medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.12.21249699; this version posted January 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

What delirium detection tools are used in routine clinical practice in the UK? A Freedom of Information investigation of UK hospitals.

Zoë Tieges[1], Jacqueline Lowrey[2], Alasdair M. J. MacLullich[1]

[1]Geriatric Medicine, Edinburgh Delirium Research Group, Usher Institute, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK.

[2] College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine, Queen's Medical Research Institute, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK.

Corresponding author:

Dr. Zoë Tieges

Edinburgh Delirium Research Group, Geriatric Medicine

Usher Institute, University of Edinburgh

Room S1642, Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh, 51 Little France Crescent

Edinburgh, EH16 4SA, UK

Tel. +44 (0) 131 242 6481

Email: zoe.tieges@ed.ac.uk

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.12.21249699; this version posted January 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

ABSTRACT

Purpose

Our aim was to collect information on delirium assessment processes and pathways in non-intensive care settings in the UK.

Methods

We sent a Freedom of Information request to 169 UK NHS hospitals, trusts and health boards (units) in July 2020 to obtain data on usage of delirium assessment tools in clinical practice and delirium pathways or guidelines.

Results

We received responses from 154 units (91% response rate). 146 (95%) units reported use of formal delirium assessment processes and 131 (85%) units had guidelines or pathways in place. The 4AT was the most widely used tool, with 117 (80%) units reporting use. The Confusion Assessment Method was used in 65[2] (45%) units, and the SQiD in 52 (36%) units.

Conclusions

Our findings show that the 4AT is the most commonly-used tool in the UK, with 80% of units reporting implementation. This study adds to our knowledge of real-world implementation of delirium detection methods at scale.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.12.21249699; this version posted January 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

INTRODUCTION

Delirium is a serious acute neuropsychiatric disorder of arousal, attention and cognition [1]. It is independently associated with multiple poor outcomes, including higher mortality, new institutionalization and dementia, and patient and carer distress [1-4]. Delirium affects > 15% of hospitalised patients, and yet multiple reports show that delirium remains grossly under-detected in routine clinical practice [5-9].

Detection is essential for the treatment of delirium, prompting the search for acute precipitants, and assessment and treatment of distress, managing delirium associated risks, and in communicating the diagnosis to patients and carers. Formal detection of delirium in routine clinical practice at the earliest possible time point has been advocated in multiple guidelines. Considering the UK, the 2010 National Institute of Clinical and Healthcare Excellence (NICE) guideline on delirium recommended the Confusion Assessment Method (CAM), published in 1990 [10], for delirium assessment. NICE guidelines apply to England, Wales and Northern Ireland. Scotland's main clinical guidelines are provided by the Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelines Network (SIGN); the 2019 SIGN delirium guidelines [11] recommended the 4 'A's Test, or 4AT, a tool with the first validation study published in 2014 [12]. Yet there is little published evidence on what tools are in clinical use at regional or national levels in the UK [1]. Knowledge of real-world clinical practices on the use of such tools is essential in enhancing our understanding of their acceptability and implementability, and may inform the content of future guidelines.

The aim of this study was to collect information on delirium assessment processes in clinical care in the UK, not including Intensive Care Unit (ICU) settings, and to assess usage of specific delirium assessment tools for delirium detection. Specifically, we sought information on usage of two assessment tools which have been extensively used in clinical practice, the 4AT [13] and the CAM [10]. Use of the Single Question to identify Delirium (SQiD), a simple

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.12.21249699; this version posted January 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

prompt question asking about new confusion in patients which is used in some settings as a brief screening process for delirium, was also assessed.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.12.21249699; this version posted January 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

METHODS

Study design

Data on delirium assessment processes in hospitals across the UK were obtained through a Freedom of Information (FOI) request. The UK Freedom of Information Act 2000 provides public access to information held by public authorities, including the National Health Service (NHS) [14].

The study authors constructed a short questionnaire composed of four questions (see supplementary appendix 1). The questionnaire addressed the following themes: usage of delirium assessment tools in clinical practice, specific tools used, clinical settings, and use of pathways or guidelines relating to delirium. Trusts and health boards were asked to only include information collected before 31 July 2020.

Data collection and analysis

The FOI request was sent to 169 UK NHS hospitals, trusts and health boards on 24 July 2020. In the NHS, trusts and health boards are organisational units that may comprise one or more groups of hospitals. For the purposes of this report, the term ‘unit’ will be used. Of these, 5 were non-acute units providing inpatient rehabilitation care for older people; the other 164 units comprised acute hospitals. 143 units were based in England, 15 were based in Scotland, 6 in Wales and 5 in Northern Ireland. A reminder was sent on 8 Oct 2020 to units that had not provided a response. The last date for responses to be included was 30 Nov 2020. Units were contacted via email throughout the study.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.12.21249699; this version posted January 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Data were collated using Microsoft Excel onto a single spreadsheet. Answers were translated into usable data and summarised. Descriptive analyses (number of responses, percentages) were conducted using R Version 3.6.1. [15].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.12.21249699; this version posted January 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

RESULTS

Responses to the FOI request were received from 154 out of 169 units (91% overall response rate). This included responses from 149/164 acute units (91%) and from 5/5 (100%) non-acute units. The results below have been grouped according to the questions in the FOI request (supplementary appendix 1).

Use of a delirium assessment tool as part of a formal delirium screening process in clinical practice.

(Questions 1 and 2)

We asked units whether they used an assessment tool for delirium detection as part of clinical practice outside the ICU. In total, 146 out of 154 units (95%) reported use of a delirium assessment tool; this included 142/149 (95%) of acute units and 4/5 (80%) of non-acute units.

We also asked in which clinical settings these assessment tools were used, specifically acute general medicine and/or Medicine of the Elderly, the Emergency Department, and surgical wards. Delirium tool use in acute general medicine and/or Medicine of the Elderly settings was reported by 126/146 (86%) units, in the Emergency Department by 94/146 (64%) units, and in surgical wards by 107/146 (73%) units (although some units stated that not all surgical units used a tool e.g. only in Orthopaedics).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.12.21249699; this version posted January 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Validated delirium assessment tools included in written policies: 4AT, CAM, SQiD and/or other tools.

(Question 3)

We asked units to indicate which of the following methods for delirium assessment were included in written (paper or electronic) policies: the 4AT, CAM, SQiD or another assessment tool. Of the 146 units which stated use of an assessment tool, 117 (80%) used the 4AT, 65 (45%) used the CAM, 52 (36%) used the SQiD and 7 (5%) used another tool. Other tools or methods were: PINCHME, a mnemonic for the review of possible causes for delirium; the Observational Scale of Level of Arousal [16] for use in people with dementia; the National Early Warning Score (NEWS [17]); RADAR (Recognizing Acute Delirium As part of your Routine [18]); CAM for the Intensive Care Unit [19] used in the High-Dependency Unit; and one delirium assessment tool that was not further specified.

Of the 117 units reporting 4AT use, 77 (66%) stated that the 4AT was the only tool used, whereas 40 (34%) stated that the 4AT was used alongside other tools. 14/117 (12%) units reported using both the 4AT and the CAM (though not necessarily in the same setting) but not the SQiD or other assessment tool. 20/117 (17%) units reported using both the 4AT and the SQiD, but not the CAM or other tool. 20/117 (17%) units reported using both the 4AT, the CAM and the SQiD.

Of the 65 units reporting CAM use, 26 (40%) stated that the CAM was the only tool used, whereas 39 (60%) stated that the CAM was used alongside other tools. 3/65 units (5%) reported using both the CAM and SQiD without any other tools. Three units stated that the SQiD was the only method used for delirium assessment.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.12.21249699; this version posted January 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Pathway or guidelines relating to delirium

(Question 4)

We asked units if they had a pathway or guidelines relating to delirium. 131/154 (85%) units stated that they had a delirium pathway or guidance in place. A further 11 acute units in England reported that such pathways or guidelines were under development.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.12.21249699; this version posted January 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

DISCUSSION

This UK-wide study with a high response rate of 91% found that 95% of units reported use of formal delirium assessment processes. Additionally, 85% of units had guidelines or pathways in place. With respect to the tools used, the 4AT was the most widely used tool across the UK, with 80% reporting use. The CAM was the next most-used, at 45%. The SQiD was reported to be used in 36% of units. Several units reported using two or more of these tools; where only one tool was used, the 4AT was the most common, at 66%. The SQiD was generally not used alone, with only 3 units reporting use without another tool.

This study provides novel information on the national clinical uptake of delirium assessment tools. The UK has two main bodies producing clinical guidelines, NICE, covering England, Wales and Northern Ireland, and SIGN, covering Scotland. These bodies recommend the CAM and the 4AT, respectively, though it is important to note that the 4AT was not published at the time that the NICE guidelines were published (2010), and the SIGN guidelines were published relatively recently, in 2019. NICE recently stated that it will review its recommendations regarding delirium detection tools [20] in response to a randomised controlled trial showing that the 4AT had better sensitivity than the CAM whilst retaining similar specificity [13]. This study and other factors such as the lack of need for special training for the 4AT (the CAM requires training), and the relative brevity of the 4AT compared to the CAM, may explain the greater uptake of the 4AT.

The SQiD is not directly comparable to the 4AT or CAM in that it is a very brief single question used as an initial screen in advance of a more definitive tool such as the 4AT and CAM. It is of interest that around one third of UK hospitals report using the SQiD, despite the relative lack of published evidence supporting its use in hospital settings. The original validation study was in a palliative care population [21], and there are two further published validation studies in hospital populations [22, 23]. The simplicity and high face validity of the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.12.21249699; this version posted January 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

SQiD may have led to its increasing adoption in the UK. Notably in April 2020 the Royal College of Physicians in the UK recommended using the SQiD in combination with the National Early Warning Score-2 as a method for monitoring new-onset delirium in hospital inpatients [24]. The guidance document states that if the SQiD is positive, the 4AT should be done as more definitive test.

This study has several strengths. Through use of the Freedom of Information process the response rate was high, at 91%. This provides reassurance that the findings are likely to provide an accurate picture of delirium tool choice in UK hospitals. Additionally the findings reflect what individual units have chosen to use in clinical practice by contrast to recommendation by guidelines committees or consensus statements. The study also revealed that 85% of UK units have formal delirium pathways in place; this was not previously known. Some limitations should be acknowledged. The study did not provide information on usage rates of the tools, or performance of the tools in real-world practice. Additionally, given the brevity of the questionnaire (which was designed to be short and simple to facilitate completion) we were not able to determine in each unit the areas of practice (e.g. medicine, surgery) employing delirium detection tools. Though we sourced all known contact emails for UK units it is possible that some units were missed. However the study is likely to have reported on the vast majority of units.

Future work should examine uptake of delirium detection tools in different settings and other countries. Alongside this, information on two key implementation parameters should be collected: (a) completion rates in eligible populations, and (b) rates of positive scores in completed tests assessed against the expected rates of delirium in the clinical population concerned [6]. This pair of metrics is essential to understand real-world performance of delirium tools, and gathering such data is increasingly feasible through large scale electronic health records. As one example, the 4AT is mandated for all hip fracture patients in England

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.12.21249699; this version posted January 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

and whole clinical population data from 2017 (total n = 60,000 patients) showed that 95% of patients were screened with the 4AT, with 25% having a positive score [25].

In conclusion, this study provides novel information on delirium detection tool use in >90% of UK hospitals. The 4AT is the most commonly-used tool, with 80% of units reporting implementation. This study adds to our knowledge of real-world implementation of delirium detection methods at scale.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.12.21249699; this version posted January 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Sharon Moncrieff and Maureen Harding who were responsible for the distribution of the FOI requests and data collection.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.12.21249699; this version posted January 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

REFERENCES

1. Wilson JE, Mart MF, Cunningham C, Shehabi Y, Girard TD, MacLullich AMJ et al. Delirium. Nat Rev Dis Primers. 2020;6:90. doi:10.1038/s41572-020-00223-4.
2. Davis DH, Muniz Terrera G, Keage H, Rahkonen T, Oinas M, Matthews FE et al. Delirium is a strong risk factor for dementia in the oldest-old: a population-based cohort study. Brain. 2012;135:2809-16. doi:10.1093/brain/aws190.
3. Williams ST, Dhesi JK, Partridge JSL. Distress in delirium: causes, assessment and management. Eur Geriatr Med. 2020;11:63-70. doi:10.1007/s41999-019-00276-z.
4. Mattison MLP. Delirium. Ann Intern Med. 2020;173:ITC49-ITC64. doi:10.7326/AITC202010060.
5. Gibb K, Seeley A, Quinn T, Siddiqi N, Shenkin S, Rockwood K et al. The consistent burden in published estimates of delirium occurrence in medical inpatients over four decades: a systematic review and meta-analysis study. Age Ageing. 2020;49:352-60. doi:10.1093/ageing/afaa040.
6. Rohatgi N, Weng Y, Bentley J, Lansberg MG, Shepard J, Mazur D et al. Initiative for Prevention and Early Identification of Delirium in Medical-Surgical Units: Lessons Learned in the Past Five Years. Am J Med. 2019;132:1421-30 e8. doi:10.1016/j.amjmed.2019.05.035.
7. Friedman JI, Li L, Kirpalani S, Zhong X, Freeman R, Cheng YT et al. A Multi-Phase Quality Improvement Initiative for the Treatment of Active Delirium in Older Persons. J Am Geriatr Soc. 2020. doi:10.1111/jgs.16897.
8. Casey P, Cross W, Mart MWS, Baldwin C, Riddell K, Dārziņš P. Hospital discharge data under-reports delirium occurrence: results from a point prevalence survey of delirium in a major Australian health service. Intern Med J. 2019;49:338-44. doi:10.1111/imj.14066.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.12.21249699; this version posted January 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

9. Traynor V, Cordato N, Burns P, Xu Y, Britten N, Duncan K et al. Is delirium being detected in emergency? Australas J Ageing. 2016;35:54-7. doi:10.1111/ajag.12255.

10. Inouye SK, van Dyck CH, Alessi CA, Balkin S, Siegal AP, Horwitz RI. Clarifying confusion: the confusion assessment method. A new method for detection of delirium. Ann Intern Med. 1990;113:941-8.

11. Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelins Network (SIGN). Risk reduction and management of delirium. Edinburgh 2019. https://www.sign.ac.uk/sign-157-delirium. Accessed 10 Jan 2021.

12. Bellelli G, Morandi A, Davis DH, Mazzola P, Turco R, Gentile S et al. Validation of the 4AT, a new instrument for rapid delirium screening: a study in 234 hospitalised older people. Age Ageing. 2014;43:496-502. doi:10.1093/ageing/afu021.

13. Shenkin SD, Fox C, Godfrey M, Siddiqi N, Goodacre S, Young J et al. Delirium detection in older acute medical inpatients: a multicentre prospective comparative diagnostic test accuracy study of the 4AT and the confusion assessment method. BMC Med. 2019;17:138. doi:10.1186/s12916-019-1367-9.

14. Information Commissioner's Office. https://ico.org.uk/your-data-matters/official-information/. Accessed 22 Dec 2020.

15. R Core Team. A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2017.

16. Hall R, Stiobhairt A, Allerhand M, MacLullich AMJ, Tieges Z. The Observational Scale of Level of Arousal: A brief tool for assessing and monitoring level of arousal in patients with delirium outside the ICU. Int J Geriatr Psychiatry. 2020;35:1021-7. doi: 10.1002/gps.5324.

17. Royal College of Physicians. National Early Warning Score (NEWS): Standardising the assessment of acute illness severity in the NHS. Report of a working party. London; 2017. https://www.rcplondon.ac.uk/projects/outputs/national-early-warning-score-news-2. Accessed 23 Dec 2020.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.12.21249699; this version posted January 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

18. Voyer P, Champoux N, Desrosiers J, Landreville P, McCusker J, Monette J et al. RADAR: A Measure of the Sixth Vital Sign? Clinical Nursing Research. 2016;25:9-29.

19. Ely EW, Inouye SK, Bernard GR, Gordon S, Francis J, May L et al. Delirium in mechanically ventilated patients: validity and reliability of the confusion assessment method for the intensive care unit (CAM-ICU). JAMA. 2001;286:2703-10.

20. National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE). Delirium guideline. Exceptional surveillance of delirium report; 2020.

21. Sands MB, Dantoc BP, Hartshorn A, Ryan CJ, Lujic S. Single Question in Delirium (SQiD): testing its efficacy against psychiatrist interview, the Confusion Assessment Method and the Memorial Delirium Assessment Scale. Palliat Med. 2010;24:561- 5. doi:10.1177/0269216310371556.

22. Hendry K, Quinn TJ, Evans J, Scortichini V, Miller H, Burns J et al. Evaluation of delirium screening tools in geriatric medical inpatients: a diagnostic test accuracy study. Age Ageing. 2016;45:832-7. doi:10.1093/ageing/afw130.

23. Lin HS, Eeles E, Pandy S, Pinsker D, Brasch C, Yerkovich S. Screening in delirium: A pilot study of two screening tools, the Simple Query for Easy Evaluation of Consciousness and Simple Question in Delirium. Australas J Ageing. 2015;34:259-64. doi:10.1111/ajag.12216.

24. Royal College of Physicians. NEWS2: Additional implementation guidance. London, UK; 2020. https://www.rcplondon.ac.uk/projects/outputs/news2-additional-implementation-guidance. Accessed 6 Jan 2021.

25. Royal College of Physicians. National Hip Fracture Database (NHFD). Annual Report; 2018. https://www.rcplondon.ac.uk/projects/outputs/national-hip-fracture-database-nhfd-annual-report-2018. Accessed 10 Jan 2021.

	Delirium assessment tool in use	Setting in which tool(s) used			Use of delirium assessment tool(s)				Delirium Pathway/ Guidance in place
		Acute general medicine/ MoE	Emergency Department	Surgical Wards	4AT	CAM	SQiD	Other tool	
NHS units	**146/154 (95%)**	**126/146 (86%)**	**94/146 (64%)**	**107/146 (73%)**	**117/146 (80%)**	**65/146 (45%)**	**52/146 (36%)**	**7/146 (5%)**	**131/154 (85%)**
England	121/129 (94%)	103/121 (85%)	76/121 (63%)	87/121 (72%)	93/121 (77%)	58/121 (48%)	37/121 (31%)	5/121 (4%)	107/129* (83%)
Scotland	15/15 (100%)	14/15 (93%)	13/15 (87%)	15/15 (100%)	15/15 (100%)	4/15 (27%)	9/15 (60%)	1/5 (20%)	15/15 (100%)
Wales	5/5 (100%)	5/5 (100%)	2/5 (40%)	2/5 (40%)	5/5 (100%)	2/5 (40%)	1/5 (20%)	1/5 (20%)	5/5 (100%)
Northern Ireland	5/5 (100%)	4/5 (80%)	3/5 (60%)	3/5 (60%)	4/5 (80%)	1/5 (20%)	5/5 (100%)	0/5 (0%)	4/5 (80%)

Table 1. Results from Freedom of Information Request on delirium assessment in UK hospitals. MoE: Medicine of the Elderly. CAM: Confusion Assessment Method. SQiD: Single Question in Delirium.

Note: * A further 11 reported that delirium clinical guidance/pathways were in development.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.01.12.21249699; this version posted January 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Supplementary Appendix 1: Freedom of Information Questions.

1. Do you use a delirium assessment tool as part of clinical practice for your non-ICU patients in your trust/hospital? YES / NO

2. If yes, in which clinical settings are they in place (please use X to indicate all that apply)?

   _____ Acute general medicine/Medicine of the Elderly

   _____ Emergency Department

   _____ Surgical wards

   _____ Other (please specify):

3. Which, if any, validated tools are included in your written (paper or electronic) policies? Please use X to indicate all that apply.

   _____ 4 'A's Test (4AT)

   _____ Confusion Assessment Method

   _____ Single Question in Delirium

   _____ Other (please specify):

4. Do you have a pathway or guidelines relating to delirium? YES / NO

   If yes, in which year were they written? Please attach an electronic copy.