

1 **Drivers of Decision-Making for Adult Tracheostomy for Prolonged Mechanical**
2 **Ventilation: A Qualitative Study**

3 Anuj B Mehta MD MS^{1,2,3}, Steven Lockhart MPH⁴, Allison V Lange MD², Daniel D Matlock
4 MD MPH^{4,5,6}, Ivor S Douglas MD^{1,2}, Megan A Morris PhD MPH^{4,7}
5

6 ¹Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, Department of Medicine, Denver Health &
7 Hospital Association, Denver, CO. ²Division of Pulmonary Sciences and Critical Care Medicine,
8 Department of Medicine, University of Colorado School of Medicine, Aurora, CO. ³Division of
9 Pulmonary, Critical Care, and Sleep Medicine, Department of Medicine. National Jewish Health,
10 Denver, CO. ⁴Adult and Child Center for Outcomes Research and Delivery Science, University
11 of Colorado School of Medicine and Children’s Hospital Colorado, Aurora, CO. ⁵Division of
12 Geriatric Medicine. Department of Medicine. University of Colorado School of Medicine.
13 Aurora, CO. ⁶Veteran’s Affairs Eastern Colorado Geriatric Research Education and Clinical
14 Center. Aurora, CO. ⁷Division of General Internal Medicine, Department of Medicine,
15 University of Colorado School of Medicine, Aurora, CO.

16 **Corresponding Author:** Anuj B Mehta, MD. 777 Bannock St. E320. Denver, CO, 80204. Phone
17 303-602-7937. anuj.mehta@cuanschutz.edu

18 **Running Head:** Drivers of Decision-Making for Adult Tracheostomy

19 **Site:** The work was a joint effort between Denver Health and Hospital Authority, the University
20 of Colorado School of Medicine, and National Jewish Health

21 **Funding:** ABM is supported by NIH K23HL141704 (Primary funding source).

22 **Word Count:** 3392

23 **Acknowledgements:** ABM is supported by NIH K23HL141704 (Primary funding source). ABM
24 had full access to all the data in the study and takes responsibility for the integrity of the data and
25 the accuracy of the data analysis. Contents are the authors’ sole responsibility and do not
26 necessarily represent official NIH views. No authors had any conflicts of interest related to this
27 study. The funders did not have any role in design and conduct of the study; collection,
28 management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the
29 manuscript; or the decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

30 **Disclosures:** No authors have any conflicts of interest to report for this study.

31 **Author Contributions:** ABM, ISD, and MAM conceived the study. ABM and SL were
32 responsible for data collection and analysis. ABM, SL, and MAM were responsible for data
33 interpretation. ABM drafted the article. ABM, SL, AVL, DDM, ISD, and MAM provided critical
34 revisions and meaningful input for the final draft. ABM had full access to all the data in the
35 study and takes responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.
36 ABM conducted all aspects of data analysis. All authors approved the final draft of the
37 manuscript.
38

39 **Abstract (Word Count 274)**

40 **Background:** Decision-making about tracheostomy and prolonged mechanical ventilation
41 (PMV) is emotionally complex. Expectations of surrogate decision-makers and physicians rarely
42 align. Little is known about what surrogates need to make goal-concordant decisions. We sought
43 to identify drivers of tracheostomy and PMV decision-making.

44 **Methods:** Using Grounded Theory, we performed a qualitative study with semi-structured
45 interviews with surrogates of patients receiving mechanical ventilation (MV) being considered
46 for tracheostomy and physicians routinely caring for patients receiving MV. Recruitment was
47 stopped when thematic saturation was reached. Separate codebooks were created for surrogate
48 and physician interviews. Themes and factors affecting decision-making were identified and a
49 theoretical model tracheostomy decision-making was developed.

50 **Results:** 43 participants (23 surrogates and 20 physicians) completed interviews. A theoretical
51 model of themes and factors driving decision-making emerged for the data. Hope, Lack of
52 Knowledge & Data, and Uncertainty emerged as the three main themes all which were
53 interconnected with one another and, at times, opposed each other. Patient Wishes, Past
54 Activity/Medical History, Short and Long-Term Outcomes, and Meaningful Recovery were key
55 factors upon which surrogates and physicians based decision-making. The themes were the lens
56 through which the factors were viewed and decision-making existed as a balance between
57 surrogate emotions and understanding and physician recommendations.

58 **Conclusions:** Tracheostomy and prolonged MV decision-making is complex. Hope and
59 Uncertainty were conceptual themes that often battled with one another. Lack of Knowledge &
60 Data plagued both surrogates and physicians. Multiple tangible factors were identified that
61 affected surrogate decision-making and physician recommendations.

62 **Implications:** Understanding this complex decision-making process has the potential to improve
63 the information provided to surrogates and, potentially, increase the goal concordant care and
64 alignment of surrogate and physician expectations.

65

66 **Highlights**

- 67 • Decision-making for tracheostomy and prolonged mechanical ventilation is a complex
68 interactive process between surrogate decision-makers and providers.
- 69 • Using a Grounded Theory framework, a theoretical model emerged from the data with
70 core themes of Hope, Uncertainty, and Lack of Knowledge & Data that was shared by
71 both providers and surrogates.
- 72 • The core themes were the lenses through which the key decision-making factors of
73 Patient Wishes, Past Activity/Medical History, Short and Long-Term Outcomes, and
74 Meaningful Recovery were viewed.
- 75 • The theoretical model provides a roadmap to design a shared decision-making
76 intervention to improve tracheostomy and prolonged mechanical ventilation decision-
77 making.
- 78

79 **Introduction**

80 In the United States, nearly 100,000 adults undergo tracheostomy annually, mostly to
81 enable prolonged respiratory support.[1, 2] While a tracheostomy can facilitate life-prolonging
82 interventions like mechanical ventilation (MV), it is also associated with significant morbidity
83 and mortality. The majority of patients with a tracheostomy require prolonged hospitalization
84 and intensive rehabilitation.[2, 3] Older adults with a tracheostomy often have a median survival
85 of three to six months with high rates of readmission, frequent complications, and prolonged
86 hospital stays.[3-5] The struggle between the potential for longer survival versus the
87 complications associated with prolonged life support can make tracheostomy-related decisions
88 emotionally complex for surrogate decision-makers.

89 A simple view of decision-making would be that physicians provide data to surrogates
90 and surrogates make the final decision. However, previous studies suggest that decision-making
91 for tracheostomy is far more complex.[6, 7] Surrogates want physician input and view (or want)
92 the process to be collaborative. However, existing data suggests that there is significant
93 dissatisfaction with decision-making in critical care settings. Previous studies have shown that
94 surrogate and physician expectations about tracheostomy outcomes rarely align.[6] Significant
95 disagreement exists in the literature with some reports indicating that most patients would find
96 being attached to a machine “worse than death”, while other studies suggest patients are satisfied
97 after a tracheostomy.[8, 9] Patients and families feel uninformed and that their values were not
98 considered.[7, 10-12] The net result is that patients and surrogates are deeply unsatisfied with the
99 decision-making process.

100 Shared decision-making (SDM) is the collaborative process of patients, surrogates, and
101 providers reaching an informed collective agreement on the treatment most consistent with a

102 patient's values and is recommended as a core part of care for critically ill patients.[13-17] A
103 necessary first step in SDM is understanding the decisional needs of key stakeholders. However,
104 large gaps exist in understanding surrogate value structure and decisional needs as well as
105 physician's mental frameworks for making recommendations. These gaps may contribute to
106 previous failed attempts at improving decision-making and reducing decisional conflict.[18] We
107 conducted a qualitative decisional needs assessment to build a model for tracheostomy decision-
108 making by identifying factors influencing surrogates and physicians.

109

110 **Methods**

111 **Please see the Online Supplemental Methods for full details.**

112 *Study Design:* We conducted a qualitative study of surrogate decision-makers of patients
113 being considered for tracheostomy and critical care physicians routinely involved in
114 tracheostomy decisions from 2018-2022. Standards from the Consolidated Criteria for Reporting
115 Qualitative Research were followed (See **eTable 1**).[19] Grounded Theory methodology was
116 used throughout the study.[20, 21] Grounded Theory aims to develop an explanatory theory of
117 processes by understanding conceptual categories of importance related to the primary research
118 question and can help build a model of a specific phenomenon.[20, 21]

119 *Participants:* Surrogate decision-makers were recruited from two hospitals and critical
120 care physicians were recruited from multiple academic, public, and private physician practices.
121 Surrogates were eligible if they represented a patient being considered for tracheostomy (see
122 **Online Supplement** for details), were ≥ 18 years, and were English-speaking. Up to three
123 surrogates per patient were allowed to enroll.[22] Critical care physicians who routinely care for

124 patients receiving MV and engage with surrogates about tracheostomy related decisions were
125 recruited through invitational emails.

126 A convenience sampling approach was initially used, followed by theoretical sampling to
127 increase the number of surrogates who decided not to pursue a tracheostomy and physicians in
128 private practice. Participant recruitment was discontinued once thematic saturation, the point at
129 which no new themes emerge with additional interviews, was reached.[23, 24] Multiple
130 interruptions to recruitment occurred due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

131 *Data Collection and Analysis:* Separate surrogate and physician interview guides were
132 developed, and semi-structured interviews were conducted in person or virtually by study
133 members trained in qualitative interviews (**Online Supplement**). Interview transcripts were
134 coded and categorized using a constant comparative method and inductive approach.[25] The
135 first five transcripts in each group were independently double-coded to develop separate
136 codebooks for surrogates and physicians. Thereafter, every fifth transcript was double-coded to
137 ensure calibration. An open team-based coding process allowed conceptual themes to emerge
138 from the data.

139 Atlas.ti v9 (Berlin, Germany) was used for data management. All participants provided
140 informed consent for the study. The study was approved by the National Jewish Health
141 Institutional Review Board (HS-3136) and the Colorado Multiple Institutional Review Board
142 (20-3102).

143

144 **Results**

145 *Participants:* Forty-three participants (23 surrogates and 20 physicians) participated in
146 interviews (**Table 1**). Surrogates had a mean age of 48.2 years (SD=15.4) and were

147 predominantly either the spouse/partner (26.1%) or child (34.8%) of the patient. Physicians had a
148 mean age of 45.1 years (SD=7.5) with a broad range of years in practice.

149 *Theoretical Model:* Based on the interviews, a theoretical model of tracheostomy-related
150 decision-making emerged from the data (**Figure 1**). Three conceptual themes were identified:
151 Hope, Uncertainty, and Lack of Knowledge & Data. Additionally, four tangible factors were
152 identified as contributing to surrogate decision-making and physician recommendations about
153 tracheostomy: Patient Wishes, Past Activity/Medical History, Short and Long-Term Recovery,
154 and Meaningful Recovery. Meaningful recovery meant different things to different participants
155 but as a concept, arose repeatedly in interviews. Decision-making existed as a complex balance
156 between surrogates and physicians with the factors affecting their decisions/recommendations
157 being viewed through the lens of the conceptual themes. Decision-making was a bidirectional
158 process with provider comments, opinions, and prognosis weighing heavily on surrogate
159 decisions. Surrogates did not view the provider's role as simply offering information and the
160 final decisions resting solely with the surrogate. An additional layer of complexity emerged in
161 the way in which themes and factors were interrelated (e.g., the Lack of Knowledge & Data
162 contributed to Uncertainty for nearly all participants). From the surrogate perspective, the
163 interplay between the themes contributed to their underlying value structure and was key to
164 guiding the overall decision-making process.

165 *Hope:* Hope was one of the most common concepts discussed by surrogates, anchoring
166 most decision-making (**Table 2, eTable 2**) Hope was the lens through which many surrogates
167 viewed past medical issues and influenced considerations about short- and long-term outcomes
168 and meaningful recovery. When considering different possible outcomes, Hope sometimes
169 superseded factual understanding of past medical issues (e.g., impact of chronic oxygen

170 dependence from pulmonary fibrosis on the chances for ventilator liberation) or even the
171 potential for recovery. Some surrogates indicated that despite knowing the high percentages of
172 poor outcomes, they still held onto Hope for recovery. Some surrogates connected the feeling of
173 Hope to their faith, “We just believe that prayer and everybody’s faith and hope is there. And it’s
174 just a different way of looking at life I guess than a lot of the medical field looks at it, and we
175 never knew that.” (*Surrogate ID1*)

176 Physicians spoke about Hope from a different perspective. Many physicians described
177 struggling with the cognitive disconnection between surrogates’ Hope for meaningful recovery
178 and the clinical probability for recovery for patients with severe comorbid disease like cancer or
179 acute illness like cardiac arrest: “I think family members who end up having tracheostomy put in
180 patients who probably have no hope of getting better are, in a sense, kicking the can down the
181 road, meaning they’re not—they’re hoping God intervenes and makes ‘em better.” (*Physician*
182 *ID37*). When physicians felt that there was little Hope for meaningful recovery (e.g., older
183 patients, patients with severe chronic comorbidities, or those with poor baseline functional
184 status), they would often steer conversations away from tracheostomy.

185 *Lack of Knowledge & Data*: For surrogates, the Lack of Knowledge often was related to
186 the specific factors affecting decision-making identified in the theoretical model especially short-
187 and long-term outcomes and meaningful recovery (**Table 3, eTable 3**). Surrogates mentioned
188 feeling uninformed about the likelihood of ventilator liberation, regaining the ability to eat or
189 talk, regaining functional status, returning home, and overall survival. One surrogate was unclear
190 about what the “quality of life” would be after a tracheostomy or any potential alternatives even
191 after the discussion with the medical team: “Can they have a quality of life? Can they do things?
192 Or are they just bound to a bed and that machine? Is there a portable machine that helps them

193 breathe or is it – I don't know. What options would there be? (*Surrogate ID3*). Multiple
194 surrogates indicated that the Lack of Knowledge about rehabilitation and long-term acute care
195 facilities and associated costs made tracheostomy decisions much more difficult, “I think that
196 I’m still a little fuzzy about the long-term. Because they had said that he was going to go to a
197 long-term rehab facility. His insurance doesn’t cover that.” (*Surrogate ID18*). Other surrogates
198 indicated that even after discussing tracheostomies with the physicians, they were still unaware
199 of potential alternative pathways. Some surrogates also struggled with Lack of Knowledge about
200 a patient’s basic medical information either due to lack of health literacy or poor communication,
201 “He may have had shortness of breath and maybe passed out and had been unconscious. . . You
202 know what, I think they did say he had a cardiac arrest” (*Surrogate ID23*).

203 Additionally, surrogates described a Lack of Knowledge about the impact of past medical
204 issues on recovery, with one surrogate not appreciating that chronic oxygen use was a major
205 health issue prior to the acute illness, negatively impacted chances for recovery. Surrogates also
206 expressed a Lack of Knowledge about a patient’s wishes, even those who had severe illness prior
207 to coming to the hospital: “I think it's difficult to make decisions for somebody. I know that I
208 know her for a long time, but this is something we never actually talked about” (*Surrogate*
209 *ID20*). Several providers also highlighted that the Lack of Knowledge about possible outcomes
210 and alternatives, even after family meetings, negatively impacted surrogates’ experience and led
211 to significant decisional conflict: “But I think they also need to know what the alternative is. I
212 think they a lot of times make a decision to proceed with tracheostomy based on fear of the
213 alternative, as opposed to wanting the tracheostomy.” (*Physician ID28*).

214 For physicians, the corollary of Lack of Knowledge was Lack of Data, specifically
215 around being able to accurately predict short and long-term outcomes and meaningful recovery.

216 The majority of physicians highlighted the Lack of Data around time spent in rehabilitation
217 facilities, ability to be liberated from the ventilator, and overall survival as negatively impacting
218 their confidence in recommendations provided to surrogates. Most physicians also discussed the
219 potential for meaningful recovery, often described as a return to previous physical function
220 combined with the ability to interact with loved ones, as distinct from other outcomes.

221 Meaningful recovery arose inductively as a key factor affecting physician recommendations, “I
222 think someone who doesn’t have a bridge therapy to a good quality of life, so say someone who
223 has a cardiac arrest and it has pretty obvious anoxic brain injury and there’s not likelihood for
224 meaningful recovery, I try to steer the family away from a tracheostomy.” (*Physician ID39*)

225 The Lack of Knowledge & Data also led participants to state that more education and
226 decision-support tools may improve the process, “Education stuff is really what I would want”
227 (*Surrogate ID7*). Some physicians even indicated that decision-support tools might offer greater
228 benefit to providers as it might standardize discussions around tracheostomy especially when
229 there was a Lack of Data: “I think that would be very helpful. I think they [surrogates] want
230 numbers that I feel like I can't provide them. What is his chance of coming off the vent? I end up
231 really pulling numbers out of just from general sense of my past experience, which not good.
232 'Cause everyone's so different. It's just if we could get those numbers, it'd be awesome. . . But I
233 think that would be great.” (*Physician ID27*).

234 *Uncertainty*: Uncertainty manifested as an intangible feeling about the entire decision-
235 making process described by both surrogates and physicians (**Table 4, eTable 4**). Uncertainty
236 was intricately linked to Hope and Lack of Knowledge & Data. For many surrogates, decision-
237 making was described as a battle between feelings of Hope and feelings of Uncertainty.
238 Moreover, while Lack of Knowledge & Data dealt with concrete information and outcomes, it

239 fueled the general sense of Uncertainty that surrogates and physicians described as contributing
240 to decisional conflict. Patient wishes were reported to be important to both surrogates and
241 physicians but views on these wishes were often influenced by Uncertainty even for patients with
242 severe comorbid disease, “Because of the fact that he didn’t have any advance directive, we were
243 winging it” (*Surrogate ID7*). Surrogates with a clearer view of a patient’s past wishes reported
244 being less burdened during the decision-making process. Physicians also expressed their own
245 Uncertainty about what might happen after a tracheostomy when discussing matters with
246 surrogates. Physicians’ Uncertainty often revolved around more general concepts about the
247 potential for recovery, the temporary or permanent nature of the tracheostomy, etc., “it’s
248 [recovery] uncertain. Right? So, I can’t actually tell ‘em, but I can say . . . I say, “I can’t
249 guarantee anything in medicine with the exception of I can guarantee we’re honest. I’ll tell you if
250 they got worse or better. . . I’m not gonna get too high or too low.” (*Physician ID33*). One of the
251 most common ways in which Uncertainty manifested for physicians was when they felt that
252 patients had a poor chance of meaningful recovery but because of Uncertainty about outcomes,
253 patient wishes, or surrogate values, they reported still recommending tracheostomy to surrogates.
254 In connection with a Lack of Data, physicians also described Uncertainty when presenting two
255 sides of a potential outcome without much information to help surrogates see which was more
256 likely (e.g. some patients coming off the ventilator quickly while others may need the
257 tracheostomy and ventilator for a long time).

258 Additional participant quotes describing can be found in **eTable 5-8**.

259

260 **Discussion**

261 In a prospective qualitative study, we identified conceptual themes and key factors
262 contributing to surrogate and physician decision-making for tracheostomy. Using Grounded
263 Theory, a theoretical model of tracheostomy decision-making emerged (**Figure 1**).[20, 21] The
264 themes were the lens through which the more tangible factors were viewed and processed.
265 Decision-making represented a balance between surrogate needs and physicians' ability to
266 provide recommendations. Unlike classic conceptions of decision-making where providers give
267 information to surrogates and surrogates are left to make decisions on their own, this study
268 revealed that tracheostomy and PMV related decision-making is a highly interactive process
269 between surrogates and providers.

270 Current decision-making approaches for tracheostomy, prolonged MV, and other critical
271 care interventions are inadequate for surrogates, with poor alignment between surrogate and
272 physician expectations.[6, 12] Xu et al reviewed family meetings and identified similar themes to
273 our study including past wishes and long-term prognosis but surrogates and physicians were not
274 directly interviewed by unbiased researchers.[26] Other studies with pediatric populations also
275 found similar themes to this study (e.g., functional status, past medical history, prior wishes,
276 etc.).[27, 28] Given the emotional complexities of tracheostomy decision-making, the lack of a
277 theoretical model may contribute to the lack of efficacy of past decision-support tools for
278 prolonged mechanical ventilation.[18] To our knowledge, this study is one of the first to use
279 qualitative methodologies to build a theoretical model for adult tracheostomy decision-making.

280 In traditional Grounded Theory, themes emerge during the analysis process that can then
281 be used to build a theoretical model of the phenomenon being studied.[20, 21] For tracheostomy
282 decision-making, the themes reflected the surrogate's value structure or the value structure of the
283 patient as perceived by the surrogate. However, tracheostomy decision-making is emotionally

284 complex and frequently encompasses larger goals of care and end-of-life discussions. It often
285 involves weighing quality of life with quantity of life. As in other areas of health care, this
286 balancing act can be influenced by concrete factors such as the patient's past wishes, past
287 medical history, and the potential for meaningful recovery. Therefore, the theoretical model that
288 emerged from the data included both conceptual themes and factors that exist as a balance
289 between surrogate views and physician recommendations.

290 A key finding was the interaction between the themes. Surrogates logically recognized
291 that pre-existing conditions like cancer or chronic oxygen use might impact the chances for
292 recovery but in many cases, Hope overrode data driven decision-making. Lack of Knowledge &
293 Data was common finding for both surrogates and physicians. The Lack of Knowledge & Data
294 referred to concrete factors such as a lack of information about rehabilitation facilities, data on
295 the chances for ventilator liberation, etc. Sometimes, it appeared that the Lack of Knowledge &
296 Data gave surrogates more Hope since no data was viewed as better than bad data. However,
297 Lack of Knowledge & Data also fueled Uncertainty for surrogates and physicians.

298 While Uncertainty was one of three themes to emerge, it was also central to all other
299 themes. In 2011, Han et al described a new taxonomy for Uncertainty given its key importance in
300 health care.[29] Han et al described multiple sub-types of Uncertainty in health care including
301 prognostic Uncertainty, Uncertainty related to structures and processes of care, and existential
302 Uncertainty. These subtypes of Uncertainty encompass many of the themes and factors identified
303 in this study. Prognostic Uncertainty aligns with Lack of Knowledge & Data. Uncertainty related
304 to structures and processes of care was akin to surrogate concerns about rehabilitation options.
305 Existential Uncertainty also mirrored the classic intangible form of Uncertainty identified as a

306 core theme in this study. This deeper understanding of Uncertainty may highlight some of the
307 core struggles for surrogates and physicians.

308 SDM is recommended by multiple medical societies and expert groups as a core
309 component of complex decision-making including for decisions like tracheostomy in the
310 ICU.[10, 14, 16, 30, 31] A core part of SDM is defining a patient or surrogates underlying value
311 structure to best present potential outcomes. Providing more data to surrogates does not always
312 improve decision-making, especially for surrogates who lack numeric literacy. However, when
313 the possible risks, benefits, and outcomes presented to surrogates align with their personal value
314 structure, behavioral theory would suggest that the additional data may reduce internal
315 conflict.[32] In fact, most surrogates and some physicians stated that the lack of information and
316 education on alternatives, rehabilitation options, and the likelihood of different outcomes
317 negatively impacts the decision-making process. Moreover, a lack of understanding of the
318 surrogate decision-making process also contributes to wide variation in physician approaches to
319 discussing tracheostomy and goals of care. This study may provide a more concrete framework
320 from which to approach future SDM interventions.[18]

321 This study has multiple limitations. Despite transitioning to a theoretical sampling
322 approach towards the end of the study, it remained difficult to enroll surrogates who had chosen
323 not to pursue tracheostomy. While many expressed interest, not pursuing tracheostomy was often
324 accompanied by the patient dying and surrogates struggled to commit to interviews while
325 grieving. As such, there is a selection bias. Additionally, the COVID-19 pandemic caused a
326 nearly two-year interruption in recruitment as research was paused at an institutional level and
327 because tracheostomy practices evolved during the first year of the pandemic. While the study
328 was multi-center, different themes may influence decision-making in other regions and

329 institutions related to different populations and different hospital structures. Finally, surrogates
330 and physicians were interviewed separately and not as part of a dyad. Therefore, it was not
331 possible to determine what was actually said during tracheostomy conversations, only surrogate
332 recollections of what was said. However, surrogate experience and final decisions are always
333 based in perceptions of decision-making conversations making the themes identified in this study
334 highly relevant to improving the decision-making process.

335 The theoretical model for tracheostomy decision-making demonstrates a complex
336 interplay between the qualitative themes of Hope, Lack of Knowledge & Data and Uncertainty.
337 These themes were the lens through which the more concrete drivers of decision-making (patient
338 wishes, past activity/medical history, short- and long-term outcomes, and meaningful recovery)
339 were viewed. The model also reveals that surrogates view the provider role as being much larger
340 than just offering information or fact sharing. While some have argued that the physician's role
341 is to only provide information and that final decisions rest on the patient or surrogate, our
342 findings indicate that decision-making is a bidirectional process.

343 The gaps identified by the theoretical model represent areas where additional outcomes
344 data may aid the decision-making process but also highlights the importance of clarifying
345 patient/surrogate value structure through which to present such data. This study highlights the
346 complex interplay between surrogates and physicians and how a collaborative approach to
347 decision-making is needed. The current theoretical model can serve as the foundation for SDM
348 tools designed to improve goal-concordant care.

349

350

351

References

- 352 [1] HCUPnet. 2021 January 1 [cited 2021 July 1] Available from: <http://hcupnet.ahrq.gov/>
- 353 [2] Mehta AB, Syeda SN, Bajpayee L, Cooke CR, Walkey AJ, Wiener RS. Trends in
354 Tracheostomy for Mechanically Ventilated Patients in the United States, 1993-2012. *American*
355 *journal of respiratory and critical care medicine*. 2015; 192(4):446-54. 10.1164/rccm.201502-
356 0239OC [doi].
- 357 [3] Mehta AB, Walkey AJ, Curran-Everett D, Douglas IS. One-Year Outcomes Following
358 Tracheostomy for Acute Respiratory Failure. *Crit Care Med*. 2019; 47(11):1572-81.
359 10.1097/ccm.0000000000003959.
- 360 [4] Law AC, Stevens JP, Choi E, Shen C, Mehta AB, Yeh RW, Walkey AJ. Days out of
361 Institution after Tracheostomy and Gastrostomy Placement in Critically Ill Older Adults. *Ann*
362 *Am Thorac Soc*. 2022; 19(3):424-32. 10.1513/AnnalsATS.202106-649OC.
- 363 [5] Mehta AB, Matlock DD, Shorr AF, Douglas IS. Healthcare Trajectories and Outcomes in
364 the First Year After Tracheostomy Based on Patient Characteristics. *Crit Care Med*. 2023.
365 10.1097/ccm.0000000000006029.
- 366 [6] Cox CE, Martinu T, Sathy SJ, Clay AS, Chia J, Gray AL, et al. Expectations and
367 outcomes of prolonged mechanical ventilation. *Critical Care Medicine*. 2009; 37(11):2888-94.
368 10.1097/CCM.0b013e3181ab86ed [doi].
- 369 [7] Frost DW, Cook DJ, Heyland DK, Fowler RA. Patient and healthcare professional factors
370 influencing end-of-life decision-making during critical illness: a systematic review. *Critical Care*
371 *Medicine*. 2011; 39(5):1174-89. 10.1097/CCM.0b013e31820eacf2 [doi].
- 372 [8] Rubin EB, Buehler AE, Halpern SD. States Worse Than Death Among Hospitalized
373 Patients With Serious Illnesses. *JAMA internal medicine*. 2016; 176(10):1557-9.
374 10.1001/jamainternmed.2016.4362 [doi].
- 375 [9] Jubran A, Grant BJB, Duffner LA, Collins EG, Lanuza DM, Hoffman LA, Tobin MJ.
376 Long-Term Outcome after Prolonged Mechanical Ventilation. A Long-Term Acute-Care
377 Hospital Study. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2019; 199(12):1508-16. 10.1164/rccm.201806-
378 1131OC.
- 379 [10] Thompson BT, Cox PN, Antonelli M, Carlet JM, Cassell J, Hill NS, et al. Challenges in
380 end-of-life care in the ICU: statement of the 5th International Consensus Conference in Critical
381 Care: Brussels, Belgium, April 2003: executive summary. *Critical Care Medicine*. 2004;
382 32(8):1781-4. 00003246-200408000-00023 [pii].
- 383 [11] White DB, Malvar G, Karr J, Lo B, Curtis JR. Expanding the paradigm of the physician's
384 role in surrogate decision-making: an empirically derived framework. *Critical Care Medicine*.
385 2010; 38(3):743-50. 10.1097/CCM.0b013e3181c58842 [doi].
- 386 [12] Azoulay E, Chevret S, Leleu G, Pochard F, Barbotou M, Adrie C, et al. Half the families
387 of intensive care unit patients experience inadequate communication with physicians. *Critical*
388 *Care Medicine*. 2000; 28(8):3044-9.
- 389 [13] Barry MJ, Edgman-Levitan S. Shared decision making--pinnacle of patient-centered care.
390 *The New England journal of medicine*. 2012; 366(9):780-1. 10.1056/NEJMp1109283 [doi].
- 391 [14] Kon AA, Davidson JE, Morrison W, Danis M, White DB, American College of Critical
392 Care M, American Thoracic S. Shared Decision Making in ICUs: An American College of
393 Critical Care Medicine and American Thoracic Society Policy Statement. *Critical Care*
394 *Medicine*. 2016; 44(1):188-201. 10.1097/CCM.0000000000001396 [doi].

- 395 [15] Matlock DD, Spatz ES. Design and testing of tools for shared decision making.
396 *Circulation Cardiovascular quality and outcomes*. 2014; 7(3):487-92.
397 10.1161/CIRCOUTCOMES.113.000289 [doi].
- 398 [16] Michalsen A, Long AC, DeKeyser Ganz F, White DB, Jensen HI, Metaxa V, et al.
399 Interprofessional Shared Decision-Making in the ICU: A Systematic Review and
400 Recommendations From an Expert Panel. *Crit Care Med*. 2019; 47(9):1258-66.
401 10.1097/ccm.0000000000003870.
- 402 [17] Teno JM, Clarridge BR, Casey V, Welch LC, Wetle T, Shield R, Mor V. Family
403 perspectives on end-of-life care at the last place of care. *Jama*. 2004; 291(1):88-93.
404 10.1001/jama.291.1.88.
- 405 [18] Cox CE, White DB, Hough CL, Jones DM, Kahn JM, Olsen MK, et al. Effects of a
406 Personalized Web-Based Decision Aid for Surrogate Decision Makers of Patients With
407 Prolonged Mechanical Ventilation: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *Ann Intern Med*. 2019;
408 170(5):285-97. 10.7326/m18-2335.
- 409 [19] Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research
410 (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *Int J Qual Health Care*. 2007;
411 19(6):349-57. 10.1093/intqhc/mzm042.
- 412 [20] Creswell JW. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five*
413 *Approaches*, 3rd edition. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. 2012.
- 414 [21] Starks H, Trinidad SB. Choose your method: a comparison of phenomenology, discourse
415 analysis, and grounded theory. *Qualitative health research*. 2007; 17(10):1372-80. 17/10/1372
416 [pii].
- 417 [22] Reczek C. Conducting a multi family member interview study. *Family process*. 2014;
418 53(2):318-35. 10.1111/famp.12060 [doi].
- 419 [23] Guest G, Bunce A, Johnson L. How Many Interviews Are Enough?: An Experiment with
420 Data Saturation and Variability. *Field Methods*. 2006; 18(1):59-82.
421 <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1525822X05279903>.
- 422 [24] Guest G, Namey E, Chen M. A simple method to assess and report thematic saturation in
423 qualitative research. *PLoS One*. 2020; 15(5):e0232076. 10.1371/journal.pone.0232076.
- 424 [25] Clandinin DJ. *Qualitative Analysis, Anthropology*. In: Kempf-Leonard K, ed.
425 *Encyclopedia of Social Measurement*: Elsevier Inc. 2005.
- 426 [26] Xu L, El-Jawahri AR, Rubin EB. Tracheostomy Decision-making Communication
427 among Patients Receiving Prolonged Mechanical Ventilation. *Ann Am Thorac Soc*. 2021;
428 18(5):848-56. 10.1513/AnnalsATS.202009-1217OC.
- 429 [27] Nageswaran S, Gower WA, Golden SL, King NMP. Collaborative decision-making: A
430 framework for decision-making about life-sustaining treatments in children with medical
431 complexity. *Pediatr Pulmonol*. 2022; 57(12):3094-103. 10.1002/ppul.26140.
- 432 [28] Shipman KJ, Mercer AH, Raisanen JC, Jabre NA, Vo HH, Miles A, et al. "What Would
433 Give Her the Best Life?": Understanding Why Families Decline Pediatric Home Ventilation. *J*
434 *Palliat Med*. 2023. 10.1089/jpm.2022.0426.
- 435 [29] Han PK, Klein WM, Arora NK. Varieties of uncertainty in health care: a conceptual
436 taxonomy. *Med Decis Making*. 2011; 31(6):828-38. 10.1177/0272989x11393976.
- 437 [30] Force UPST. Collaboration and Shared Decision-Making Between Patients and
438 Clinicians in Preventive Health Care Decisions and US Preventive Services Task Force
439 Recommendations. *JAMA*. 2022; 327(12):1171-6. 10.1001/jama.2022.3267.

440 [31] Li L, Nelson JE, Hanson LC, Cox CE, Carson SS, Chai EJ, et al. How Surrogate
441 Decision-Makers for Patients With Chronic Critical Illness Perceive and Carry Out Their Role.
442 Crit Care Med. 2018; 46(5):699-704. 10.1097/ccm.0000000000003035.

443 [32] Bosnjak M, Ajzen I, Schmidt P. The Theory of Planned Behavior: Selected Recent
444 Advances and Applications. Eur J Psychol. 2020; 16(3):352-6. 10.5964/ejop.v16i3.3107.

445

446

447 **Figure Legends**

448 **Figure 1 Tracheostomy Decision-Making Theoretical Model:** Based on interviews with
449 surrogates decision-makers and physicians, a theoretical model emerged from the data. Three
450 conceptual themes were identified: Hope, Lack of Knowledge & Data (Lack of K&D), and
451 Uncertainty. The bidirectional arrows between these themes indicates the significant
452 interconnectedness of these themes. In addition to the conceptual themes, four tangible factors
453 also emerged: Patient Wishes, Past Activity/Medical History, Short and Long-Term Outcomes,
454 and Meaningful Recovery. The conceptual themes were the lens through which the factors were
455 evaluated by both surrogates and physicians. The theoretical model depicts the conceptual
456 qualitative themes as being the fulcrum of decision-making and that the process is a balance
457 between surrogates and physicians influenced by the factors. Abbreviations – Lack of K&D –
458 Lack of Knowledge & Data
459

460 **Table 1: Participant Characteristics**

	Surrogate (n=23)	Physician (n=20)
Age (mean, SD)	48.2 (15.4) ^A	45.1 (7.5)
Female, n (%)	16 (76.2) ^A	4 (20)
Race, n (%)		
White	9 (39.1)	15 (75.0)
Black	9 (39.1)	2 (10.0)
American Indian/Native American	2 (8.7)	0 (0)
Other/Unknown	3 (13.1)	3 (15.0)
Hispanic, n (%)	4 (17.4)	2 (10.0)
Relationship to Patient (%)		NA
Spouse/Significant Other	6 (26.1)	
Child	8 (34.8)	
Sibling	3 (13.0)	
Other/Unknown	6 (23.1)	
Where do you practice? (%)	NA	
Academic Setting		8 (40.0)
Private Practice Model		4 (20.0)
Hybrid Model		8 (40.0)
How long have you practiced critical care medicine? (%)	NA	
<5 years		4 (20.0)
5-9 years		5 (25.0)
10-14 years		7 (35.0)
>15 years		4 (20.0)

461 Abbreviations: SD – standard deviation. n – number.

462 ^A2 surrogates did not provide demographic information. No missing data was imputed.

463

464 **Table 2: Hope**

<p>Oh, I think he's strong. Stronger than everybody thought he could be with the blessings he's had. I have no idea how long he'll live. I'm just going to enjoy every day that we have, and his family is the same and his friends. I read and I see 70 percent of people don't make it to three years or five years or whatever that percentage is, and I see it and I can't help but hope that he'll be the one that'll be on the other percentage that'll live longer, and I don't know if that'll happen or not. (<i>Surrogate ID1</i>)</p>
<p>Well hopefully she gets out of the hospital and gets off the breathing machine. If she has to have a trach, she has to have one. But she needs to get back home, in her own bed, and back to her old life. And back to the regular things she does. Even though she can't eat my good cooking. (<i>Surrogate ID2</i>)</p>
<p>I wish it was all better...had to do what I need to do if she's gonna stay alive. I can't just say take it off. I was just explaining to you earlier. I'm not gonna make a decision that will end her life. I can't do that. (<i>Surrogate ID6</i>)</p>
<p>We're saying it's not necessarily benefiting the patient. Yeah, and, typically, families will tell you that they usually get it, and they usually eventually come to a decision that they'll say, "We don't want the tracheostomy," and so on. Sometimes families, though, the values are such that they feel a heartbeat is life. As long as there's a heartbeat, there's hope, and they want it done. They will express that the patient's was such that, when they were lucid, they said that that was their values. They would rather be alive in a vegetative state than not, and so we'll go ahead and do it. (<i>Physician ID36</i>)</p>
<p>None of us can predict the future. Everyone should have hope. I don't count that as a negative. I just try to—what you don't want, is you don't want the family, the surrogate or the patient afterwards saying, "I never wish I'd have to go through that again." It's really hard to portray it accurately enough and for the family to make a decision based on that. Right? They're making decisions based on wanting their family member to live. It's really, really hard. That's what I'm trying to do, but I don't think any of us do it that well. (<i>Physician ID40</i>)</p>
<p>In our patient population, which may or may not be similar to what you guys deal with is pretty much all the patients go to the mat that they want everything done, every intervention. They're a fighter. There's miracles. We're praying to God. Most of our families don't ever wanna give up anything, and they're demanding more and more and more. Even when the patient's skin is falling off, and they just, "Keep going, keep going." (<i>Physician ID42</i>)</p>

465

466

467 **Table 3: Lack of Knowledge & Data**

<p>Maybe more details about the rehabs and absolutely about the rehabs, what he'd do there, what the possibility – we were wanting to ask about if he can't walk, would he have to have a mobile chair, wheelchair or those little gadget chairs that move around, what can he do to still have a little bit of quality of life to get around. We wanted to ask if the dry weather was going to be better than humid weather, warm weather better than cold weather altitudes, but they – we never got a chance to sit down. And even when we were in the team meetings, we weren't ever asked do you have any questions ever. (<i>Surrogate ID1</i>)</p>
<p>Interviewer: Sure. What kind of education would want in terms of the different things that people can do with a trach, a tracheostomy? Interviewee: Can they have a quality of life? Can they do things? Or are they just bound to a bed and that machine? Is there a portable machine that helps them breathe or is it – I don't know. What options would there be? (<i>Surrogate ID3</i>)</p>
<p>Educational stuff. What you can expect. . . .Going forward with it. The amount of sicknesses. Even if you don't go over every sickness that you can get because yeah, you can get everything from not having a trach too. But the chances of getting sick go up. The chances of having a respiratory infection go up. But really what you can expect is the biggest thing that I would really have wanted to know going forward with somebody with a trach. (<i>Surrogate ID7</i>)</p>
<p>But I think if the trach is seriously being considered, if there's a good prediction tool that could really say, "There's a better chance than not this is a permanent fixture to this person's body, and it may mean they're gonna be living in the nursing home forever," that can be helpful. (<i>Physician ID28</i>)</p>
<p>I think that would be good information to tell patients, here's where this patient fits in terms of expected outcomes and trying to come to that decision with the family. Is it really worth it for us to pursue the tracheostomy or not? I think if we had a good data that showed us this patient fits this phenotype and they have this percentage chance to come off the ventilator, I think that would be very beneficial. . . I try not to do that, but if I had objective data that I could plug the specific patient's information into and say, "Hey, 50 percent of patients have this outcome," then I think that—or to stay on the ventilator for this long when they have this particular course to this particular disease pathology. I think that's good information for them to manage their expectations and say, "Hey, maybe this is worth it, maybe this isn't," so that just everyone's more informed. (<i>Physician ID39</i>)</p>

468

469 **Table 4: Uncertainty**

<p>So I've often wondered, . . . Because, of course, you don't want to give up on your family member at all, especially when you're the one making the decision. You don't want to make that decision. But it's just hard because you can't foresee the future. (<i>Surrogate ID5</i>)</p>
<p>I think it's difficult to make decisions for somebody. I know that I know her for a long time, but this is something we never actually talked about (<i>Surrogate ID20</i>)</p>
<p>Interviewer: Okay, has that been hard not knowing what your dad would've wanted if he got really sick? Interviewee: Well, it's just hard bein' in that position of knowing or not knowing, but having to make that decision [laughter] for him as far as what to do health wise, and it's extremely uncomfortable. I believe that that was maybe the hardest part in this whole thing, not just because I didn't know what my dad would want, but also because I am a firm believer in Jesus Christ. I didn't want to play the role of God in any decision-making like that, though, as far as life and death. (<i>Surrogate ID22</i>)</p>
<p>Interviewee: I don't know at first . . . I guess I was just worried. I was worried if he would be able to breathe on his own, and then I was also worried as far as how long they would be allowed to leave him on there 'cause I wasn't really sure how that worked, if they could only leave him on there for a certain amount of days, and then take him off. Interviewer: Gotcha, so that uncertainty? Interviewee: Mm-hmm. (<i>Surrogate ID23</i>)</p>
<p>I guess it's usually tailored to the clinical situation, but there's always uncertainty, so I'll usually—the hope would be that this would be a short-term thing and I guess that's one other thing that I usually add on to your prior question which if this is reversible? You can take it out and the hole will heal up and go away, usually within days. . . I think it's, hopefully, temporary, but it's always hard to know. May often translate into leaving the hospital to go to a long-term acute care hospital, so different physical settings. Sometimes that can be seen as at least an encouraging sign of recovery to make it out of the hospital, but also to know that it could be something that goes on for days, weeks or even months. In rare cases, it's clear that it's going to be indefinite, in which case I'll certainly try not to pull any punches here in these discussions and I'll let them know if I think it will be indefinite. (<i>Physician ID35</i>)</p>

470

471

472 **Acknowledgements**

473 See Title Page for Acknowledgements

474

475 **Disclosures:** No authors have any conflicts of interest to report for this study.

476

Factors/Subthemes Affecting Decision-Making

Patient Wishes

Past Activity/Medical History

Short and Long-Term Outcomes

Meaningful Recovery

Surrogates

Physicians

Uncertainty

Qualitative
Themes

Hope

Lack of K&D