

1 Abstract: 242 words

2 Total: 2539 words

3

4 Derivation and validation of a prediction rule for sedative-associated delirium during acute

5 respiratory failure requiring mechanical ventilation

6 Short form: “sedative-associated delirium prediction rule”

7

8 Niall T. Prendergast¹, MD; Chukwudi A. Onyemekwu¹, DO; Kelly M. Potter, RN, PhD²;

9 Christopher A. Franz, MD³; Georgios D. Kitsios MD, PhD¹; Bryan J. McVerry, MD¹; Pratik P.

10 Pandharipande, MD, MSCI^{4,5}; E. Wesley Ely, MD, MPH^{4,6,7}; Timothy D. Girard, MD, MSCI^{2,4}

11

12 Affiliations:

13 ¹Division of Pulmonary, Allergy, Critical Care, and Sleep Medicine in the Department of

14 Medicine and ²Center for Research, Investigation, and Systems Modeling of Acute Illness

15 (CRISMA) in the Department of Critical Care Medicine, University of Pittsburgh School of

16 Medicine, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

17 ³UPMC Harrisburg, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

18 ⁴Critical Illness, Brain Dysfunction, and Survivorship (CIBS) Center, ⁵Division of Anesthesiology

19 Critical Care Medicine in the Department of Anesthesiology, ⁶Division of Allergy, Pulmonary,

20 and Critical Care Medicine in the Department of Medicine, Vanderbilt University Medical Center;

21 Nashville, Tennessee

22 ⁷Geriatric Research, Education and Clinical Center (GRECC) Service, Department of Veterans
23 Affairs Medical Center, Tennessee Valley Healthcare System, Nashville, TN, USA

24

25 Keywords:

26 Delirium, mechanical ventilation, modeling, risk prediction, sedation

27

28 Declarations:

29 Ethics approval and consent to participate: BRAIN-ICU and MIND-ICU were approved
30 by the institutional review board (IRB) at Vanderbilt University, and by local IRBs at each site,
31 when the study was initially approved. The use of the data was approved by the IRB at the
32 University of Pittsburgh as PRO18020380. The ALIR was approved as STUDY19050099 by the
33 IRB at the University of Pittsburgh. Both studies involve(d) consent by the patient or his/her
34 legally authorized representative.

35 Availability of data and materials: The datasets used and/or analysed during the current
36 study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

37 Competing interests: NTP, CAO, KMP, and CAF declare that they have no competing
38 interests. GDK has received research funding from Genentech, Inc, and Pfizer, Inc, unrelated to
39 this work. BJM receives research funding from Genentech, and previously served as consultant
40 or advisory board member for BioAegis, Synairgen Research Ltd, and Boehringer Ingelheim.
41 PPP declares no competing interest. EWE reports honoraria for continuing medical education
42 lectures sponsored by Pfizer, and study support (investigational drug provision, no direct
43 payments) from Eli Lilly. TDG receives research funding from Ceribell and served previously on
44 an advisory board for Lungpacer Medical Inc.

45 Funding: This work was supported by NIH grants F32HL158058 (to NTP),
46 R03HL162655 (to GDK), P01HL114453 (to BJM), and R01AG027472 (to EWE) and by a Merit
47 Review Grant from Department of Veterans Affairs (to EWE).

48 Authors' contributions: NTP and TDG conceived of and designed the work. NTP, CAF,
49 GDK, BJM, PPP, EWE, and TDG participated in the acquisition and analysis of data. NTP,
50 CAO, KMP, CAF, GDK, BJM, and TDG participated in the drafting and/or substantial revision of
51 the manuscript. All authors have approved the submitted manuscript.

52 Acknowledgements: Not applicable.

53 Authors' information: Please contact the corresponding author, Dr. Niall Prendergast, via
54 email at prendergastnt@upmc.edu, or via mail at 200 Lothrop Street, Pittsburgh PA 15213.

55

56 **Abstract**

57 *Background:* Delirium during acute respiratory failure is common and morbid. Pharmacologic
58 sedation is a major risk factor for delirium, but some sedation is often necessary for the
59 provision of safe care of mechanically ventilated patients. A simple, transparent model that
60 predicts sedative-associated delirium in mechanically ventilated ICU patients could be used to
61 guide decisions about personalized sedation.

62 *Research Question:* Can the risk of sedative-associated delirium be estimated in mechanically-
63 ventilated ICU patients?

64 *Study Design and Methods:* Using the subset of patients in a previously-published ICU cohort
65 who received mechanical ventilation, we performed backward stepwise logistic regression to
66 derive a model predictive of sedative-associated delirium. We validated this model internally
67 using hundredfold bootstrapping. We then validated this model externally in a separate
68 prospective cohort of mechanically ventilated ICU patients.

69 *Results:* 836 patients comprised the derivation cohort. Backwards stepwise regression
70 produced a model with age, BMI, sepsis, SOFA, malignancy, COPD, stroke, sex, and doses of
71 sedatives (opioids, propofol, and/or benzodiazepines) as predictors of sedative-associated
72 delirium. The model had very good discriminative power, with an area under the receiver-
73 operator curve (AUROC) of 0.83. Internal validation via bootstrapping showed preserved
74 discriminatory function with an AUROC of 0.81 and graphical evidence of good calibration.
75 External validation in a separate set of 340 patients showed good discrimination, with AUROC
76 of 0.70.

77 *Interpretation:* Sedative-associated delirium during acute respiratory failure requiring mechanical
78 ventilation can be predicted using a simple, transparent model, which can now be validated in a
79 prospective study.

80 **Introduction**

81 Delirium, a syndrome of acutely altered attention, awareness, and cognition, affects up
82 to 80% of patients with acute respiratory failure requiring mechanical ventilation.¹⁻⁴ Delirium is
83 associated with both ICU and hospital mortality.^{5,6} Among survivors, delirium is also associated
84 with long-term cognitive impairment,^{2,7} which reduces quality of life and, for many patients,⁸ is a
85 less desirable outcome than death.

86 During acute respiratory failure, delirium is likely a manifestation of different or
87 converging pathophysiologic processes. Recognizing this multifaceted pathophysiology,
88 clinicians and researchers often subcategorize delirium by probable etiology, with common
89 examples including alcohol withdrawal delirium, septic delirium, delirium associated with hepatic
90 dysfunction (also known as “hepatic encephalopathy”), and medication-induced delirium. In a
91 recent study with a large cohort of ICU patients, 90% of whom were mechanically ventilated, we
92 found that sedative-associated delirium was the most common risk factor-defined delirium
93 subtype.⁹ Like hypoxic and septic delirium, sedative-associated delirium was associated with
94 decreased long-term cognitive function after recovery from critical illness.⁹

95 In contrast to other etiologies of delirium, sedative-associated delirium is at least in part
96 under the control of the clinical team. However, deliriogenic sedation practices, such as frequent
97 use of benzodiazepines, persist worldwide—indeed, this has worsened since the beginning of
98 the COVID-19 pandemic.¹⁰ Sedative choice and depth is ideally personalized according to each
99 patient’s condition and needs, but evidence-based tools to guide sedation practices are limited
100 to sedation scales used to gauge depth of sedation.^{11,12} Therefore, we sought to derive and

101 validate a simple, transparent prediction tool that quantifies the risk of sedative-associated
102 delirium during invasive mechanical ventilation, with a particular focus on the newly intubated
103 patient. If accurate and reliable, this tool could then inform clinicians as they consider risk-
104 benefit tradeoffs regarding sedation, particularly in the immediate post-intubation period.

105 **Methods**

106 **Patient Cohorts**

107 We derived and internally validated the model using data collected during the Bringing to
108 Light the Risk Factors and Incidence of Neuropsychological Dysfunction in intensive care unit
109 (ICU) Survivors (BRAIN-ICU)² and Delirium and Dementia in Veterans Surviving ICU Care
110 (MIND-ICU) studies.¹³ These were parallel multicenter, prospective cohort studies with identical
111 inclusion/exclusion criteria in different patient populations that have been extensively described
112 elsewhere.² In brief, adults with acute respiratory failure and/or septic or cardiogenic shock were
113 enrolled in five US hospitals; complete medication administration data and daily delirium
114 assessments by trained research personnel were collected. BRAIN-ICU and MIND-ICU also
115 collected neurocognitive data out to one year from ICU discharge, as the aims of the study were
116 to estimate the prevalence of long-term cognitive impairment after critical illness and to test the
117 hypothesis that longer duration of delirium in the hospital and higher doses of sedative and
118 analgesic agents are independently associated with more severe cognitive impairment. For the
119 current study, we used only data from ICU admission and restricted the analysis to patients who
120 were mechanically ventilated at the time of study enrollment.

121 Following derivation and internal validation, we externally validated the rule using data
122 collected as part of the Acute Lung Injury Registry (ALIR),¹⁴ an ongoing prospective cohort
123 study conducted at the University of Pittsburgh. Inclusion criteria, exclusion criteria, and data
124 gathering procedures have previously been described.¹⁴ In brief, adults with acute respiratory

125 failure are enrolled from three hospitals within the UPMC health system in Pittsburgh, PA. For
126 the current study, we analyzed mechanically ventilated patients with delirium assessments.

127 **Baseline Data and Outcomes**

128 During BRAIN-ICU and MIND-ICU, research personnel collected baseline variables at
129 the time of study enrollment, including age, sex, height, weight, admission diagnosis, chronic
130 disease burden according to the Charlson comorbidity index,¹⁵ preexisting cognitive impairment
131 according to the Short Informant Questionnaire on Cognitive Decline in the Elderly (IQCODE),¹⁶
132 and cerebrovascular disease burden according to the Framingham Stroke Risk Profile.¹⁷ Every
133 study day until ICU discharge or study day 30, research personnel collected data on severity of
134 illness according to the Sequential Organ Failure Assessment (SOFA) score and presence of
135 severe sepsis, hypoxemia, coma, and delirium.¹⁸ We assessed participants' level of
136 consciousness with the Richmond Agitation-Sedation Scale (RASS) and assessed for delirium
137 using the Confusion Assessment Method for the ICU (CAM-ICU).^{11,19} We also collected
138 medication-administration data from the medical record, converting benzodiazepine doses to
139 midazolam equivalents and opioid doses to fentanyl equivalents as per the study's
140 Supplementary Appendix.² As previously described,⁹ we defined sedative-associated delirium
141 as delirium (identified by a positive CAM-ICU assessment) occurring on the same day that the
142 subject received a benzodiazepine, opioid, propofol, and/or dexmedetomidine.

143 ALIR study personnel collect baseline variables at the time of enrollment, including age,
144 sex, chronic disease burden, height, and weight. Respiratory failure diagnoses are established
145 via a consensus conference of intensivist investigators. Medication data are automatically
146 abstracted from the medical record; doses of benzodiazepines and opioids are converted to
147 midazolam and fentanyl equivalents (respectively) as previously described.²⁰⁻²² For the
148 validation cohort, we included ALIR patients who were assessed for coma and delirium daily
149 using the RASS and CAM-ICU by research personnel and/or twice daily using the Riker

150 Sedation-Agitation Scale (SAS) and the Intensive Care Delirium Screening Checklist
151 (ICDSC).^{12,23} As the ICDSC evaluates a patient over a period of time, while the CAM evaluates
152 a patient at a particular moment, and as delirium is frequently underrecognized, we treated
153 patients as having been delirious on a given day if either CAM-ICU or ICDSC were positive and
154 classified this as sedative-associated delirium using the previously described definition.

155 **Statistical Analysis**

156 We analyzed data using Stata (version 18 StataCorp, College Station, TX) and R
157 (version 4.1.2, R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria). Missing BRAIN-ICU
158 data were imputed as previously described.² We imputed missing delirium data in the ALIR
159 dataset (for approximately 9% of measurements) using the MICE package for multivariate
160 imputation in R.

161 We chose an initial 28 candidate variables that had previously been shown to associate
162 with delirium risk.²⁴ Because we sought to derive a relatively simple, transparent score to
163 facilitate implementation, we applied logistic regression so that the resulting model would be
164 intuitively interpretable, the strengths of individual predictors would be explicit, and the model
165 could be used for new prediction in different data sets. Specifically, we used backwards logistic
166 regression with variable elimination at a threshold of $p > 0.2$ to streamline the model. We used
167 the entire derivation set to create the initial model and used hundred-fold bootstrapping to
168 internally validate the model. Some data (notably frailty and history of stroke) were not captured
169 in the validation cohort, therefore probabilities were calculated in the external validation cohort
170 without those terms. Finally, for both internal and external validation, we assessed
171 discrimination using the area under the receiver-operator curve (i.e., the C-statistic) and
172 assessed calibration graphically and with the Brier index.

173 **Ethics Approval and Consent to Participate**

174 The BRAIN-ICU and MIND-ICU data comprising the derivation set were obtained with
175 Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval from Vanderbilt University and participating
176 Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Centers. Patients or their legally authorized
177 representatives granted consent, as previously described.² The ALIR study was approved by
178 the IRB at the University of Pittsburgh. Patients or their legally authorized representatives
179 provided initial consent, as previously described.¹⁴ We also obtained a separate IRB approval
180 from the University of Pittsburgh to analyze deidentified data for the current study.

181

182 **Results**

183 Of the 1040 patients in the BRAIN-ICU/MIND-ICU data set, 836 were intubated and
184 mechanically ventilated on the day of enrollment and were used to generate the prediction
185 model. Baseline data are displayed in **Table 1**. Of these 836 patients, 571 (68%) had sedative-
186 associated delirium in the first 72 hours after study enrollment.

187 The 28 initial candidate variables we analyzed in the initial regression are shown in
188 **Table 2**. The strongest predictors were benzodiazepine and propofol doses as well as severity
189 of illness (as measured by SOFA score); other predictors included opioid dose, malignancy,
190 COPD, sepsis at admission, sex, and age (**Table 3**).

191 Concordance statistic analysis showed good discrimination, with an area under the
192 receiver-operator curve of 0.83 (**Figure 1**). Internal validation via hundredfold bootstrapping
193 showed a C-statistic of 0.81 with good graphical calibration (**Figure 2**). External validation in the
194 ALIR cohorts also showed good discrimination, with a C-statistic of 0.70 (**Figure 3**).

195

196 **Discussion**

197 In this study, we found that a 10-variable clinical prediction tool accurately predicted
198 sedative-associated delirium in two multihospital cohorts of mechanically ventilated acute

199 respiratory failure patients. Variables that are readily available to clinicians—age, admission
200 diagnosis, severity of illness (as measured by the SOFA score), malignancy, COPD, sepsis,
201 sex, and doses of benzodiazepines, propofol, and opioids—successfully predicted sedative-
202 associated delirium during the early period of mechanical ventilation. Future studies are now
203 needed to determine whether a personalized sedation protocol based on this model and other
204 relevant data improves outcomes when used clinically.

205 The most common, and likely most directly modifiable, cause of delirium during acute
206 respiratory failure is pharmacologic sedation. Despite longstanding guidance by multiple
207 professional societies, much of the sedation provided in ICUs around the world is not
208 concordant with guidelines and often places patients at higher risk of delirium.²⁵ The reasons for
209 lack of concordance are multiple and complex but may often arise from the need to balance the
210 risks of sedative-associated delirium against other risks inherent in the care of mechanically
211 ventilated patients, for example, the occasional need to maintain deep sedation during
212 management of severe hypoxemic respiratory failure.

213 Even guideline-concordant sedation is not without delirium risk. Sedation is commonly
214 provided during mechanical ventilation for valid clinical reasons—for example, to treat anxiety or
215 agitation or to avoid excessive work of breathing. Until now, clinicians have not had a way to
216 quantify the delirium risk of any given sedation strategy. Our work allows for the estimation of
217 risk and thus the balancing of that risk against competing interests including work of breathing,
218 metabolic demand, and patient agitation. This tool allows a clinician to estimate the risks for a
219 specific patient associated with multiple different sedation options and thereby to incorporate
220 explicit risk information along with the goals of sedation into his or her decision-making. Thus,
221 this sedation-associated delirium prediction tool could be used to guide decision-making about
222 sedation and may serve as a key element in a personalized sedation protocol, the effects of
223 which should be examined in future clinical trials.

224 Numerous previous studies have examined risk factors for delirium during critical
225 illness,²⁶⁻²⁸ but none, to our knowledge, have focused specifically on sedative-associated
226 delirium in mechanically ventilated patients. Additionally, though several delirium risk prediction
227 tools have been generated and validated in ICU cohorts,²⁹⁻³¹ these tools do not distinguish
228 sedative-associated delirium—which is directly related to treatment decisions made by
229 clinicians—from numerous other delirium subtypes and therefore may be less useful as part of a
230 personalized sedation protocol.

231 Strengths of our study include the use of diverse, high-quality study cohorts for both
232 generation and internal and external validation of the prediction tool. The BRAIN-ICU cohort has
233 been extensively studied and includes data on variables related to patient demographics,
234 comorbidities, acute illness, treatments, and delirium outcomes. The ALIR cohort is a similarly
235 high-quality but fundamentally different cohort, as it is drawn from medical and cardiac intensive
236 care units and includes very few post-surgical patients. The discriminatory power of the model
237 during external validation thus speaks to its likely generalizability. Other strengths include the
238 tool's strong face validity and transparency. The predictors included in the final model have all
239 been consistently associated with delirium, and benzodiazepines have been shown to be the
240 highest-risk class of sedative medications used in the intensive care unit, a finding consistent
241 with prior research. One benefit of logistic regression is that it produces clear, transparent
242 effects of each model component. For example, the odds of sedative-associated delirium
243 increase by a factor of 1.55 if ten milligrams of midazolam are used, for example. This
244 transparency should, in theory, make it easier for clinicians to assess the risks of multiple
245 strategies for the same patient and thus to select the lowest-risk strategy that meets the desired
246 sedation goals. Finally, this work is the first to our knowledge to allow for the explicit estimation
247 of sedative-associated delirium risk among mechanically ventilated patients.

248 One major limitation of this work is the confounding of delirium by coma. Since coma
249 prevents assessment of delirium in the case of a comatose patient, heavy sedation to the point
250 of coma will cause a patient not to score as positive for delirium even if he or she might have
251 been delirious with less sedation. Another limitation of this work include the use of a potentially
252 less predictive statistical approach. More advanced machine learning techniques, such as
253 random forest, extreme gradient boosting, or deep learning neural networks, may fit a given
254 data set better and may generate more accurate predictions. These methods, however, are
255 more prone to overfitting. Additionally, it can be difficult or impossible to interpret the individual
256 variable effects within such models. Along similar lines, the variables available in the two
257 cohorts were not identical; more accurate predictions might be possible with more complete
258 information. A final limitation was inability to include certain other delirium risk factors that were
259 not measured in the cohorts analyzed, such as sensory disturbance or the presence of some
260 invasive devices, such as central venous catheters or fecal collection devices. This limitation
261 could be addressed in prospective validation studies of this model.

262

263 **Conclusion**

264 We generated a simple, straightforward prediction tool for early sedative-associated
265 delirium in a diverse cohort of mechanically ventilated patients and validated the tool internally
266 and externally. Our findings suggest that sedative-associated delirium in mechanically ventilated
267 ICU patients can be predicted with good confidence. Since our prediction tool allows treating
268 clinicians to predict the risk of delirium in individual patients for any given sedative strategy, it
269 may allow clinicians to personalize sedation based on explicit risk-benefit tradeoffs. This
270 prediction tool should now be optimized and studied prospectively before its implementation as
271 a clinical decision support tool is tested.

272

273 **Table 1.** Baseline characteristics and outcome data in generation and validation sets.

Variable	BRAIN-ICU/MIND-ICU	ALIR
Number of patients used	836	340
Age, years	63.3 [53.7, 72.6]	59.4 [47.8, 68.4]
Male sex	505 (60.4%)	193 (56.8%)
BMI, kg/m²	28.9 [24.4, 34.8]	29.7 [25.6, 36.3]
Day 1 SOFA	9 [7, 12]	7 [4, 10]
History of malignancy	180 (21.5%)	15 (4.4%)
History of COPD	254 (30.4%)	70 (20.6%)
Sepsis at admission	159 (31.0%)	206 (60.6%)
Admission diagnosis		
Acute MI/CHF/arrhythmia	118 (14.1%)	35 (10.3%)
Airway protection	108 (12.9%)	55 (16.2%)
ARDS	301 (36.0%)	103 (30.3%)
Cirrhosis	15 (1.8%)	0 (0%)
Non-ARDS respiratory	100 (12.0%)	147 (43.2%)
Other*	27 (3.2%)	0 (0%)
Surgical	167 (20.0%)	0 (0%)
Received benzodiazepines in first 24hrs	364 (43.7%)	288 (84.7%)
Received propofol in first 24hrs	360 (43.2%)	235 (67.6%)
Received opioids in first 24hrs	572 (68.6%)	312 (91.8%)
Sedative-associated delirium in first 72hrs	686 (82.1%)	242 (71.2%)

274 Data are displayed as N (%) or median [interquartile range]. Abbreviations: BMI: Body mass

275 index. SOFA: Sequential Organ Failure Assessment. MI: Myocardial infarction. CHF:

276 Congestive heart failure. ARDS: Acute respiratory distress syndrome. COPD: Chronic

277 obstructive pulmonary disease.

278 *Other admission diagnoses included hemorrhage, neurological disease, renal failure,

279 malignancy, and other infectious disease.

280

281 **Table 2.** Initial candidate variables prior to backward regression.

Admission diagnosis	Age	BMI	Frailty
Home BZD use	History of alcohol use	History of cancer	History of CHF
History of COPD	History of CVD	History of diabetes	History of HIV
History of liver disease	History of psychiatric illness	History of kidney disease	History of stroke
ICU type	IQCODE score	Race	Day 1 benzodiazepines
Day 1 dexmedetomidine	Day 1 propofol	Day 1 opioids	Sepsis at admission
Sex	SOFA on day 1	Surgery (elective)	Surgery (emergent)

282 These variables were considered as initial candidates during the model generation process, as
283 each has previously been associated with delirium risk in other publications.

284 Abbreviations: BZD: benzodiazepine. CHF: Congestive heart failure. COPD: Chronic obstructive
285 pulmonary disease. CVD: cardiovascular disease. HIV: Human immunodeficiency virus. ICU:
286 Intensive care unit. IQCODE: Informant questionnaire on cognitive decline in the elderly. SOFA:
287 Sequential organ failure assessment.

288

289 **Table 3.** Variables and associated odds ratios included in the final model.

Variable	Odds Ratio	95% Confidence Interval
Age (per year)	1.03	(1.01, 1.04)
BMI (per point)	0.98	(0.96, 1.00)
History of Cancer	2.22	(1.24, 3.98)
History of COPD	0.69	(0.44, 1.09)
Sepsis at admission	1.54	(0.94, 2.53)
Sex (female vs. male)	1.55	(1.00, 2.39)
SOFA (per point)	1.19	(1.11, 1.28)
Benzodiazepines^a	1.55	(1.27, 1.88)
Opioids^b	1.54	(1.25, 1.90)
Propofol^c	1.50	(1.29, 1.73)

290 Abbreviations: BMI: Body mass index. COPD: Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. SOFA:

291 Sequential organ failure assessment.

292 ^aPer 10 milligrams of midazolam equivalent received on day 1 of mechanical ventilation


293 ^bPer milligram of fentanyl equivalent received on day 1 of mechanical ventilation

294 ^cPer gram of propofol received on day 1 of mechanical ventilation

295 Note that variables were excluded from the model above a threshold p value of 0.2, therefore


296 some variables included in the final model have 95% confidence intervals which cross 1.

297



298


299 **Figure 1.** Receiver-operator characteristic curve for training set.



300

301 **Figure 2.** Calibration plot after internal validation using hundredfold bootstrapping.

302



303
304

Figure 3. Receiver-operator characteristic curve in external validation data set.

305 References

306

- 307 1. Khan BA, Fadel WF, Tricker JL et al. Effectiveness of implementing a wake up and
308 breathe program on sedation and delirium in the ICU. *Crit Care Med*. 2014;42(12):e791-795.
- 309 2. Pandharipande PP, Girard TD, Jackson JC et al. Long-term cognitive impairment after
310 critical illness. *N Engl J Med*. 2013;369(14):1306-1316.
- 311 3. American Psychiatric Association., American Psychiatric Association. DSM-5 Task
312 Force. *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders : DSM-5*. 5th ed. Washington, D.C.:
313 American Psychiatric Association; 2013
- 314 4. Prendergast NT, Franz CA, Schaefer C et al. Inflammatory Subphenotype Is Associated
315 with Acute Brain Dysfunction in Mechanically Ventilated Patients. *Ann Am Thorac Soc*.
316 2024;21(9):1329-1333.
- 317 5. Salluh JI, Wang H, Schneider EB et al. Outcome of delirium in critically ill patients:
318 systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ*. 2015;350:h2538.
- 319 6. Ely EW, Shintani A, Truman B et al. Delirium as a predictor of mortality in mechanically
320 ventilated patients in the intensive care unit. *JAMA*. 2004;291(14):1753-1762.
- 321 7. Girard TD, Jackson JC, Pandharipande PP et al. Delirium as a predictor of long-term
322 cognitive impairment in survivors of critical illness. *Crit Care Med*. 2010;38(7):1513-1520.
- 323 8. Fried TR, Bradley EH, Towle VR et al. Understanding the treatment preferences of
324 seriously ill patients. *N Engl J Med*. 2002;346(14):1061-1066.
- 325 9. Girard TD, Thompson JL, Pandharipande PP et al. Clinical phenotypes of delirium
326 during critical illness and severity of subsequent long-term cognitive impairment: a prospective
327 cohort study. *Lancet Respir Med*. 2018;6(3):213-222.
- 328 10. Luz M, Brandao Barreto B, de Castro REV et al. Practices in sedation, analgesia,
329 mobilization, delirium, and sleep deprivation in adult intensive care units (SAMDS-ICU): an
330 international survey before and during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Ann Intensive Care*.
331 2022;12(1):9.
- 332 11. Sessler CN, Gosnell MS, Grap MJ et al. The Richmond Agitation-Sedation Scale: validity
333 and reliability in adult intensive care unit patients. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*.
334 2002;166(10):1338-1344.
- 335 12. Riker RR, Picard JT, Fraser GL. Prospective evaluation of the Sedation-Agitation Scale
336 for adult critically ill patients. *Crit Care Med*. 1999;27(7):1325-1329.
- 337 13. Hughes CG, Patel MB, Jackson JC et al. Surgery and Anesthesia Exposure Is Not a
338 Risk Factor for Cognitive Impairment After Major Noncardiac Surgery and Critical Illness. *Ann*
339 *Surg*. 2017;265(6):1126-1133.
- 340 14. Kitsios GD, Yang L, Manatakis DV et al. Host-Response Subphenotypes Offer
341 Prognostic Enrichment in Patients With or at Risk for Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome. *Crit*
342 *Care Med*. 2019;47(12):1724-1734.
- 343 15. Charlson ME, Pompei P, Ales KL et al. A new method of classifying prognostic
344 comorbidity in longitudinal studies: development and validation. *J Chronic Dis*. 1987;40(5):373-
345 383.

- 346 16. Jorm AF, Scott R, Cullen JS et al. Performance of the Informant Questionnaire on
347 Cognitive Decline in the Elderly (IQCODE) as a screening test for dementia. *Psychol Med.*
348 1991;21(3):785-790.
- 349 17. Llewellyn DJ, Lang IA, Xie J et al. Framingham Stroke Risk Profile and poor cognitive
350 function: a population-based study. *BMC Neurol.* 2008;8:12.
- 351 18. Vincent JL, Moreno R, Takala J et al. The SOFA (Sepsis-related Organ Failure
352 Assessment) score to describe organ dysfunction/failure. On behalf of the Working Group on
353 Sepsis-Related Problems of the European Society of Intensive Care Medicine. *Intensive Care*
354 *Med.* 1996;22(7):707-710.
- 355 19. Ely EW, Inouye SK, Bernard GR et al. Delirium in mechanically ventilated patients:
356 validity and reliability of the confusion assessment method for the intensive care unit (CAM-
357 ICU). *JAMA.* 2001;286(21):2703-2710.
- 358 20. Patanwala AE, DUBY J, Waters D et al. Opioid conversions in acute care. *Ann*
359 *Pharmacother.* 2007;41(2):255-266.
- 360 21. Barr J, Zomorodi K, Bertaccini EJ et al. A double-blind, randomized comparison of i.v.
361 lorazepam versus midazolam for sedation of ICU patients via a pharmacologic model.
362 *Anesthesiology.* 2001;95(2):286-298.
- 363 22. Ng K, Dahri K, Chow I et al. Evaluation of an alcohol withdrawal protocol and a
364 preprinted order set at a tertiary care hospital. *Can J Hosp Pharm.* 2011;64(6):436-445.
- 365 23. Bergeron N, Dubois MJ, Dumont M et al. Intensive Care Delirium Screening Checklist:
366 evaluation of a new screening tool. *Intensive Care Med.* 2001;27(5):859-864.
- 367 24. Wilson JE, Mart MF, Cunningham C et al. Delirium. *Nat Rev Dis Primers.* 2020;6(1):90.
- 368 25. Devlin JW, Skrobik Y, Gelinac C et al. Clinical Practice Guidelines for the Prevention and
369 Management of Pain, Agitation/Sedation, Delirium, Immobility, and Sleep Disruption in Adult
370 Patients in the ICU. *Crit Care Med.* 2018;46(9):e825-e873.
- 371 26. Davis DHJ, Skelly DT, Murray C et al. Worsening cognitive impairment and
372 neurodegenerative pathology progressively increase risk for delirium. *Am J Geriatr Psychiatry.*
373 2015;23(4):403-415.
- 374 27. Persico I, Cesari M, Morandi A et al. Frailty and Delirium in Older Adults: A Systematic
375 Review and Meta-Analysis of the Literature. *J Am Geriatr Soc.* 2018;66(10):2022-2030.
- 376 28. Van Rompaey B, Elseviers MM, Schuurmans MJ et al. Risk factors for delirium in
377 intensive care patients: a prospective cohort study. *Crit Care.* 2009;13(3):R77.
- 378 29. Wassenaar A, van den Boogaard M, van Achterberg T et al. Multinational development
379 and validation of an early prediction model for delirium in ICU patients. *Intensive Care Med.*
380 2015;41(6):1048-1056.
- 381 30. van den Boogaard M, Pickkers P, Slooter AJ et al. Development and validation of PRE-
382 DELIRIC (PREdiction of DELIRium in ICu patients) delirium prediction model for intensive care
383 patients: observational multicentre study. *BMJ.* 2012;344:e420.
- 384 31. Marra A, Pandharipande PP, Shotwell MS et al. Acute Brain Dysfunction: Development
385 and Validation of a Daily Prediction Model. *Chest.* 2018;154(2):293-301.
- 386