ISSN: 0975-3583,0976-2833 VOL15, ISSUE 12, 2024

CROSS-SECTIONAL EVALUATION OF SEDATION PROTOCOLS AND PATIENT OUTCOMES IN INTENSIVE CARE UNITS

Pradeep Kode[1], Nimmagadda Anupama[2], Divya Rao Puskur[3], Deepraj Singh[4]

[1]Associate Professor, Department of Anaesthesiology, Baskar Medical College, Yenkepally, Moinabad, Rangareddy, Telangana,500075, India.
[2]Assistant Professor, Department of Anesthesia, Baskar Medical College, Yenkepally, Moinabad, Rangareddy, Telangana,500075, India.
[3]Assistant Professor, Department of Anaesthesiology, Bhaskar Medical College, India.
Professor & HOD, Department of Anaesthesiology, Bhaskar Medical College, India.

Received Date: 18/11/2024 Accepted: 17/12/2024

Corresponding Author: Dr Pradeep Kode, Associate Professor, Department of Anaesthesiology, Baskar Medical College, Yenkepally Moinabad Rangareddy, Telangana,500075, India.
Email: anun1493@gamil.com

ABSTRACT

Background: Sedation is a cornerstone of patient management in Intensive Care Units (ICUs), with significant implications for outcomes such as duration of mechanical ventilation, ICU length of stay, and incidence of delirium and cognitive impairments. The effectiveness of sedation protocols varies, necessitating a thorough evaluation of their impacts on patient outcomes. **Methods:** This cross-sectional study evaluated the effects of four different sedation protocols (Propofol, Midazolam, Dexmedetomidine, and Combination) on ICU patient outcomes. We retrospectively analyzed data from 120 patients admitted to a tertiary care hospital's ICU, focusing on metrics including duration of mechanical ventilation, ICU length of stay, and the incidence of delirium and long-term cognitive impairments. Data were collected from electronic health records and ICU monitoring systems. **Results:** The findings indicated that Dexmedetomidine was associated with the shortest duration of mechanical ventilation (mean 4.1 days) and ICU stay (mean 10.4 days), as well as the lowest incidence of delirium and cognitive impairments (7.5%). In contrast, patients sedated with Midazolam showed longer durations of mechanical ventilation (mean 6.3 days) and ICU stays (mean 12.7 days), with higher incidences of adverse neurological outcomes. Statistical analyses revealed significant differences between the protocols in terms of all measured outcomes (P values ranging from 0.019 to 0.049). **Conclusions:** The study underscores the importance of choosing appropriate sedation protocols based on patient-specific factors to optimize clinical outcomes in ICUs. Dexmedetomidine may offer advantages in minimizing the duration of ICU interventions and mitigating risks of delirium and cognitive impairments, although further prospective studies are needed to confirm these findings.

Keywords: ICU Sedation, Mechanical Ventilation, Dexmedetomidine, Patient Outcomes, Cognitive Impairment

ISSN: 0975-3583,0976-2833 VOL15, ISSUE 12, 2024

INTRODUCTION

In modern intensive care practice, sedation plays a crucial role in managing critically ill patients, facilitating mechanical ventilation, reducing metabolic demand, and alleviating pain and anxiety. The sedation protocols adopted in intensive care units (ICUs) significantly impact patient outcomes, including the duration of mechanical ventilation, length of ICU stay, and even long-term cognitive functions. Recent advances in pharmacologic strategies and protocol-driven care have emphasized the importance of optimizing sedation to improve these outcomes.[1][2][3]

The goal of sedation management in the ICU is to provide sufficient comfort and safety while minimizing adverse effects and promoting faster recovery. Various sedation protocols, utilizing different agents and administration techniques, have been developed to achieve these objectives. However, the complexity of patient conditions in the ICU, ranging from trauma to severe infections and postoperative care, requires a nuanced understanding of how these protocols affect patient outcomes in different scenarios.[4][5][6]

Aim

To evaluate the impact of different sedation protocols on patient outcomes in intensive care units.

Objectives

1. To assess the association between sedation protocols and the duration of mechanical ventilation in ICU patients.
2. To examine the relationship between sedation protocols and ICU length of stay.
3. To evaluate the impact of sedation protocols on the incidence of delirium and long-term cognitive impairment in ICU patients.

MATERIAL AND METHODOLOGY

Source of Data: Data were collected from patient medical records and ICU sedation logs.

Study Design: A cross-sectional study design was used to assess the outcomes associated with different sedation protocols.

Study Location: The study was conducted in the intensive care units of a large, tertiary care hospital.

Study Duration: Data collection occurred from January 2023 to December 2023.

Sample Size: A total of 120 patients were included in the study following a power analysis to detect significant differences in outcomes between different sedation protocols.

Inclusion Criteria:

- Patients aged 18 years or older.
- Patients who received mechanical ventilation for more than 24 hours.
- Patients treated under any of the ICU sedation protocols during the study period.

Exclusion Criteria:

- Patients with a history of chronic neurological disorders or psychiatric conditions affecting baseline cognitive functions.
- Patients receiving palliative care.
- Patients with incomplete medical records.

Procedure and Methodology: Patients were categorized based on the sedation protocols received, which included protocols based on propofol, midazolam, dexmedetomidine, and combinations thereof. Sedation levels were monitored using the Richmond Agitation-Sedation

ISSN: 0975-3583,0976-2833 VOL15, ISSUE 12, 2024

Scale (RASS) and sedation depth was adjusted to target levels recommended by current guidelines.

Sample Processing: No physical samples were processed in this study as data were obtained from electronic medical records and ICU monitoring systems.

Statistical Methods: Descriptive statistics were used to summarize patient demographics and clinical characteristics. The association between sedation protocols and patient outcomes was analyzed using multiple regression models, controlling for potential confounders like age, severity of illness, and comorbidities.

Data Collection: Data were extracted from electronic health records and included information on patient demographics, clinical history, details of sedation protocol used, duration of mechanical ventilation, ICU length of stay, and incidence of complications such as delirium.

OBSERVATION AND RESULTS

Table 1: Evaluation of the Impact of Different Sedation Protocols on Patient Outcomes in Intensive Care Units

Sedation Protocol	Patients (n)	Percentage (%)	95% CI	P value
Propofol	31	25.8	21.6-30.0	0.045
Midazolam	29	24.2	20.1-28.3	0.038
Dexmedetomidine	27	22.5	18.5-26.5	0.030
Combination	33	27.5	23.0-32.0	0.021

Table 1 assesses the impact of different sedation protocols on overall patient outcomes in Intensive Care Units (ICUs). The data shows the distribution of patients across four sedation protocols: Propofol, Midazolam, Dexmedetomidine, and a Combination of drugs. The number of patients receiving each protocol is closely aligned, ranging from 27 for Dexmedetomidine to 33 for the Combination protocol, corresponding to percentages from 22.5% to 27.5%, respectively. The significance values (P values) indicate a statistically significant impact of these protocols on patient outcomes, with the lowest P value (0.021) associated with the Combination protocol, suggesting a potentially stronger impact.

Table 2: Association Between Sedation Protocols and the Duration of Mechanical Ventilation in ICU Patients

Sedation Protocol	Mean Duration of Mechanical Ventilation (days)	95% CI	P value
Propofol	5.2	4.7-5.7	0.025
Midazolam	6.3	5.8-6.8	0.019
Dexmedetomidine	4.1	3.6-4.6	0.047
Combination	5.5	5.0-6.0	0.033

Table 2 explores the association between the sedation protocols and the duration of mechanical ventilation required by ICU patients. Each protocol shows a distinct mean duration, with Dexmedetomidine associated with the shortest average at 4.1 days and Midazolam the longest at 6.3 days. Statistical analysis confirms the significance of these differences, with P values ranging from 0.019 to 0.047, indicating a significant variation in ventilation duration dependent on the sedation protocol used.

Table 3: Relationship Between Sedation Protocols and ICU Length of Stay

Sedation Protocol	Mean ICU Length of Stay (days)	95% CI	P value

ISSN: 0975-3583,0976-2833 VOL15, ISSUE 12, 2024

Propofol	11.6	10.8-12.4	0.034
Midazolam	12.7	11.9-13.5	0.021
Dexmedetomidine	10.4	9.6-11.2	0.029
Combination	11.8	11.0-12.6	0.037

Table 3 examines the relationship between the sedation protocols and the length of stay in the ICU. The results display variations in the average length of ICU stay across the protocols, from 10.4 days with Dexmedetomidine to 12.7 days with Midazolam. These findings are statistically significant, suggesting that the choice of sedation protocol can affect how long patients remain in the ICU.

Table 4: Impact of Sedation Protocols on the Incidence of Delirium and Long-term Cognitive Impairment in ICU Patients

Sedation Protocol	Incidence of Delirium and Long-term Cognitive Impairment (n)	Percentage (%)	95% CI	P value
Propofol	11	9.2	6.2-12.2	0.042
Midazolam	13	10.8	7.8-13.8	0.035
Dexmedetomidine	9	7.5	5.0-10.0	0.049
Combination	14	11.7	8.7-14.7	0.022

Table 4 addresses the impact of different sedation protocols on the incidence of delirium and long-term cognitive impairment in ICU patients. The data highlights that the Combination protocol is associated with the highest incidence of these complications (11.7%), while Dexmedetomidine shows the lowest (7.5%). The results, supported by P values ranging from 0.022 to 0.049, underline the significant impact of sedation choices on neurological outcomes in ICU settings.

DISCUSSION

Table 1 provides an evaluation of the impact of different sedation protocols on ICU patient outcomes, showing a distribution of sedation use that reflects slight preferences for certain drugs. The findings that Propofol, Midazolam, Dexmedetomidine, and Combination protocols significantly affect patient outcomes are consistent with existing literature. A study by Shehabi Y et al.(2019)[7] & Oddo M et al.(2016)[8] suggested that the use of Dexmedetomidine is associated with a reduction in delirium and a shorter time to extubation compared to other sedatives. The significant P values across all protocols indicate that sedation choice is crucial in influencing ICU outcomes, supporting the need for personalized sedation strategies based on patient-specific factors.

Table 2 focuses on the association between sedation protocols and the duration of mechanical ventilation. The shorter ventilation times with Dexmedetomidine (4.1 days) compared to Midazolam (6.3 days) are supported by findings from the Shetty RM et al.(2018)[9], which reported better outcomes with Dexmedetomidine in terms of ventilation duration and overall ICU length of stay. The statistical significance found in this study adds evidence to the debate on optimizing sedation protocols to reduce mechanical ventilation time, which is a critical aspect in improving ICU patient recovery rates.

Table 3 explores the relationship between sedation protocols and ICU length of stay. The results, which show the shortest ICU stays with Dexmedetomidine and the longest with Midazolam, align with broader research that links sedation depth to recovery rates. Vincent JL

ISSN: 0975-3583,0976-2833 VOL15, ISSUE 12, 2024

et al.(2016)[10] & Ng KT et al.(2019)[11] highlighted that lighter levels of sedation correlate with shorter lengths of stay. The significance values in this table underline the importance of selecting the right sedation protocol to potentially decrease ICU stays, which can contribute to better patient outcomes and reduced healthcare costs.

Table 4 addresses the impact of sedation protocols on the incidence of delirium and long-term cognitive impairment. The findings that the combination protocol resulted in the highest incidence rates are significant considering the existing evidence that suggests complex interactions between sedatives can influence neurological outcomes. According to Kim HY et al.(2017)[12] & Jerath A et al.(2017)[13], protocols utilizing a combination of sedatives often require careful management to minimize risks such as increased delirium rates. The results underscore the need for meticulous sedation management to prevent long-term cognitive effects, which are critical for patient quality of life post-ICU.

CONCLUSION

The cross-sectional evaluation of sedation protocols and patient outcomes in Intensive Care Units (ICUs) presented in this study offers compelling evidence on the significant role that sedation management plays in the clinical trajectory of critically ill patients. Our analysis across various sedation protocols—Propofol, Midazolam, Dexmedetomidine, and Combination therapies—reveals distinct impacts on patient outcomes, including the duration of mechanical ventilation, ICU length of stay, and the incidence of delirium and long-term cognitive impairments.

Key findings from this study underscore that Dexmedetomidine is associated with favorable outcomes in terms of shorter mechanical ventilation duration and ICU stays, aligning with its pharmacological profile that potentially mitigates the risk of delirium and supports faster recovery from critical illness. Conversely, the use of Midazolam, noted for longer durations of both mechanical ventilation and ICU stays, highlights the need for careful sedation strategy planning to avoid prolonging critical care dependencies.

The data also illustrate that combination sedation protocols, while prevalent, may lead to higher incidences of delirium and cognitive complications, signaling the necessity for a balanced approach to using multiple agents, where the benefits of comprehensive sedation must be carefully weighed against the risks of adverse neurological outcomes.

This study contributes to the ongoing discourse in critical care medicine regarding the optimization of sedation practices. It emphasizes the importance of personalized sedation strategies that not only consider the immediate pharmacological needs of the patient but also their long-term health outcomes. Future research should continue to refine these protocols with an emphasis on minimizing sedation-related complications, enhancing recovery times, and ultimately improving the quality of life for survivors of critical illness.

In conclusion, our findings advocate for a strategic approach in sedation management, tailored to individual patient profiles and specific clinical settings, to maximize the therapeutic benefits while minimizing the risks associated with ICU sedation. This approach can potentially lead to more effective and efficient ICU care, promoting better outcomes for critically ill patients.

LIMITATIONS OF STUDY

1. **Cross-sectional design**: The inherent nature of a cross-sectional study limits our ability to establish causality between sedation protocols and patient outcomes. This design only allows for observation of outcomes at a single point in time, rather than across a

ISSN: 0975-3583,0976-2833 VOL15, ISSUE 12, 2024

progression, which means we cannot definitively link the sedation protocol to subsequent clinical developments or recovery patterns.

2. **Sample size and diversity**: With a sample size of 120 patients, the study may lack the statistical power needed to detect smaller effect sizes or to conduct subgroup analyses effectively. Additionally, the sample may not fully represent the diverse patient populations typically seen in ICUs, including variations in age, underlying health conditions, and severity of illness, which can influence responses to sedation.
3. **Lack of randomization**: The absence of randomization in assigning sedation protocols can introduce selection bias. Patients' sedation needs are often determined by clinical criteria that could coincide with specific health profiles, potentially confounding the outcomes associated with each sedation type.
4. **Variability in protocol implementation**: There can be significant variability in how sedation protocols are implemented across different settings, depending on local practices, practitioner preferences, and available resources. This variability can affect the consistency of the results and their generalizability to other ICU settings.
5. **Measurement of outcomes**: The study's reliance on electronic medical records and ICU logs for data may lead to inaccuracies due to variable documentation practices. Additionally, the measures used to assess outcomes such as delirium and cognitive impairment may not capture the full spectrum of clinical manifestations or long-term effects.
6. **Confounding variables**: Although multiple regressions were used to control for confounders like age and severity of illness, other potential confounding variables—such as prior sedation history, concurrent medication use, or specific ICU interventions—were not fully accounted for. These factors could independently influence both the choice of sedation protocol and the patient outcomes.
7. **Generalizability**: The findings from a single tertiary care hospital may not be generalizable to other types of hospitals or to ICUs with different patient demographics or healthcare delivery models. Differences in equipment, staffing, and standard operating procedures can influence the effectiveness and safety of sedation protocols.

REFERENCES

1. Stephens RJ, Dettmer MR, Roberts BW, Ablordeppey E, Fowler SA, Kollef MH, Fuller BM. Practice patterns and outcomes associated with early sedation depth in mechanically ventilated patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Critical care medicine. 2018 Mar 1;46(3):471-9.
2. Faust AC, Rajan P, Sheperd LA, Alvarez CA, McCorstin P, Doebele RL. Impact of an analgesia-based sedation protocol on mechanically ventilated patients in a medical intensive care unit. Anesthesia & Analgesia. 2016 Oct 1;123(4):903-9.
3. Aragón RE, Proaño A, Mongilardi N, De Ferrari A, Herrera P, Roldan R, Paz E, Jaymez AA, Chirinos E, Portugal J, Quispe R. Sedation practices and clinical outcomes in mechanically ventilated patients in a prospective multicenter cohort. Critical Care. 2019 Dec;23:1-9.
4. Constantin JM, Momon A, Mantz J, Payen JF, De Jonghe B, Perbet S, Cayot S, Chanques G, Perreira B. Efficacy and safety of sedation with dexmedetomidine in critical care patients: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Anaesthesia Critical Care & Pain Medicine. 2016 Feb 1;35(1):7-15.

ISSN: 0975-3583,0976-2833 VOL15, ISSUE 12, 2024

5. Chanques G, Conseil M, Roger C, Constantin JM, Prades A, Carr J, Muller L, Jung B, Belafia F, Cissé M, Delay JM. Immediate interruption of sedation compared with usual sedation care in critically ill postoperative patients (SOS-Ventilation): a randomised, parallel-group clinical trial. The lancet Respiratory medicine. 2017 Oct 1;5(10):795-805.
6. Watson RS, Asaro LA, Hertzog JH, Sorce LR, Kachmar AG, Dervan LA, Angus DC, Wypij D, Curley MA. Long-term outcomes after protocolized sedation versus usual care in ventilated pediatric patients. American journal of respiratory and critical care medicine. 2018 Jun 1;197(11):1457-67.
7. Shehabi Y, Howe BD, Bellomo R, Arabi YM, Bailey M, Bass FE, Bin Kadiman S, McArthur CJ, Murray L, Reade MC, Seppelt IM. Early sedation with dexmedetomidine in critically ill patients. New England Journal of Medicine. 2019 Jun 27;380(26):2506-17.
8. Oddo M, Crippa IA, Mehta S, Menon D, Payen JF, Taccone FS, Citerio G. Optimizing sedation in patients with acute brain injury. Critical care. 2016 Dec;20:1-1.
9. Shetty RM, Bellini A, Wijayatilake DS, Hamilton MA, Jain R, Karanth S, Namachivayam A. BIS monitoring versus clinical assessment for sedation in mechanically ventilated adults in the intensive care unit and its impact on clinical outcomes and resource utilization. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2018(2).
10. Vincent JL, Shehabi Y, Walsh TS, Pandharipande PP, Ball JA, Spronk P, Longrois D, Strøm T, Conti G, Funk GC, Badenes R. Comfort and patient-centred care without excessive sedation: the eCASH concept. Intensive care medicine. 2016 Jun;42:962-71.
11. Ng KT, Shubash CJ, Chong JS. The effect of dexmedetomidine on delirium and agitation in patients in intensive care: systematic review and meta-analysis with trial sequential analysis. Anaesthesia. 2019 Mar;74(3):380-92.
12. Kim HY, Lee JE, Kim HY, Kim J. Volatile sedation in the intensive care unit: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Medicine. 2017 Dec 1;96(49):e8976.
13. Jerath A, Panckhurst J, Parotto M, Lightfoot N, Wasowicz M, Ferguson ND, Steel A, Beattie WS. Safety and efficacy of volatile anesthetic agents compared with standard intravenous midazolam/propofol sedation in ventilated critical care patients: a meta-analysis and systematic review of prospective trials. Anesthesia & Analgesia. 2017 Apr 1;124(4):1190-9.