

City Research Online

City, University of London Institutional Repository

Citation: Ward, D. S., Absalom, A. R., Aitken, L. M., Balas, M. C., Brown, D. L., Burry, L., Colantuoni, E., Coursin, D., Devlin, J. W., Dexter, F., et al (2021). Design of Clinical Trials Evaluating Sedation in Critically III Adults Undergoing Mechanical Ventilation. Critical Care Medicine, 49(10), pp. 1684-1693. doi: 10.1097/ccm.000000000005049

This is the supplemental version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version.

Permanent repository link: https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/26144/

Link to published version: https://doi.org/10.1097/ccm.000000000005049

Copyright: City Research Online aims to make research outputs of City, University of London available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to.

Reuse: Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

City Research Online: http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/ publications@city.ac.uk/

SCEPTER III Steering Committee

Douglas Coursin, MD University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health Madison, Wisconsin

Gilles L. Fraser, PharmD Tufts University School of Medicine Maine Medical Center Portland, Maine

Mervyn Maze, MBChB Department of Anesthesia and Perioperative Care University of California San Francisco San Francisco, California

Pratik Pandharipande, MD, MSCI Vanderbilt University Medical Center Nashville, Tennessee

Richard Riker, MD Maine Medical Center Portland, Maine

Daniel Sessler, MD Department of Outcomes Research Cleveland Clinic Cleveland, Ohio

Denham Ward, MD, PhD
Department of Anesthesiology and Perioperative Medicine
University of Rochester
Rochester, New York



Sedation Consortium on Endpoints and Procedures for Treatment, Education, and Research (SCEPTER-III)

Clinical Trials to Evaluate Patient-Centered Outcomes of Sedation in Mechanically Ventilated Patients in the Adult ICU

MEETING AGENDA

	Wednesday, March 27, 2019	
7:00 – 9:00 PM	Reception and Dinner	Mayfair Court
	Thursday, March 28, 2019	
7:30 – 8:00 AM	Continental Breakfast	
8:00 – 8:30	Welcome and Introductions	Bob Dworkin
8:30 – 8:45	Procedural Sedation – SCEPTER 1 & 2. Goals for SCEPTER 3	Denham Ward
8:45 – 10:00	Panel Discussion: Current Clinical Guidelines - SCCM	Douglas Coursin (moderator),
	PADIS guidelines: Pain, Agitation/Sedation, Delirium, Immobility and Sleep Impairment	John Devlin Yoanna Skrobik
10:00 – 10:30	Break	
10:30 - 11:00	Patient and family perspective	David Brown
11:00 – 11:30	Establishing core outcome measures and instruments: a case study in evaluating post-discharge status of ICU survivors	Dale Needham
11:30 – 12:00	Q&A and Panel discussion: How to incorporate the patient's and families' perspective	Pam Flood (moderator), David Brown, Dale Needham, Ingrid Egerod
12:00 – 1:00 PM	Lunch	Mayfair Court
1:00 – 1:30	SEDCOM, MENDS, MIDEX & PRODEX – Lessons learned for study design, outcomes and measures	Richard Riker
1:30 - 2:00	Evaluating efficacy in ICU sedation clinical trials: a regulatory perspective	Martha Van Clief
2:00 - 2:30	Q&A and panel discussion: current controversies, and unmet needs	Gil Fraser, Douglas Coursin (moderators), Yoanna Skrobik, Mervyn Maze, Richard Riker, Martha Van Clief
2:30 -3:00	Break	
3:00 - 3:30	Design issues for clinical trials of ICU sedation	Daniel Sessler
3:30 - 4:00	Clinical Trials for new ICU Sedation Protocols	Leanne Aitken
4:00 - 4:30	Statistical issues in clinical trial design for ICU sedation	Elizabeth Colantuoni
4:30 – 5:00	Q&A and Panel discussion: Clinical trial design	Steve Shafer(moderator), Daniel Sessler, Leanne Aitken, Franklin Dexter, Elizabeth Colantuoni, Yahya Shehabi
7:00 – 9:00	Dinner	Mayfair Court



	Friday, March 29, 2019	
7:30 – 8:00 AM	Continental Breakfast	Washington Ballroom
8:00 - 8:30	Defining and measuring light vs moderate sedation / analgesia	Pratik Pandharipande
8:30 - 9:00	Case Study: Approval of Dexmed for ICU sedation	Mervyn Maze
9:00 - 10:00	Who should be studied and how?	Avery Tung (moderator)
	 Controls and patient inclusion / exclusion criteria? 	
	Overall trial design.	
10:00 - 10:30	Break	
10:30 – 12:00	 Evaluating acute use of ICU sedation / analgesia. How best to measure level of sedation? Patient and family perspective. Sleep state? Efficacy of the sedation / analgesia? Safety measures during sedation? 	Yoanna Skrobik (moderator)
12:00 - 1:00	Lunch	Mayfair Court
1:00 – 2:30	 Acute, Subacute and chronic outcomes after ICU sedation. Sedation outcome domains, measures, and items? Improving medical outcomes, short term and post discharge? Outcomes that are more likely to have a strong correlation with sedation? 	Tim Girard (moderator)
2:30 - 3:00	Group Discussion: SCEPTER 3 next steps	Denham Ward

How sa	tisfied are yo	ou with the	currently a	vailable sed	dative pha	rmacologic	agents for	use	in
	Not satisfie	d		Satisfied		Ver	/ satisfied		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	N/O
How sa the ICU	tisfied are yo		currently a	vailable and	algesic pha	<u> </u>	c agents fo	r use	in
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	N/C
					0	,	0		
	tisfied are yo acologic ager Not satisfie	its for use i	-	vailable (na	atural or pl		l) sleep-ind	ducing	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	N/C
	nportant is it ped for use ir Not importa	the ICU?	sale, collin	Important	ng medica		important		е Т
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	N/C
new se	dative-analge	esic for use	ood is that Pharma would be willing to invest in developing se in the ICU?						
	Not likely					Ve	ry likely		
1	Not likely 2	3	4	Likely 5	6	Ve 7	ry likely 8	9	N/C
How im sedativ	2 nportant is the e/analgesic u Not importa 2	ne patient a use in the IO nt 3	4 nd/or fami CU? 4	Likely 5 ly perspecti Important 5	ve in addr	7 essing issue Very 7	8 es with cur important 8	rent	
How im sedativ	portant is the e/analgesic under the portant important 2	ne patient a use in the IO nt 3 ou that curr	4 nd/or fami CU? 4	Likely 5 ly perspecti Important 5 ed sedation	ve in addr	essing issue Very 7 equate for	es with cur important 8 clinical tria	rent	
How im sedativ	portant is the e/analgesic under the land portant is the e/analgesic under the e	ne patient a use in the IO nt 3 ou that curr d	4 nd/or fami CU? 4 rent validat	Likely 5 ly perspecti Important 5 ed sedation Satisfied	6 scales ad	7 essing issue Very 7 equate for Very	8 es with cur important 8 clinical tria / satisfied	g 9	N/C
How im sedativ	portant is the e/analgesic under the portant important 2	ne patient a use in the IO nt 3 ou that curr	4 nd/or fami CU? 4	Likely 5 ly perspecti Important 5 ed sedation	ve in addr	essing issue Very 7 equate for	es with cur important 8 clinical tria	rent	N/C
How im sedativ 1 How sa	portant is the e/analgesic used Not importate 2 tisfied are you not satisfied 2	ne patient a use in the IG nt 3 ou that curred 3 ou that curred th	4 nd/or fami CU? 4 rent validat	Likely 5 ly perspecti Important 5 ed sedation Satisfied 5 ed pain sca	6 scales ad	7 essing issue Very 7 equate for Very 7	es with cur important 8 clinical tria y satisfied 8 cal trials?	g 9	N/C
How im sedativ 1 How sa 1 How sa	nportant is the e/analgesic use. Not important 2 tisfied are you not satisfied are you	ne patient a use in the IO nt 3 ou that curred 3 ou that curred d	4 nd/or fami CU? 4 rent validat rent validat	Likely 5 ly perspection Important 5 ed sedation Satisfied 5 ed pain sca Satisfied	6 scales add 6 les adequa	essing issue Very 7 equate for Very 7 te for clinic	8 es with cur important 8 clinical tria / satisfied 8 cal trials? / satisfied	9 als?	N/C
How im sedativ 1 How sa	portant is the e/analgesic used Not importate 2 tisfied are you not satisfied 2	ne patient a use in the IG nt 3 ou that curred 3 ou that curred th	4 nd/or fami CU? 4 rent validat	Likely 5 ly perspecti Important 5 ed sedation Satisfied 5 ed pain sca	6 scales ad	7 essing issue Very 7 equate for Very 7	es with cur important 8 clinical tria y satisfied 8 cal trials?	g 9	- N/C
How im sedative 1 How sa 1 How sa	nportant is the e/analgesic use. Not important a 2 stisfied are you not satisfied a 2 stisfied are you not satisfied a 2 stisfied are you not satisfied a 2 stisfied	e patient a use in the IO nt 3 ou that curred 3 ou that curred 3	4 nd/or fami CU? 4 rent validat 4 rent validat	Likely 5 ly perspection Important 5 ed sedation Satisfied 5 ed pain sca Satisfied 5	6 scales added	essing issue Very 7 equate for Very 7 ete for clinic	es with cur important 8 clinical tria / satisfied 8 cal trials? / satisfied 8	9 sls?	N/C
How im sedativ 1 How sa 1 How sa	portant is the e/analgesic use. Not important a 2 stisfied are you not satisfied are you tisfied are you tisfied are you tisfied are you	ne patient a use in the IO nt 3 ou that curred 3 ou that curred 3 ou that curred out that	4 nd/or fami CU? 4 rent validat 4 rent validat	Likely 5 ly perspection Important 5 ed sedation Satisfied 5 ed pain sca Satisfied 5 ed delirium	6 scales added	7 essing issue Very 7 equate for Very 7 ete for clinic Very 7	es with cur important 8 clinical tria / satisfied 8 cal trials? / satisfied 8	9 sls?	N/C
How im sedativ 1 How sa 1 How sa	nportant is the e/analgesic use. Not important a 2 stisfied are you not satisfied a 2 stisfied are you not satisfied a 2 stisfied are you not satisfied a 2 stisfied	ne patient a use in the IO nt 3 ou that curred 3 ou that curred 3 ou that curred out that	4 nd/or fami CU? 4 rent validat 4 rent validat	Likely 5 ly perspection Important 5 ed sedation Satisfied 5 ed pain sca Satisfied 5	6 scales added	7 essing issue Very 7 equate for Very 7 ete for clinic Very 7	es with cur important 8 clinical tria / satisfied 8 cal trials? / satisfied 8	9 sls?	N/C

Should pa	Should patient and family contribution apply to all phases of research including trial design,									
result review and preparation of publication?										
N	Not important Important Very important			Important Very imp				N/O		
1	2	3	4	4 5 6 7 8 9					IN/U	

How important is it that the FDA has qualified clinical outcome assessments (COA) for sedation, analgesia and delirium in the ICU (there currently are none)?										
N	ot importa	nt					N/O			
1	2	3	4	4 5 6 7 8 9 N/C						

Supplemental Table 1. Information Survey Questions

		*	Not Important (1,2,3)	Important but not critical (4,5,6)	Critical (7,8,9)
The indications for the initiation of sedation (separate from the indication for enrollment in the study) are fully specified in the study protocol.	Round 1	30	-	24%	76%
An illness score (APACHE II, SOFA, SAPS II, etc.) is recorded for all patients at the time of enrollment.	Round 1	30	-	7%	93%
The risk of substance withdrawal (e.g., opioids,	Round 1	30	-	72%	28%
alcohol, etc.) is assessed with a validated tool	Round 2	27	8%	73%	19%
prior to enrollment.	Round 3	25	-	91%	9%
Baseline pain is measured before study	Round 1	30	3%	38%	59%
initiation using a validated scale.	Round 2	27	4%	26%	70%
Describe weight to the stand to a superinfield level	Round 1	30	24%	48%	28%
Baseline pain is treated to a pre-specified level using a validated scale prior to enrollment	Round 2	27	15%	67%	19%
using a valuated scale prior to emoliment	Round 3	25	4%	72%	24%

		*	Immedi -ately	1 hr	6	12	24	48
Enrollment is to occur no later than [make selection] after initiation of "usual" practice sedation (non-protocol)	Round 1	30	4%	23%	15%	8%	38%	12%
	Round 2	26	-	-	9%	13%	74%	4%
	Round 3	25	-	-	9%	-	87%	4%

Supplemental Table 2A. Enrollment and Study Initiation. Questions were removed from a subsequent round if consensus was reached for the recommendation being "critical" (see text). APACHE II - Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation II. SOFA – Sequential Organ Failure Assessment. SAPS II – Simplified Acute Physiology Score II. * Total number of respondents for each round. The percentages are based on the number who indicated a response 1-9, excluding "No Opinion" option.

				Important	
		*	Not Important	but not	Critical
			(1,2,3)	critical	(7,8,9)
				(4,5,6)	
A "non-inferiority" trial design compared to "usual	Round 1	30	13%	43%	43%
practice" is an acceptable RCT design for a study of a	Round 2	27	-	52%	48%
new ICU sedative or protocol.	Round 3	25	4%	72%	24%
A pragmatic RCT design (e.g., "usual practice" as the	Round 1	29	14%	54%	32%
comparison group) is acceptable for a study of a new ICU	Round 2	27	-	81%	19%
sedative or protocol.	Round 3	25	-	92%	8%
	Round 1	30	7%	52%	41%
Complete blinding (patients, family, clinicians and study personal) for the study conduct and analysis is:	Round 2	27	4%	58%	38%
	Round 3	25	-	76%	24%
For new ICU sedation agents (or combinations) adequate Pk/Pd data must be available for the specific	Round 1	30	7%	36%	57%
ICU patient population to be studied	Round 2	27	-	24%	76%
Former ICU patients and families should be explicitly	Round 1	30	14%	31%	55%
consulted in the design phase of an ICU sedation clinical	Round 2	27	11%	30%	59%
trial	Round 3	25	4%	24%	72%
All outcome assessments for sedation, pain and/or delirium should be conducted by fully trained research	Round 1	30	13%	27%	60%
personnel		27	4%	22%	74%
Documentation of adequate training for all personnel (study or clinical) who measure study outcomes must be made	Round 1	30	3%	23%	73%

Supplemental Table 2B. Study Design. Questions were removed from a subsequent round if consensus was reached for the recommendation being "critical" (see text). RCT – Randomized Controlled Trial. ICU – Intensive Care Unit Pk/Pd – pharmacokinetic / pharmacodynamic. . * Total number of respondents for each round. The percentages are based on the number who indicated a response 1-9, excluding "No Opinion" option.

			NI-+	Important	
		*	Not Important	but not critical	Critical
			· (1,2,3)	(4,5,6)	(7,8,9)
In a sedation clinical trial, the Richmond Agitation and	Round 1	28		58%	42%
Sedation Scale (RASS) is included as an efficacy	Round 2	27	-	58%	42%
outcome measurement of the sedation level	Round 3	25	-	63%	38%
In a sedation clinical trial, the Sedation Agitation Scale	Round 1	28	13%	39%	48%
(SAS) is included as an efficacy outcome measurement	Round 2	27	4%	73%	23%
of the sedation level	Round 3	25	8%	79%	13%
In a sedation clinical trial, the Ramsey Sedation Scale	Round 1	28	57%	30%	13%
(RSS) is included as an efficacy outcome measurement	Round 2	27	77%	19%	4%
of the sedation level	Round 3	25	92%	8%	-
The use of pre-specified rescue medications (e.g., which		28			
medications and indications for use) is included as an outcome	Round 1		-	19%	81%
A composite efficacy outcome (e.g., components of	Round 1	28	29%	38%	33%
sedation, pain and [lack of] delirium) is not used as a	Round 2	27	28%	56%	16%
primary outcome	Round 3	25	16%	64%	20%
A Principle of the second seco	Round 1	28	4%	50%	46%
A validated tool for patient and/or family satisfaction with sedation is included as an efficacy outcome.	Round 2	27	-	56%	44%
with sedation is included as an emcacy outcome.	Round 3	25	-	68%	32%

		*						
			Hour	2 hrs	4	8	12	Day
As an efficacy outcome the sedation level	Round 1	28	8%	16%	60%	12%	4%	0%
should be measured every	Round 2	26	4%	-	96%	-	-	-

Supplemental Table 2C. Efficacy Outcome Measurements. Questions were removed from a subsequent round if consensus was reached for the recommendation being "critical" (see text). * Total number of respondents for each round. The percentages are based on the number who indicated a response 1-9, excluding "No Opinion" option.

				Important	
		*	Not	but not	
			Important	critical	Critical
			(1,2,3)	(4,5,6)	(7,8,9)
In patients who can self-report pain a numeric rating scale (NRS) is used	Round 1	28	-	19%	81%
In patients who cannot self-report pain the Critical Care Pain Observation Tool (CCPOT) is used.	Round 1	28	4%	23%	73%
In patients who cannot self-report pain the Behavioral	Round 2	27	8%	46%	46%
Pain Scale (BPS) is used.	Round 3	25	-	29%	71%
Pain is measured and recorded only by study personnel	Round 1	27	19%	31%	50%
fully trained in the use of the scale:	Round 2	27	15%	11%	74%
Al-19 of the control of the control of the foodbased	Round 1	28	4%	56%	41%
Ability of the patient to communicate with family and staff is included as an outcome.	Round 2	27	4%	62%	35%
starr is included as an outcome.	Round 3	25	4%	80%	16%
Assessment of amnesia (without specification as to	Round 1	28	35%	42%	23%
whether amnesia is good or bad from a patient's	Round 2	27	15%	81%	4%
perspective) is included as an outcome measurement:	Round 3	25	-	96%	4%
Assessment of sleep (subjective or objective sleep	Round 1	28	15%	52%	33%
assessment scores) is included as an outcome	Round 2	27	11%	70%	19%
measurement:	Round 3	25	4%	84%	12%

		*						
			Hour	2 hrs	4	8	12	Day
As an outcome, pain should be assessed	Round 1	28	12%	16%	48%	12%	8%	4%
every	Round 2	27	4%	4%	88%	4%	-	-

Supplemental Table 2D. Other Outcome Measurements. Questions were removed from a subsequent round if consensus was reached for the recommendation being "critical" (see text). * Total number of respondents for each round. The percentages are based on the number who indicated a response 1-9, excluding "No Opinion" option.

		*	Not Important	Important but not t critical	Critical
			(1,2,3)	(4,5,6)	(7,8,9)
The ICU mortality is required as a safety outcome.	Round 1	28	4%	15%	81%
Days on a ventilator is a required safety outcome measure.	Round 1	28	7%	11%	82%
Lack of delirium is an important safety outcome and assessment of delirium should use the CAM-ICU scale.	Round 1	28	7%	11%	81%
Lack of delirium is an important safety outcome and assessment of delirium should use the Intensive Care Delirium Screening Checklist (ICDSC) scale.	Round 2	27	8%	36%	56%
	Round 3	25	4%	24%	72%
Delirium measurement should distinguish between hypoactive and hyperactive types	Round 1	28	15%	46%	38%
	Round 2	26	8%	56%	36%
	Round 3	25	4%	60%	36%
Delirium is measured and recorded only by study personnel fully trained in the use of the scale:	Round 1	28	11%	30%	59%
	Round 2	27	7%	11%	81%

		*						
			Hour	2 hrs	4	8	12	Day
The measurement of delirium should be made every	Round 1	28	-	4%	28%	24%	36%	8%
	Round 2	27	-	-	31%	15%	54%	-
	Round 3	24	-	-	9%	14%	73%	5%

Supplemental Table 2E. Safety Outcome Measurements. Questions were removed from a subsequent round if consensus was reached for the recommendation being "critical" (see text). CAM-ICU – Confusion Assessment Method for the Intensive Care Unit. * Total number of respondents for each round. The percentages are based on the number who indicated a response 1-9, excluding "No Opinion" option.

			Important				
		*		Not	but not		
			Imp	ortant	critical	Critical	
			(1	L,2,3)	(4,5,6)	(7,8,9)	
The Core Outcome Measurement Set (Am J Crit Care Med 196 (9): 1122-1130, 2017) should be used to assess long term outcomes.	Round 1	28	4%		32%	64%	
	Round 2	26	8%		15%	77%	
"Institution (i.e., not at home) free days" after discharge should be a long-term outcome.	Round 1	28		4%	63%	33%	
	Round 2	27		4%	73%	23%	
	Round 3	25	-		76%	24%	
		*	30	60	6	1	
			days	days	months	year	
Long term (post ICU discharge) mortality should be measured at what interval(s)	Round 1	30	32%	18%	26%	24%	
	Round 2	22	45%	14%	28%	14%	

Supplemental Table 2F. Long Term Outcome Measurements. Questions were removed from a subsequent round if consensus was reached for the recommendation being "critical" (see text). * Total number of respondents for each round. The percentages are based on the number who indicated a response 1-9, excluding "No Opinion" option.

Round 3

25

57%

4%

29%

11%

(choose one or more):