICE: Be careful when you travel to Stockholm.

(Laughter.)

DR. ABSALOM: Tony Absalom. I was just going to say there was this trial of adrenaline during CPR in the UK, but they had to jump through an awful lot of hoops to do that. They had to have all these media campaigns to allow all exposed possible people to notify that they wouldn't like to be enrolled should they have a cardiac arrest.

MALE VOICE: Do you wear a bracelet?

MALE VOICE: Yes.

DR. DEVLIN: John Devlin. The one thing I just want to bring up, too, is the extent to exclusion and inclusion, which a lot of things are obvious, safety issues and confounders. But we end up with studies that are sort of a leading [indiscernible]. It's quite low. Maybe only 10 percent of the population is actually enrolled.

Any thoughts from the panel on -- I realize [indiscernible] that has a very narrow enrollment, you're right; it's easy to interpret. We get a better assessment of the treatment effect, the side effect profile of the product and all that, but the ability to generalize is limited.

So one of the other things that we are certainly open to is that one trial would be narrow, and then you could have another trial to replicate the results but have that be, if you wish, all comers, or a little wider, but you can get a wider population that may be more generalizable to the public. We're very much willing to see that.

DR. WARD: Denham Ward. We've heard a lot of things about outcomes. The amount of time at sedation level is probably no longer an appropriate primary outcome; we've kind of moved past that. And now we've heard some things about composite outcomes as a way to improve and get more power on a clinical trial. What composite outcome should we be using? If we're going to use a composite outcome in a clinical trial for sedation, what is it?
1 DR. COLANTUONI: Never ask you statistician that question.
2 (Laughter.)
3 DR. COLANTUONI: I'm just kidding. No, but I'm not.
4 DR. SHEHABI: I think a composite outcome may look like a solution, but it's really a very imperfect solution. I think there is a lot of issues with composite outcomes. We find that public funders in Australia, for sample, they will rank a trial that has a primary outcome as a composite outcome of multiple things, and their rank is brought down because of all the issues that you've mentioned before and I've mentioned before. So I'm not sure that we do need to invent a composite outcome for sedation trials.

Probably to go further to what you said, Dan, before, that a certified baseline, what we chose to do with a spot [indiscernible], rather than serve at baseline, is to have a better sample size is to choose the subgroups at the median level of what are you looking at, whether it's age, or Apache [ph], or whatever, and that would immediately give you two halves of the groups, distributed nicely between the groups.

4 DR. SESSLER: Composite outcomes are good for rare dichotomous outcomes. Most of the outcomes we're talking about here are not dichotomous. Death is, but the others are not. We're talking about mechanical ventilation, time in the ICU, functional outcome; those are all continuous outcome. They don't lend themselves to composites very well.

12 DR. COLANTUONI: I think there's a distinction between what Dan just said and the approach to summarize an outcome that's dynamic over time like ventilator-free days and delirium-free days, that incorporates the complicating factors of mortality, which is how I was defining composite outcome versus the difference between what Dan was defining as composite outcome.

So you can create a composite that is a delirium, but summarizing over a time course and potentially calling for competing risks is slightly different in my thinking than saying we're going to include mortality and some other adverse events that we might see -- other binary adverse events that we might see over the course.

6 DR. SESSLER: Well, I think it's good for complications --

8 DR. COLANTUONI: Oh, yeah.

9 DR. SESSLER: -- because very often, complications are rare. Your primary outcome is how well does a drug sedate somebody? Well, you're going to look at measures of sedation for that primarily. But if you want to know does this drug cause complications, now you're suddenly looking at a wide variety of presumably rare events, and many of these are dichotomous. Composites are a really good way to look at the complication. You're never going to be powered for individual types of complications.

20 DR. SHAFER: Let me point out that Dr. Ward just asked a question that was similar to the one I asked earlier, and looking at what we are here for, a patient-centered outcome. I think he sort of said what is that patient-centered outcome, which I tried to ask earlier, and I did not get an answer. And you tried to ask it, and you just didn't get an answer.

6 Let's try again. Both to the people on the panel and people in the audience, what is a measurable, trialable, falsifiable, patient-centered outcome?

10 DR. AITKEN: I'll start by saying it has to be beyond hospital. I don't think that we can be having a primary outcome that's only in hospital would be my suggestion. But what it should be, I think we could argue for various things.

14 DR. AITKEN: Like, certainly mortality is the obvious one, but I think more functional measures like returning to work, or that's probably the one that jumps out as an obvious one because that incorporates a whole lot of other things in there. You can't return to work if you don't have reasonable, functional health, reasonable,
psychological health; and reasonable cognitive health. 

DR. GIRARD: And we should recognize -- actually, you just described it beautifully -- return to work is a composite outcome because all of those things have to be true for you to return to work.

DR. AITKEN: That's the risk of it.

DR. FLOOD: The thing about return to work is that many people in the ICU aren't working. DR. AITKEN: Sorry. I should say return to work or previous normal activity. Sorry. Yes, it has to be a broader definition than that; you're right.

DR. FLOOD: How about a quality-of-life outcome?

DR. TANG: Sorry. Real quickly. There's a work productivity, activity measure that -- it's WPAI. I apologize. I'm just scrambling to remember what the acronym stands for, but it does measure essentially not only work but also activity impairment that could be associated. So just a note that that's a regularly used one in the quality-of-life space that's typically used.

DR. DEXTER: I was going to say from a point of view, two separate issues. When it comes at least to the retrospective analysis of data, I found it to be quite challenging to do something, whether it's work or functional activity, among patients for which you don't have baseline measures. Unless you are planning to be in the ICU, at least when I try to analyze those data, I tend to find very weak baseline measures. So it's something to consider.

But I'd like to go back to address your point about patient-centered outcome. Avery has made the comment in terms of thinking about an indication. The point that you brought up is to be able to provide for those patients for whom the goal is to provide a deep level of sedation to prevent adverse events or something like that. I think that actually there is something to be said for that. When you think about analogies in terms of endpoints of anesthesia trials, there are a large number of patients, large numbers of procedures, where general anesthesia is not an appropriate endpoint. You may use a drug for different applications, but initially at least you start with the subgroup of patients for whom you think you want to do something.

The other thing about it is you can also ask individual patients whether or not that would be an appropriate choice and so forth. I think that that is not an unreasonable approach. It's not going to be that trying to provide a deep level of sedation is appropriate for all patients; it's going to be a minority of patients, but you can have a patient-centered outcome for the subset of patients for whom you want to be providing that.

MALE VOICE: So an individualized patient-centered outcome.

DR. DEXTER: Well, that is how we would be doing -- if this were not a question about ICU patients, If this were a question about satisfaction of patients after general anesthesia, satisfaction with monitored anesthesia care, that is exactly how we would do it. You would ask the patient, so to speak, or the surrogate for the patient, what would that patient want given this particular context. That would be the patient-centered approach. And given the condition on the idea that it's going to be general anesthesia or deep so to speak, go forward in that way.

DR. NEEDHAM: This is Dale Needham. I think we're giving all our perspectives on patient-centered outcomes, but what research has been done to rigorously understand what are patient-centered outcomes, I'm not aware of it with respect to sedation. So I think until there actually is research done doing that it's just kind of everybody's opinion on that. So I think there needs to be an agenda so that people actually do that, and I think one starting point that is great, as Leanne showed, is these are the outcomes that have been used. That's kind of like a scoping review kind of thing to think about. Those are kind of candidate things.
Then we need to be talking to patients. Also, we need to think about maybe the most important outcome is going to be a resource utilization one, perhaps, in terms of shortening duration, mechanical ventilation, length of stay at hospital, that might be where the strongest signal is between an intervention and an outcome, at least based on my understanding of prior studies, and we want to show that there are positive signals of benefit in other things as well and no harm, and that might be, at least from my naive perspective, the best way to be thinking about it.

Do people want to argue the opposite?

DR. SHEHABI: I just wanted to add, I think the context is quite important. And if you're looking at a patient-centered outcome that looks at function or outcome, for example, it's important to go back to the inclusion/exclusion criteria that Tim was talking about, where you would not include in a sedation trial, for example, traumatic brain injury patients, or patients who come with a green beret, or patients who are going to be intubated for 6 months because of a neurological disease because the outcome is going to be determined by their underlying illness rather than by the sedation that you're doing.

I think it's very important to marry the patient's outcome we're looking at with the population you're studying and pretty much like what you mentioned about the seizure population, the same for the ICU population. In our trial, John, we've excluded anybody who had any neurological problems whatsoever, whether they have weakness or brain injury of any kind. So we want them to be completely neurologically intact on entering the study, and for that that, the patient-centered outcomes that we looked at were specific on things like -- in addition to mortality, we looked at cognitive function at 180 days, institution dependency at 180 days with basically societal resource utilization. Then on top of that looked at their quality of life at 180 days in terms of what are they able to do, and because we knew that they entered intact, we could assess them at 6 months and say this is where they were at this point in time.

DR. SHAFER: Leanne?

DR. AITKEN: I was just going to pick up on Dale's comments. Certainly, I think the issue of talking more to patients and asking them what they want is absolutely essential. It still doesn't tell us what every individual is going to want, but that gives us a better sense.

My only hesitation in what you said about resource utilization is I think we have to think health system wide rather than just hospitals, so I'd be hesitant in only looking at resource utilization within the hospital because if we're shifting sick or dependent patients outside the hospital, then we're shifting resource utilization.

So I do think we have to think across the system.

DR. SHAFER: I'd like to pose a question to Frank. Frank, you do a lot of work with economic analysis, and basically why should somebody invest in something? Why should they invest in a certain kind of system? Why should they undertake a certain study?

Let's say that we come up with a patient-centered outcome that everybody says this is a great patient-centered outcome. This will really improve the wellbeing, somehow measured, of patients who are sedated in the ICU. Somebody's got to invest in that. There's got to be some sort of return. I mean, I agree that we do this for noble reasons and for academic glory and things like this, but these trials are big. Big trials are expensive. Somebody's got to invest.

How would you put together economic argument that whatever this great thing is that we're going to measure should be studied, measured, and improved? How does one go about making that economic case?

DR. DEXTER: I don't think I can answer that question per se.

DR. SHAFER: Can you answer a different one?

(Laughter.)

DR. DEXTER: Yeah.

DR. SHAFER: Let's suppose that you've got a
company with a hypothetic gold product, and they're thinking about actually bringing product to market.

Let's suppose that you've got the following option. One is you've got resource use in the hospital, ventilator days with adjustment or something like that.

One of the challenges you have -- I'm sorry; it's a slightly long answer here. One of the challenges you have is that the dollar value associated with these resource uses will vary massively among organizations, and really this is a function of the variability in the workload within the organization.

So that's why things like ventilator days, a few primary endpoints which are measurable, works totally adequately. If you've got tons of ventilator days, you have more costs. That is easy to understand. Also, there's a difference from a regulatory point of view, you can measure it and do the trial.

In contrast, when you're thinking about -- let's take a couple of others -- long term from the point of view, something about the functional measure, quality recovery of the patient, or something like that, at least from the point of view of critical care and watching companies make these decisions, they freak out because you don't have the baseline measurements. You're not really randomizing patients where you have this and stuff like that.

It seems very large sample sizes compared to the consumption or something like that. That seems to be something which you would do after you have the drug approved, then you might go ahead and do it; at least that's what I tend to hear.

The costs are oftentimes the families and things like that. But again, the problem is going to be are they then going to be able to sell the drug and what is going to be the variability, and how are you going to actually randomize a patient, stratify based upon that? I think that the answer would be, typically, hospital resource use makes quite a bit of sense practically.

DR. DEXTER: How about about a post-use like looking at SNF facilities. They're long-term care after ICU, so try to avoid these very expensive outcomes that are measurable.

DR. SHAFER: Yes, but I think that one of the things would be is that it's quite -- when I say straightforward, I don't mean like trivial; to be able to use a variety of different economic endpoints such as that, which is days in [indiscernible] care or after the hospital; days on the ventilator and things like that. Those things can be combined in terms of quantitatively and stuff like that.

DR. MAZE: Steve, can I ask you a question about your question to Frank, that he changed the question up.

DR. SHAFER: He really didn't.

DR. MAZE: No, he didn't. In a situation where the patient is not directly responsible for the cost of the care, and there are many countries like that, what does it matter? Where's the patient centeredness about that?

DR. SHAFER: About --

DR. DEXTER: I don't think it's patient centered. I going to take an extreme example. Like ventilator days, I don't see how that's patient centered at all. It completely escapes me how that would be patient centered, or maybe I'm totally missing something, and I apologize.

MALE VOICE: You probably haven't been on a vent.

(Crosstalk.)

FEMALE VOICE: The risk of respiratory infection and death is directly tied to ventilator days.

DR. AITKEN: But those say some patients describe quite vividly wanting to get the tube out, so there's that angle of it as well.

DR. KRESS: But I think it's important, this concept of patient centered, I certainly think it sounds good. You have to be careful what you ask for, though, because you ask the patient, the
patient doesn't necessarily understand what the
implications are. Put me in a coma for 4 days;
wake me when it's over. It sounds good except when
you actually come to realize what that entails.

So ventilator days isn't [inaudible - mic
face] patient-centered from one perspective, but
from another perspective, the longer you stay on
the ventilator, more likely you are to have
problems X, Y, and Z, that are going to affect you
down the road. So maybe that's just semantics, but
I would argue that ventilator days is very patient
centered if you look at what it means to the
patient down the road.

DR. DEXTER: I think when I think from an
anesthesia point of view of patient centered, it is
in things that are -- all outcomes, death is very
bad for the patient. Pneumonia is bad for the
patient, but that's not what I think of. When I
think of patient-centered outcome as something like
that, it's quality of life, quality of recovery,
those types of things.

FEMALE VOICE: But if you have pneumonia,
your recovery is going to be awful.

DR. SPIES: Claudia?

I think the preference of some
not very valid structure established, and I think
what we did last year is try to inform the patients
much better. So the patient preferences need to be
in fact boxes at some point.

I think it's very difficult for patients to
understand what we tell them, and even as for us,
it's difficult at the end because we often give the
wrong information because we have not enough
knowledge. This is also a problem because we don't
always see the whole path.

So I think we need preference with processes
of structured interviews like in the shared
decision making processes, and then we can evaluate
if we have the right knowledge, all of us, think.
That's a major issue I have. So I think we need
global knowledge in that structured patient

You had one comment.

DR. SHEHABI: I just wanted to make sure
that we don't really lose the baby with the bath
tub. As you sit there, the patient-centered
outcomes should improve the patient's survival,
function, and feeding.

For that reason, I think we must not just
focus on things that come outside the ICU because,
for example, delirium, when we know how much it
impacts patients, must really be an important
patient-centered outcome. We may argue about
ventilation, an extra day or an extra 6 hours, but
I think we need to be quite clear that delirium is
absolutely a patient-centered outcome.

DR. SHAFER: Dr. Ward, you get the last
word.

Adjournment

DR. WARD: A couple of things, housekeeping.

But just to comment, for example, the drug from my
generation, droperidol, is a great,
non-patient-centered drug. It works great as a
sedative, but if you ask a patient how they felt,
they felt horrible. So you address patient
centered by finding out how the patient actually
felt through it all.
Thank you all.
(Applause.)
(Whereupon, at 5:04 p.m., the meeting was
adjourned.)
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