OPEN

Design of Clinical Trials Evaluating Sedation in Critically Ill Adults Undergoing Mechanical Ventilation: Recommendations From Sedation Consortium on Endpoints and Procedures for Treatment, Education, and Research (SCEPTER) Recommendation III

OBJECTIVES: Clinical trials evaluating the safety and effectiveness of sedative medication use in critically ill adults undergoing mechanical ventilation differ considerably in their methodological approach. This heterogeneity impedes the ability to compare results across studies. The Sedation Consortium on Endpoints and Procedures for Treatment, Education, and Research Recommendations convened a meeting of multidisciplinary experts to develop recommendations for key methodologic elements of sedation trials in the ICU to help guide academic and industry clinical investigators.

DESIGN: A 2-day in-person meeting was held in Washington, DC, on March 28–29, 2019, followed by a three-round, online modified Delphi consensus process.

PARTICIPANTS: Thirty-six participants from academia, industry, and the Food and Drug Administration with expertise in relevant content areas, including two former ICU patients attended the in-person meeting, and the majority completed an online follow-up survey and participated in the modified Delphi process.

MEASUREMENTS AND MAIN RESULTS: The final recommendations were iteratively refined based on the survey results, participants' reactions to those results, summaries written by panel moderators, and a review of the meeting transcripts made from audio recordings. Fifteen recommendations were developed for study design and conduct, subject enrollment, outcomes, and measurement instruments. Consensus recommendations included obtaining input from ICU survivors and/or their families, ensuring adequate training for personnel using validated instruments for assessments of sedation, pain, and delirium in the ICU environment, and the need for methodological standardization.

CONCLUSIONS: These recommendations are intended to assist researchers in the design, conduct, selection of endpoints, and reporting of clinical trials involving sedative medications and/or sedation protocols for adult ICU patients who require mechanical ventilation. These recommendations should be viewed as a starting point to improve clinical trials and help reduce methodological heterogeneity in future clinical trials.

Denham S. Ward, MD, PhD[1]
Anthony R. Absalom, MBChB, FRCA, MD[2]
Leanne M. Aitken, RN, PhD[3,4]
Michele C. Balas, RN, PhD[5]
David L. Brown, MD[6]
Lisa Burry, BScPharm, PharmD, PhD (c)[7]
Elizabeth Colantuoni, PhD[8]
Douglas Coursin, MD[9]
John W. Devlin, PharmD[10,11]
Franklin Dexter, MD, PhD[12]
Robert H. Dworkin, PhD[13]
Talmage D. Egan, MD[14]
Doug Elliott, RN, PhD[15]
Ingrid Egerod, RN, PhD[16]
Pamela Flood, MD[17]
Gilles L. Fraser, PharmD[18]
Timothy D. Girard, MD, MSCI[19]
David Gozal, MD[20]
Ramona O. Hopkins, PhD[21,22]
John Kress, MD[23]
Mervyn Maze, MBChB[24]
Dale M. Needham, MD, PhD[25]
Pratik Pandharipande, MD, MSCI[26]
Richard Riker, MD[27]
Daniel I. Sessler, MD[28]
Steven L. Shafer, MD[29]
Yahya Shehabi, MB BS, PhD[30]
Claudia Spies, MD[31]
Lena S. Sun, MD[32]
Avery Tung, MD[33]
Richard D. Urman, MD, MBA[34]

DOI: 10.1097/CCM.0000000000005049

KEY WORDS: clinical trial; intensive care; outcome assessments; research methodology; sedation

Clinical practice guidelines for managing mechanically ventilated adults in the ICU acknowledge the lack of high-quality evidence on which to base recommendations for sedation and analgesia (1, 2). High-quality evidence is sparse because numerous barriers make clinical research in this area complex (3). An absence of standardized approaches to study design and methods and a lack of consensus on the most important clinical outcomes and measures are notable barriers. For example, a sampling of clinical trials on ICU sedation from the "ClinicalTrials.gov" website and several recently published trials (4–8) revealed substantial heterogeneity in their inclusion and exclusion criteria, primary and secondary efficacy outcomes, safety outcomes, measurement instruments, and timing of outcome measures relative to the sedative intervention and ICU admission. Unfortunately, such heterogeneity hinders meaningful comparisons across trials and prevents the use of meta-analysis to synthesize evidence and provide recommendations regarding how to optimally provide sedation for mechanically ventilated adults in the ICU (8).

To address these gaps, the Sedation Consortium on Endpoints and Procedures for Treatment, Education and Research (SCEPTER) convened a meeting that focused on the design and conduct of clinical trials for sedation management in critically ill adults who require mechanical ventilation (SCEPTER III). SCEPTER is part of the Analgesic, Anesthetic, Addiction Clinical Trial Translations, Innovations, Opportunities, and Networks (ACTTION) public-private partnership with the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) (9). Previous recommendations regarding the design of clinical trials for procedural sedation have been developed by SCEPTER (10, 11). Briefly, ACTTION was conceived as part of the FDA's Critical Path Initiative (12), with a mission "… to identify, prioritize, sponsor, coordinate, and promote innovative activities—with a special interest in optimizing clinical trials—that will expedite the discovery and development of improved analgesic, anesthetic, addiction, and peripheral neuropathy treatments for the benefit of the public health."

The purpose of the SCEPTER III meeting was to develop pragmatic, evidence-based guidance to clinical investigators who are designing, conducting, and reporting clinical trials evaluating sedation in mechanically ventilated adults in the ICU. Recommendations for key elements of study design, conduct, and reporting of sedation-related clinical trials in the ICU are offered to help facilitate comparison of studies of new agents, combinations, or protocols.

METHODS

A 2-day, in-person meeting was held in Washington, DC, on March 28–29, 2019. This meeting was followed by a modified Delphi consensus process (conducted online from February through June 2020) that focused on discussion points from the in-person meeting. This article reports on results of both the meeting and the modified Delphi consensus process.

Meeting

The meeting agenda and participant list were developed by a seven-member ACTTION/SCEPTER III steering committee, **supplemental data 1** (http://links.lww.com/CCM/G350) and **supplemental data 2** (http://links.lww.com/CCM/G351) present the steering committee membership and the meeting agenda, respectively. Participants were an international, interprofessional group of experts who had either attended prior SCEPTER meetings, published research involving sedation in adult ICUs, and/or were experts in clinical trial design, short- and long-term ICU patient outcomes, pharmacology, and/or statistics. Attendees included clinical, academic, patient, FDA, and industry representatives.

Prior to the meeting, participants were asked to review the Society of Critical Care Medicine's (SCCM) 2018 Pain, Agitation/Sedation, Delirium, Immobility, Sleep Disruption guidelines (1), two prior SCEPTER meeting publications (10, 11), and the SCEPTER III agenda. Thirty-six participants from academia, industry, and the FDA with expertise in relevant content areas and two former ICU patients attended the in-person meeting which included formal presentations, panel-led discussions, and informal discussion time. Particularly noteworthy was the session devoted to the patient and family perspective. The presentation from an ICU survivor was followed by a panel discussion led by another ICU survivor (supplemental data 2, (http://links.lww.com/CCM/G351). Both ICU survivors are anesthesiologists who had explicit memory of their time

in the ICU, providing a unique perspective. The meeting was audio-recorded and professionally transcribed (13).

Postmeeting Modified Delphi Consensus Process

Following the in-person meeting, in July 2019, an online survey **Supplemental Table 1** (http://links.lww.com/CCM/G352) was sent to all participants to assess their perspectives on key points discussed at the meeting. Survey results, participants' reactions to those results, written summaries of the meeting panel discussions provided by the panel moderators, and a review of the meeting transcripts formed the basis for generating questions for the modified Delphi consensus process. These questions were written by two authors (D.W., D.E.), neither of whom participated in the survey. The questions were pilot tested and refined based on feedback with several intensivists. This modified Delphi protocol was reviewed by the University of Rochester Research Study Review Board (Institutional Review Board) and determined to be exempt (Study00003771). Web based software (Mesydel, Seraing, Belgium; https://mesydel.com/en) was used to conduct each round of the modified Delphi process.

Within the modified Delphi process, a nine-point Likert scale was used for most responses, anchors were "Not Important" (score: 1–3), "Important but Not Critical" (score: 4–6), and "Critical" (score: 7–9). A "No opinion" option was also provided (14). The remaining questions required selection of a specific time interval. As determined a priori, a recommendation was considered to have reached consensus when greater than or equal to 70% of respondents rated the recommendation as "Critical" (score ≥ 7) and less than or equal to 15% of respondents rated the recommendation as "Not Important." For questions with a time scale response, consensus was defined as greater than or equal to 70% of respondents agreeing on a specific response option. Recommendations reaching this definition of consensus were not included in subsequent Delphi rounds. In the first and second Delphi rounds, participants could include comments, which were anonymously shared with all participants as part of the subsequent round. After three rounds, questions with greater than or equal to 70% of responses as "Important but Not Critical" or "Not Important" were also noted.

Final recommendations for this report, summarized in tabular form, were developed based on the meeting discussions, panel summaries, transcripts, and the modified Delphi consensus process, with iterative refinement of the draft recommendations by participants of the SCEPTER III meeting.

RESULTS

Table 1 outlines the recommendations for key elements of a clinical trial of a new sedative, combination of sedatives, or sedation strategy in critically ill adults who require mechanical ventilation and represents the combined results of the 2-day meeting and the subsequent three-round modified Delphi consensus process. These recommendations aim to enhance the consistency and comparability of future sedation trials. **Supplemental Table 2** (http://links.lww.com/CCM/G353) reports results for each Delphi recommendation.

Key Recommendations—Study Development

Critically ill adults represent a heterogenous study population even in specialty-focused ICUs. Study eligibility criteria should be defined to select patients most likely to benefit from the proposed intervention while balancing potential limitations of a restricted patient population for trial enrollment as well as study generalizability. Whenever possible, measurement instruments should have evidence of validity and reliability in the proposed study population and setting and should be used in a manner consistent with such evidence. The lack of validated assessment tools for alcohol and opioid withdrawal in critically ill adults represents a particularly pertinent gap for sedation research.

The perspectives of survivors of critical illness and their family/caregivers should also be considered during the clinical trial design to ensure a patient-centered focus. The impact of critical illness on the patient cannot be separated from the impact on loved ones and family members. The perspectives of survivors and family/caregivers are unique and panels assisting with study development should include both.

Key Recommendations—Study Enrollment

Patients eligible for a sedation clinical trial should be enrolled as early as possible within the constraints of urgent clinical care, availability of research staff, and the need for informed consent. Although enrollment

TABLE 1.
Key Elements in the Design and Conduct of Clinical Trials of Sedation in Adult Mechanically Ventilated ICU Patients

Study design
The specific clinical trial design will depend on the goals of the study, with adaptive, pragmatic, and/or noninferiority designs as potential options.
The number of study sites, type of ICUs eligible for the study, and patient eligibility criteria, along with the rationale for these choices, should be explicitly stated in the study protocol.
A panel of survivors of critical illness and their caregivers should be consulted throughout the design of the clinical trial (15).
Study enrollment
The specific indication(s) for use of sedation in an enrolled patient should be recorded (4).
Patient enrollment should occur as soon as possible, and preferably no later than 24 hr after initiation of sedation.
A validated ICU severity of illness score (e.g., Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation, Sequential Organ Failure Assessment, Simplified Acute Physiology Score) should be recorded, preferably at the time of ICU admission or study enrollment (16–18).
Study conduct
All pain, sedation, and delirium assessments should be performed by personnel who are trained in use of the assessment instrument (19). Ideally, these measurements are done by research (rather than clinical) personnel. Quality assurance monitoring of the completeness, accuracy, consistency, and reproducibility of the measures, over the duration of the study is recommended.
The use of "rescue" medications (e.g., for patient agitation and pain) should be standardized via the study protocol, recorded, and reported.
Outcomes and measurement instruments
Achieving the target level of sedation may be a primary or secondary outcome or a protocol adherence measure.
The sedation level should be assessed at least every 4 hr using a valid and reliable scale (e.g., Richmond Agitation and Sedation Scale [20] or Sedation-Agitation Scale [21]). The Ramsay Sedation Scale is not recommended (22).
Pain should be measured prior to study initiation and at least every 4 hr thereafter using a valid and reliable scale (e.g., numeric rating scale in patients who can self-report pain and the Critical Care Pain Observation Tool (23) or Behavioral Pain Scale in those who cannot [24]).
Consideration should be given to treating pain to a prespecified score prior to any sedation assessment or administration of a sedative.
Delirium should be assessed at least every 12 hr using a valid and reliable scale (e.g., Confusion Assessment Method for the ICU or Intensive Care Delirium Screening Checklist [25–28]).
ICU and hospital mortality, length of stay, mechanical ventilation duration, and mortality at 30 d (and possibly up to 180 d) should be measured and reported.
If outcomes beyond hospital discharge will be assessed, a core outcome measurement set for acute respiratory failure survivors should be used (14).

prior to, or within 24 hours of, sedation initiation is ideal, later enrollment may be consistent with the goals of a clinical trial in some circumstances. Management of both control and intervention groups should be consistent with accepted clinical practice for the use of sedation medications and a target sedation level (e.g., no sedation vs light sedation vs deep sedation). Since heterogeneity in the patient population is expected, recording a validated ICU severity of illness score at the time of ICU admission or patient enrollment is recommended.

Key Recommendations—Study Conduct

Many measures (e.g., of level of sedation) are based on scoring systems with a subjective component. Ideally, all such assessments are performed by trained study personnel. However, this goal may not always be feasible on evenings, nights, and weekends. If measures obtained by clinical personnel are used for research purposes, personnel training and quality assurance monitoring of the completeness, accuracy, consistency, and reproducibility of such measures, over the duration of the study, are recommended.

Key Recommendations—Outcome Measures

Important outcomes include both those occurring during the ICU admission and after ICU and hospital discharge. During the ICU stay, measures of sedation, pain, and delirium should be evaluated using valid and reliable instruments for the ICU setting. This recommendation does not limit use of additional novel scales or techniques (e.g., processed electroencephalogram) in the study so long as they do not compromise the use of validated measures. The times to clinically important outcomes (e.g., extubation, ICU and hospital discharge, etc.) should be reported.

Consideration should be given to evaluating patient-centered outcomes after hospital discharge (e.g., post intensive care syndrome including mental health, cognition, and functional mobility as well as chronic pain, quality of life, etc.), while recognizing that proven associations between ICU sedation and these outcomes is evolving. An existing core outcome measurement set (COMS) (14), designed for research studies evaluating postdischarge outcomes of acute respiratory failure survivors, was presented at the meeting. This COMS is recommended for use by both a National Heart Lung and Blood Institute working group on clinical research in adult pulmonary and critical care (29) and the American Thoracic Society/European Respiratory Society task force as part of postdischarge follow-up of acute respiratory failure survivors with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) (30). Instruments from this COMS project also have also been recommended for clinical outpatient use by a SCCM international consensus conference (31). After the SCEPTER III meeting, a separate set of recommendations for measurement instruments for outpatient clinical use in critical illness survivors was published (32).

DISCUSSION

An international group of interprofessional experts met to develop recommendations for the design, conduct, and reporting of clinical trials evaluating sedation in adults requiring mechanical ventilation. The goals of the meeting were to improve the quality and consistency of data generated, reduce methodological heterogeneity, and provide practical guidance for these trials. Herein, we discuss three themes that merit further elaboration: 1) incorporating views of surviving patients and/or families, 2) data collection quality assurance, and 3) need for methodological standardization.

With the increased call for patient-centered focus in clinical research (31), trialists should formally incorporate the perspectives of patients and families/caregivers and patient comfort into the design of clinical trials of ICU sedation. Since posttraumatic stress disorder, depression, and other mental illnesses occur in the caregivers as well as ICU survivors, it is important to include both of these groups in a panel that is involved in all aspects of the clinical trial (33, 34). The involvement of patient and family advisors has been considered critical in designing trials that are patient centered and whose results change clinical care practice and social support may change outcomes (34). In the United Kingdom, it is not possible to obtain government funding without effective patient and public involvement in all stages of the project (36). The Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute (32, 37), among other funding bodies, has noted both the difficulty and importance of creating community partnerships that reflect the diversity of the population to be studied and eventually treated based on trial results. To achieve improved health equity and reduced health

disparities, we must strengthen the capacity to create partnerships with individuals and families living in diverse and underserved communities; better involve them in their care; and engage them in the improvement of care processes, interprofessional education, and research (38).

The acute and severe nature of illness commonly experienced by patients in an ICU generally precludes a priori discussion of research participation. Furthermore, delirium is commonly experienced by adults in the ICU and limits patient participation. During his recovery, one of the authors reflected on delusions experienced during prolonged critical illness (15) and developed a framing tool for the ICU teams caring for him. Gaining patient and family perspectives during the design of a clinical trial may offer valuable insights to optimally serve future patients. Specifically, careful consideration of the nature of ICU patients' experiences may improve the ability of clinical trials to help answer patient-centered research questions, optimize enrollment, and improve patient and family satisfaction with trial participation. In particular, family members are pivotal to patient enrollment because they usually serve as the legally authorized representatives for ICU patients who commonly lack capacity for informed consent. Also, patients and families are an essential part of community engagement exercises that are required for potentially obtaining exemption from informed consent (39).

Assessments of pain, sedation, delirium and quality of life, using valid and reliable instruments, can measure important trial outcomes when completed by personnel trained in use of these instruments (40–44). For data collection around the clock, reliance on clinical, rather than research, personnel may aid with feasibility of frequent measurements; however, this reliance on busy clinical personnel has the potential to introduce error. Hence, appropriate training and quality assurance is recommended for all personnel who perform such assessments required for sedation trials.

Clinical trials often use a "usual care" control group are sometimes unblinded and may have outcome measures that are subjective or can be influenced by actions of the clinical team. Hence, it is important to have a clear definition of "usual care" at the study site hospitals, including consideration of this issue as part of the study site selection process and standardization of the control group (e.g., management of pain, management of agitation, extubation protocols). Furthermore, designing study eligibility criteria to minimize the time interval between the start of sedation and study enrollment can help reduce exposure to medications that may confound assessment of the study intervention on the outcomes.

Several limitations of this work merit comment. The specific recommendations may have been influenced by the expert panel membership. The meeting attendees have collectively published extensively on sedation and related subjects but cannot exhaustively capture all potential viewpoints. In addition, dominant voices or opinions within the panel may introduce bias. However, the panel members were purposely selected to provide expertise in the field, along with a wide range of experience and opinions, and there was facilitation of robust, but respectful, discussion and debate during the 2-day in-person meeting. The in-person meeting was specifically designed to allow ample time for both formal discussion during panel-led questions as well as informal discussions during the group social gatherings.

Although the Delphi process spanned the early months of the COVID-19 pandemic, the panel members did not feel the pandemic affected our recommendations. Clinical trials for sedation should be consistent across COVID and non-COVID populations. The observation that COVID-19 patients may require increased depth of sedation does underscore our recommendation that a severity of illness score be recorded for all patients entered into the clinical trial (45–47).

Furthermore, recommendations were refined using a postmeeting survey to help identify topics that deserved further exploration or clarification via an anonymous, three-round, online modified Delphi consensus process followed by iterative refinement and debate. For example, there was discussion during the meeting on the problems of defining deep, moderate, and light sedation, which was deemphasized after the meeting in favor of recommendations concerning the sedation measurement instruments and frequency of evaluation.

In addition, these recommendations may not be suitable for all ICU trials, and adaptation of these recommendations may be appropriate for unique aspects of trial objectives and design. Furthermore, our focus was on pragmatic recommendations with the potential to reduce heterogeneity in clinical trial design,

conduct, and reporting. However, we realize some ICU sedation trials will want to incorporate novel features not considered in these recommendations that may still help advance the field.

CONCLUSIONS

An international group of interprofessional multidisciplinary experts met, discussed, and agreed upon 15 recommendations to assist with the design, conduct, and reporting of clinical trials of sedation of mechanically ventilated adults in the ICU. We view these recommendations as the beginning of further developments and processes, with the goals of improving and reducing heterogeneity in research methods used in clinical trials and facilitating comparisons of studies of new sedation agents, combinations, or protocols.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Alla Bazini, MD; Allison Lin, PharmD, PhD; Rigoberto Roca, MD; and Martha Van Clief, MD, Food and Drug Administration, Division of Anesthesia, Addiction Medicine, and Pain Medicine, Office of New Drugs for their participation in the meeting. We also thank Valorie Thompson and Andrea Speckin, Innovations Consulting Group LLC, Washington DC, for their invaluable assistance organizing the meeting and facilitating distribution of the article among the authors. We also thank Anna Zhao-Wong, MD, PhD, of Medical Dictionary for Regulatory Activities Maintenance and Support Service Organization, Yoanna Skrobik, MD, MSc of Université de Montréal and McGill University, and Diane Martire, MD, MPH, and Wing Yu Tang, MPH, Pfizer, Inc. New York, NY, for their participation.

1 *Department of Anesthesiology and Perioperative Medicine, University of Rochester School of Medicine and Dentistry, Rochester, NY.*

2 *University Medical Center Groningen, University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands.*

3 *School of Health Sciences, University of London, London, United Kingdom.*

4 *School of Nursing and Midwifery, Griffith University, Brisbane, QLD, Australia.*

5 *Center of Healthy Aging, Self-Management, and Complex Care, The Ohio State University, College of Nursing, Columbus, OH.*

6 *Clear Consults, LLC, Hayward, WI.*

7 *Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy, Mount Sinai Hospital, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada.*

8 *Department of Biostatistics, Bloomberg School of Public Health, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD.*

9 *Departments of Anesthesiology and Medicine, University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health, Madison, WI.*

10 *School of Pharmacy, Northeastern University, Boston, MA*

11 *Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, MA.*

12 *Department of Anesthesia, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA.*

13 *Department of Anesthesiology and Perioperative Medicine, University of Rochester School of Medicine and Dentistry, Rochester, NY.*

14 *Department of Anesthesiology, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT.*

15 *Faculty of Health, University of Technology Sydney, Sydney, NSW, Australia.*

16 *Intensive Care Unit, Rigshospitalet, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark.*

17 *Department of Anesthesiology, Perioperative and Pain Medicine, Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA.*

18 *Department of Medicine, Tufts University School of Medicine, Maine Medical Center, Portland, ME.*

19 *Department of Critical Care Medicine, University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine, Pittsburgh, PA.*

20 *Division of Anesthesiology and CCM, Hadassah Medical Center, The Hebrew University School of Medicine, Jerusalem, Israel.*

21 *Psychology Department and Neuroscience Center, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT.*

22 *Center for Humanizing Critical Care, Intermountain Medical Center, Murray, UT.*

23 *Department of Medicine, Section of Pulmonary and Critical Care, The University of Chicago, Chicago, IL.*

24 *Department of Anesthesia and Perioperative Care, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA.*

25 *Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, Department of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD.*

26 *Department of Anesthesiology and the Critical Illness, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, TN.*

27 *Department of Critical Care Services, Maine Medical Center, Portland, ME.*

28 *Department of Outcomes Research, Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, OH.*

29 *Department of Anesthesiology, Perioperative and Pain Medicine, Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA.*

30 *Monash Health School of Clinical Sciences – Department of Intensive Care Medicine - Critical Care Research, Melbourne, VIC, Australia.*

31 *Department of Anesthesiology and Operative Intensive Care Medicine, Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Campus Charité Mitte & Campus Virchow-Klinikum, Berlin, Germany.*

32 *Department of Anesthesiology, Columbia University Medical Center, New York, NY.*

33 *Department of Anesthesia and Critical Care, The University of Chicago, Chicago, IL.*

34 *Department of Anesthesiology, Perioperative and Pain Medicine, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA.*

The views expressed in this article are those of the authors, none of whom have financial conflicts of interest specifically related to the issues discussed in this article. At the time of the meeting (March 28–29, 2019) on which this article is based, several participants were employed by a pharmaceutical company or had received consulting fees or honoraria from one or more pharmaceutical or device companies. Meeting participants of this article who were not employed by industry at the time of the meeting received (or their Universities received) travel stipends, hotel accommodations, and meals during the meeting from the Analgesic, Anesthetic, and Addiction Clinical Trial Translations, Innovations, Opportunities, and Networks public-private partnership with the Food and Drug Administration.

Supplemental digital content is available for this article. Direct URL citations appear in the printed text and are provided in the HTML and PDF versions of this article on the journal's website (http://journals.lww.com/ccmjournal).

Supported, in part, by Addiction Clinical Trial Translations, Innovations, Opportunities, and Networks, which has received research contracts, grants, or other revenue from the Food and Drug Administration, multiple pharmaceutical and device companies, philanthropy, and other sources.

Drs. Ward, Aitken, Colantuoni, Maze, and Needham received funding from Analgesic, Anesthetic, and Addiction Clinical Trial Translations, Innovations, and Networks (ACTTION). Dr. Ward received support for article research from the University of Rochester Maine Medical Center Spectrum Medical Partners. Dr. Absalom's institution received funding from The Medicines Company, Carefusion (BD), and Rigel; he received support for article research from Philips, Janssen Pharma, Johnson & Johnson, Ever Pharma, Orion, and Paion. Drs. Aitken, Brown, and Coursin received funding from Innovations Consulting Group LLC. Dr. Aitken also received funding from Elsevier Australia. Dr. Balas' institution received funding from the National Institutes of Health (NIH), the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, AACN research grant; she received funding from H3C and received support for article research from the NIH. Dr. Colantuoni received support for article research from ACTTION. Dr. Dexter received funding from the Division of Management Consulting of the University of Iowa's Department of Anesthesia. Dr. Dworkin's institution received funding from the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA); he received funding from Abide, Acadia, Adynxx, Analgesic Solutions, Aptinyx, Aquinox, Asahi Kasei, Astellas, AstraZeneca, Biogen, Biohaven, Boston Scientific, Braeburn, Celgene, Centrexion, Chromocell, Clexio, Collegium, Concert, Coronado, Daiichi Sankyo, Decibel, Dong-A, Editas, Eli Lilly, Eupraxia, Glenmark, Grace, Hope, Hydra, Immune, Johnson & Johnson, Lotus Clinical Research, Mainstay, Medavante, Merck, Neumentum, Neurana, NeuroBo, Novaremed, Novartis, NSGene, Olatec, Periphagen, Pfizer, Phosphagenics, Quark, Reckitt Benckiser, Regenacy (also equity), Relmada, Sanifit, Scilex, Semnur, SK Life Sciences, Sollis, Spinifex, Syntrix, Teva, Thar, Theranexus, Trevena, Vertex, and Vizuri. Dr. Girard received funding from Haisco Pharmaceutical. Dr. Hopkins' institution received funding from Intermountain Medical and Research Foundation. Dr. Maze received funding from the University of California Office of the President and Cambridge University Press; he received support for article research from the NIH. Dr. Needham received funding from the FDA, Haisco-USA Pharmaceuticals, GlaxoSmithKline, and Novartis Pharma; he disclosed he is a principal investigator on a NIH-funded, multicentered randomized trial (R01HL132887) funded by Baxter Healthcare Corporation and Reck Medical Devices. Dr. Pandharipande's institution received funding from Pfizer. Dr. Shehabi's institution received funding from Orion Pharma and Pfizer; he received funding from Pfizer, Orion Pharma, Abbott Laboratories, and Ever Pharma. Dr. Sun received funding from UpToDate; she disclosed she is the Editor in Chief for UpToDate/Anesthesiology. Dr. Tung received funding from Anesthesia and Analgesia. Dr. Urman's institution received funding from Medtronic/Covidien and AcelRx; he received funding from Merck, Sandoz, Heron, Takeda, and Pfizer. The remaining authors have disclosed that they do not have any potential conflicts of interest.

For information regarding this article, E-mail: Denham_Ward@URMC.Rochester.edu

REFERENCES

1. Devlin JW, Skrobik Y, Gélinas C, et al: Clinical practice guidelines for the prevention and management of pain, agitation/sedation, delirium, immobility, and sleep disruption in adult patients in the ICU. *Crit Care Med* 2018; 46:e825–e873
2. Baron R, Binder A, Biniek R et al: Evidence and consensus based guideline for the management of delirium, analgesia, and sedation in intensive care medicine. Revision 2015 (das-guideline 2015) - short version. *Ger Med Sci* 2015; 13:Doc19
3. Coursin DB, Skrobik Y: What is safe sedation in the ICU? *N Engl J Med* 2019; 380:2577–2578
4. Olsen HT, Nedergaard HK, Strøm T, et al: Nonsedation or light sedation in critically ill, mechanically ventilated patients. *N Engl J Med* 2020; 382:1103–1111
5. Shehabi Y, Howe BD, Bellomo R, et al; ANZICS Clinical Trials Group and the SPICE III Investigators: Early sedation with sexmedetomidine in critically ill patients. *N Engl J Med* 2019; 380:2506–2517
6. Shehabi Y, Forbes AB, Arabi Y, et al; The SPICE III study investigators; The Australian and New Zealand Intensive Care

Society Clinical Trials Group; The Australian and New Zealand Intensive Care Research Centre: The SPICE III study protocol and analysis plan: A randomised trial of early goaldirected sedation compared with standard care in mechanically ventilated patients. *Crit Care Resusc* 2017; 19:318–326

7. Walsh TS, Kydonaki K, Antonelli J, et al; Development and Evaluation of Strategies to Improve Sedation practice in in Tensive care Study Investigators: Rationale, design and methodology of a trial evaluating three strategies designed to improve sedation quality in intensive care units (DESIST study). *BMJ Open* 2016; 6:e010148
8. Aitken LM, Bucknall T, Kent B, et al: Sedation protocols to reduce duration of mechanical ventilation in the ICU: A cochrane systematic review. *J Adv Nurs* 2016; 72:261–272
9. Analgesic, Anesthetic, Addiction Clinical Trial Translations, Innovations, Opportunities, and Networks (ACTTION): Available at: http://www.acttion.org. Accessed May 11, 2020
10. Williams MR, Ward DS, Carlson D, et al: Evaluating patient-centered outcomes in clinical trials of procedural sedation, part 1 efficacy: Sedation consortium on endpoints and procedures for treatment, education, and research recommendations. *Anesth Analg* 2017; 124:821–830
11. Ward DS, Williams MR, Berkenbosch JW, et al: Evaluating patient-centered outcomes in clinical trials of procedural sedation, part 2 safety: Sedation consortium on endpoints and procedures for treatment, education, and research recommendations. *Anesth Analg* 2018; 127:1146–1154
12. Woodcock J: FDA's critical path initiative. *Drug Discov Today Technol* 2007; 4:33
13. Analgesic, Anesthetic, Addiction Clinical Trial Translations, Innovations, Opportunities, and Networks (ACTTION): Sedation Consortium on Endpoints and Procedures for Treatment, Education and Research (Scepter): Available at: https://www.acttion.org/scepter. Accessed November 22, 2020
14. Needham DM, Sepulveda KA, Dinglas VD, et al: Core outcome measures for clinical research in acute respiratory failure survivors. An international modified delphi Consensus Study. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2017; 196:1122–1130
15. Brown DL: Fantastic delusions, futility and a family's love. *Anesthesiology* 2013; 119:984–986
16. Vincent JL, Moreno R, Takala J, et al: The SOFA (sepsis-related organ failure assessment) score to describe organ dysfunction/failure. On behalf of the Working Group on sepsis-related problems of the European Society of Intensive Care Medicine. *Intensive Care Med* 1996; 22:707–710
17. Moreno RP, Metnitz PG, Almeida E, et al; SAPS 3 Investigators: SAPS 3–From evaluation of the patient to evaluation of the intensive care unit. Part 2: Development of a prognostic model for hospital mortality at ICU admission. *Intensive Care Med* 2005; 31:1345–1355
18. Knaus WA, Draper EA, Wagner DP, et al: APACHE II: A severity of disease classification system. *Crit Care Med* 1985; 13:818–829
19. De Jonghe B, Cook D, Appere-De-Vecchi C, et al: Using and understanding sedation scoring systems: a systematic review. *Intensive Care Med* 2000; 26:275–285
20. Sessler CN, Gosnell MS, Grap MJ, et al: The richmond agitation-sedation scale: Validity and reliability in adult intensive care unit patients. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2002; 166:1338–1344
21. Riker RR, Picard JT, Fraser GL: Prospective evaluation of the sedation-agitation scale for adult critically ill patients. *Crit Care Med* 1999; 27:1325–1329
22. Ramsay MA, Savege TM, Simpson BR, et al: Controlled sedation with alphaxalone-alphadolone. *Br Med J* 1974; 2:656–659
23. Gelinas C, Fillion L, Puntillo KA, et al: Validation of the critical-care pain observation tool in adult patients. *Am J Crit Care* 2006; 15:420-427
24. Aissaoui Y, Zeggwagh AA, Zekraoui A,et al: Validation of a behavioral pain scale in critically ill, sedated, and mechanically ventilated patients. *Anesth Analg* 2005; 101:1470-1476
25. Semler MW, Bernard GR, Aaron SD et al: Identifying clinical research priorities in adult pulmonary and critical care: NHLBI working group report. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2020; 202:511–523
26. Ely EW, Margolin R, Francis J, et al: Evaluation of delirium in critically ill patients: Validation of the confusion assessment method for the Intensive Care Unit (CAM-ICU). *Crit Care Med* 2001; 29:1370–1379
27. Skrobik Y, Duprey MS, Hill NS, et al: Low-dose nocturnal dexmedetomidine prevents ICU delirium. A randomized, placebo-controlled trial. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2018; 197:1147–1156
28. Luetz A, Heymann A, Radtke FM, et al: Different assessment tools for intensive care unit delirium: Which score to use? *Crit Care Med* 2010; 38:409–418
29. Spruit MA, Holland AE, Singh SJ, et al: Covid-19: Interim guidance on rehabilitation in the hospital and post-hospital phase from a European respiratory society and American thoracic society-coordinated international task force. *Eur Respir J* 2020; 56: 2002197
30. Mikkelsen ME, Still M, Anderson BJ, et al: Society of critical care medicine's international consensus conference on prediction and identification of long-term impairments after critical illness. *Crit Care Med* 2020; 48:1670–1679
31. Spies CD, Krampe H, Paul N, et al: Instruments to measure outcomes of post-intensive care syndrome in outpatient care settings – results of an expert consensus and feasibility field test. *J Intensive Care Soc* 2000 May 14. [online ahead of print]
32. Frank L, Basch E, Selby JV; Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Institute: The PCORI perspective on patient-centered outcomes research. *JAMA* 2014; 312:1513–1514
33. Cameron JI, Chu LM, Matte A, et al; RECOVER Program Investigators (Phase 1: towards RECOVER); Canadian Critical Care Trials Group: One-year outcomes in caregivers of critically ill patients. *N Engl J Med* 2016; 374:1831–1841

34. Choi KW, Shaffer KM, Zale EL, et al: Early risk and resiliency factors predict chronic posttraumatic stress disorder in caregivers of patients admitted to a neuroscience ICU. *Crit Care Med* 2018; 46:713–719
35. Deja M, Denke C, Weber-Carstens S, et al: Social support during intensive care unit stay might improve mental impairment and consequently health-related quality of life in survivors of severe acute respiratory distress syndrome. *Crit Care* 2006; 10:R147
36. UK Standards for Public Involvement. Available at: https://sites.google.com/nihr.ac.uk/pi-standards/home. Accessed on January 8, 2021
37. Coleman CL, Abraham MR, Johnson BH: Strengthening diversity in research partnerships: Knowledge to action guide. Bethesda, MD: Institute for Patient- and Family-Centered Care. 2019. Available at: http://ipfcc.org/bestpractices/strengthening-diversity/index.html. Accessed April 6, 2021
38. Warner JJ, Crook HL, Whelan KM, et al; American Heart Association Partnering with Regulators Learning Collaborative: Improving cardiovascular drug and device development and evidence through patient-centered research and clinical trials: A call to action from the value in healthcare initiative's partnering with regulators learning collaborative. *Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes* 2020; 13:e006606
39. Exception From Informed Consent Requirements for Emergency Research. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/exception-informed-consent-requirements-emergency-research. Accessed on November 22, 2020
40. Barr J, Fraser GL, Puntillo K, et al; American College of Critical Care Medicine: Clinical practice guidelines for the management of pain, agitation, and delirium in adult patients in the intensive care unit. *Crit Care Med* 2013; 41:263–306
41. Gélinas C, Puntillo KA, Joffe AM, et al: A validated approach to evaluating psychometric properties of pain assessment tools for use in nonverbal critically ill adults. *Semin Respir Crit Care Med* 2013; 34:153–168
42. Gélinas C, Bérubé M, Chevrier A, et al: Delirium assessment tools for use in critically ill adults: A psychometric analysis and systematic review. *Crit Care Nurse* 2018; 38:38–49
43. Turnbull AE, Rabiee A, Davis WE et al: Outcome measurement in ICU survivorship research from 1970 to 2013: A scoping review of 425 publications. *Crit Care Med* 2016, 44:1267–1277
44. Robinson KA, Davis WE, Dinglas VD, et al: A systematic review finds limited data on measurement properties of instruments measuring outcomes in adult intensive care unit survivors. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2017; 82:37–46
45. Hanidziar D, Bittner EA: Sedation of mechanically ventilated COVID-19 patients: Challenges and special considerations. *Anesth Analg* 2020; 131:e40–e41
46. Madhok J, Mihm FG: Rethinking sedation during prolonged mechanical ventilation for COVID-19 respiratory failure. *Anesth Analg* 2020; 131:e123–e124
47. Hanidziar D, Bittner EA: In response. *Anesth Analg* 2020; 131:e124–e125