TITLE: Society of Critical Care Medicine's International Consensus Conference on Prediction and Identification of Long-Term Impairments after Critical Illness

Authors:

Mark E. Mikkelsen MD, MSCE[1], Mary Still MSN, RN, ANP-BC[2], Brian J. Anderson MD, MSCE[1], O. Joseph Bienvenu MD[3], Martin B. Brodsky MD[3], Nathan Brummel MD[4], Brad Butcher MD[5], Alison S. Clay MD[6], Hali Felt MFA, Lauren E. Ferrante MD[7], Kimberley J. Haines PhD[8], Michael O. Harhay PhD[1,9], Aluko A. Hope MD[10], Ramona O. Hopkins PhD[11,12,13], Megan Hosey PhD[3], Catherine "Terri" L. Hough MD[14], James C. Jackson PsyD[15], Annie Johnson ACNP-BC[16], Babar Khan MD[17], Nazir I. Lone MBBS, MD, MPH[18], Pamela MacTavish MSc[19], Joanne McPeake PhD[19], Ashley Montgomery-Yates MD[20], Dale M. Needham MD[3], Giora Netzer MD[21], Christa Schorr DNP, RN, NEA-BC[22], Becky Skidmore BA, MLS[23], Joanna L. Stollings PharmD[24], Reba Umberger PhD, RN, Critical Care Registered Nurse-Knowledge[25], Adair Andrews RN, MATD[26], Theodore J. Iwashyna MD, PhD[27], Carla M. Sevin MD[15]

Institution:
[1] Department of Medicine, Perelman School of Medicine at the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, United States
[2] Emory University Hospital, Atlanta, Georgia, United States
[3] Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, United States
[4] Division of Pulmonary, Critical Care, and Sleep Medicine, The Ohio State University Wexner Medical Center, Columbus, Ohio, United States
[5] Department of Critical Care Medicine, University of Pittsburgh Medical Center, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, United States
[6] Duke University School of Medicine, Durham, North Carolina, United States
[7] Section of Pulmonary, Critical Care, and Sleep Medicine, Department of Medicine, Yale School of Medicine, New Haven, Connecticut, United States
[8] Department of Physiotherapy, Western Health, Sunshine Hospital, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia
[9] Palliative and Advanced Illness Research (PAIR) Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, United States
[10] Department of Medicine, Division of Critical Care Medicine, Montefiore Medical Center, Bronx, New York, United States

[11] Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, Intermountain Medical Center, Murray, Utah
[12] Psychology Department and Neuroscience Center, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah
[13] Center for Humanizing Critical Care, Intermountain Health Care, Murray, Utah, United States
[14] Department of Medicine, Division of Pulmonary, Critical Care and Sleep Medicine, Harborview Medical Center, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, United States
[15] Department of Medicine, Division of Allergy, Pulmonary, and Critical Care Medicine, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, Tennessee, United States
[16] CCRN Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minnesota US
[17] Division of Pulmonary/Critical Care, Allergy and Occupational Medicine, Department of Medicine, Indiana University School of Medicine; Research Scientist, Regenstrief Institute Inc. Indianapolis, Indiana, United States
[18] Usher Institute, The University of Edinburgh, Scotland, UK
[19] Glasgow Royal Infirmary, NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde, Scotland, UK
[20] Division of Pulmonary, Critical Care and Sleep Medicine, University of Kentucky, Kentucky, United States
[21] Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, University of Maryland School of Medicine, United States
[22] Critical Care Department, Cooper University Hospital, Camden, New Jersey, United States
[23] Independent Information Specialist, Ottawa, Canada
[24] Department of Pharmaceutical Services, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, Tennessee, United States
[25] Department of Acute and Tertiary Care, College of Nursing, University of Tennessee Health Sciences Center, Memphis, Tennessee, United States
[26] Society of Critical Care Medicine, Mount Prospect, Illinois, United States
[27] Department of Medicine, Division of Pulmonary & Critical Care, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, United States

Corresponding author:
Mark E. Mikkelsen, MD, MSCE, FCCM
Pulmonary, Allergy, and Critical Care Division
Perelman School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania
Gates
3400 Spruce Street, Gates 05.037
Philadelphia, PA 19104
e-mail: mark.mikkelsen@uphs.upenn.edu

Abstract Word Count: 298

Word Count: 3291

Funding: This work was supported by the Society of Critical Care Medicine as part of its generous support of the Thrive initiative.

Disclosures: The authors have no financial or other potential conflicts of interest exist.

Key Words: critical illness; post-intensive care syndrome; long-term impairments; screening; cognitive impairment; mental health; physical activities; rehabilitation

Abstract

Background: After critical illness, new or worsening impairments in physical, cognitive, and/or mental health function are common among patients who have survived. Who should be screened for long-term impairments, what tools to use, and when, remain unclear.

Objectives: Provide pragmatic recommendations to clinicians caring for adult survivors of critical illness related to screening for post-discharge impairments.

Participants: 31 international experts in risk-stratification and assessment of survivors of critical illness, including practitioners involved in the Society of Critical Care Medicine's (SCCM) Thrive Post-ICU Collaboratives, survivors of critical illness, and clinical researchers.

Design: SCCM consensus conference on post-intensive care syndrome (PICS) prediction and assessment, held in Dallas, in May, 2019.

Meeting Outcomes: We concluded that existing tools are insufficient to reliably predict PICS. We identified factors before (e.g., frailty, pre-existing functional impairments), during (e.g., duration of delirium, sepsis, acute respiratory distress syndrome), and after (e.g., early symptoms of anxiety, depression, or post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD)) critical illness that can be used to identify patients at high-risk for cognitive, mental health, and physical impairments after critical illness in whom screening is recommended. We recommend serial assessments, beginning within 2-4 weeks of hospital discharge, using the following screening tools: Montreal Cognitive Assessment

test; Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale; Impact of Event Scale-Revised (PTSD); 6-minute walk and/or the EuroQol-5D-5L (physical function).

Conclusions: Beginning with an assessment of a patient's pre-ICU functional abilities at ICU admission, clinicians have a care coordination strategy to identify and manage impairments across the continuum. As hospital discharge approaches, clinicians should use brief, standardized assessments and compare these results to patient's pre-ICU functional abilities ("functional reconciliation"). We recommend serial assessments for PICS-related problems continue within 2-4 weeks of hospital discharge, be prioritized amongst high-risk patients, using the identified screening tools to prompt referrals for services and/or more detailed assessments.

BACKGROUND

Each year, with advances in care delivery, millions of patients survive critical illness. Unfortunately, after critical illness, new or worsening impairments in physical, cognitive, and/or mental health function are common among survivors (1-4). In 2010, a stakeholders' conference was convened by the Society of Critical Care Medicine (SCCM) to improve long-term impairments experienced by survivors of critical illness (5). To increase awareness of the long-term consequences of critical illness, the term "post-intensive care syndrome" (PICS) was recommended to describe these impairments (5).

In 2012, SCCM held a second stakeholders meeting which engaged representatives of professional organizations, health systems, patient advocates, and professionals with experience and expertise in post-ICU patient care (6). At the second meeting, it was recognized that "a substantial but unknown proportion of survivors of a critical illness are at risk of developing mental health, cognitive, and/or physical impairments" (6). To improve long-term outcomes, participants concluded that "systematic recognition of mental health, cognitive, and/or physical impairments related to PICS is required during transitions of care settings across the continuum of critical illness and recovery" (6). Barriers to practice were identified and included the need to develop educational information for providers that included PICS risk factors and triggers to refer survivors for additional medical care.

At ICU discharge, as a result of the impact of the acute illness and the hazards of bed rest and hospitalization, nearly all survivors of critical illness experience

impairments in one or more PICS domains. At three and 12-months, 64% and 56% of survivors experience one or more new post-intensive care problems, respectively, and co-occurrence is common (3). As such, prediction, risk-stratification, and screening remain vitally important areas to improve the long-term outcomes of survivors of critical illness.

This report summarizes the findings of a consensus conference convened by SCCM on May 21st, 2019, in Dallas, Texas. The purpose of the conference was to provide pragmatic recommendations to clinicians caring for adult survivors of critical illness related to screening for long-term impairments in cognition, mental health, or physical health as a means to improve long-term outcomes. The conference was organized around three fundamental questions related to post-hospital discharge assessments for adult survivors of critical illness. First, who should be screened for these often inter-related impairments? Second, what screening tools should be used? Third, when should these assessments be performed?

METHODS

Meeting

As part of SCCM's Thrive initiative, SCCM approved the plan for an international consensus conference on prediction and identification of long-term impairments after critical illness in September, 2017. Two Co-Chairs were appointed (M.E.M. and M.S.). The Co-Chairs worked within and outside of Thrive to identify experts to participate in the workshop.

Thrive, designed to accelerate survivor recovery by partnering with and learning from survivors of critical illness, began in 2015 and was supported through 2020. In addition to its educational and research missions, Thrive was designed to support survivors clinically. To achieve its clinical and research missions, Thrive implemented and then studied its two international post-ICU collaboratives: one focused on peer support to survivors of critical illness and the other on post-ICU clinics (7-10). The practical clinical experience of these collaboratives confirmed that fundamental questions regarding screening for long-term impairments after critical illness require attention. Outside of the collaboratives, issues of survivorship are rarely addressed (11), further supporting the need for pragmatic guidance.

Participants

To achieve the stated goals, we convened a multi-disciplinary conference of 31 international experts in risk-stratification and assessment of survivors of critical illness. Participants, 52% of whom were female, included practitioners involved in the Thrive Post-ICU Collaboratives, survivors of critical illness that included use of mechanical ventilation, and clinical researchers. Clinician perspectives included physicians, nurses, advanced practice providers, neuropsychologists, pharmacists, and rehabilitation experts. Physician representation was diverse and included those trained in medicine, surgery, anesthesiology, psychiatry, and physical medicine and rehabilitation.

Consensus Approach

In this consensus statement, we followed the methods of consensus established by the National Institutes of Health (12) and adapted for use in critical care medicine (13). As used in prior consensus statements (14-15), we employed a four step process.

First, as detailed above, we formulated three questions related to post-hospital discharge assessments for adult survivors of critical illness to guide who should be screened for long-term impairments, what tools should be used, and when should screening be performed. Second, beginning in May, 2018, one year prior to the conference, we worked with a medical librarian (B.S.) to conduct a comprehensive literature search, described in detail below and in the appendices.

Third, at the conference, held May 21, 2019 in Dallas, Texas, experts delivered presentations, followed by discussion and deliberations to collectively answer the inter-related questions (see **Appendix A** for the conference agenda and other Appendices for details of individual background work). We began the Dallas conference with insights from two survivors of critical illness.

Finally, we reviewed summary statements, informed by the presentations and deliberations, to arrive at recommendations. We used Twitter polls to provide the summary statements and as a means to poll the group. We maintained anonymity throughout the polling process to prevent dominant voices from driving a false impression of consensus. Strong recommendations from the group required 80% agreement amongst participants; those achieving 60% agreement are reported here and categorized as weak recommendations. As context, 70% agreement was used to achieve consensus in the core outcome measures for clinical research (16).

Recognizing the paucity of randomized clinical trials data to guide recommendations, participants were instructed to use the totality of their professional judgment, not just the published literature, in guiding their deliberations. For similar reasons, formal guideline development methodology (e.g., grading of recommendations,

assessment, development and evaluation (GRADE) methodology) was not used in this meeting.

Clinical Questions

To address our first question, “Can We Predict PICS?,” we conducted a new systematic review to examine whether we can predict cognitive, mental health, or physical impairments in adult survivors of critical illness (16). Because we anticipated a limited ability to predict PICS, we also sought to identify which survivors are most likely to have impairments in cognition, mental health, or physical health after critical illness. In this complementary question, we identified and systematically reviewed 17 pre-existing systematic reviews and recent original research to identify risk factors associated with impairments after critical illness. At the conference, we summarized and discussed these systematic reviews (**Appendix B and C)** (17-51). Risk factors were categorized, for each domain, as before, during, and after the ICU.

After the presentations and discussion, conference attendees were asked to recommend risk factors that would trigger interventions and screening assessments for cognitive, mental health, and physical impairments. Experience from the clinical care of survivors emphasized the potential importance of social aspects of recovery, and highlighted the limitations of current knowledge about in-ICU practices and experiences as risk factors.

We then addressed our third question, “How and when should we screen for long-term cognitive, mental health, and physical impairments in survivors of critical illness?” The discussions of recommendations for specific tools, and the modes and timing of their administration, were framed by reviews of the recent extensive

consensus process around core outcomes sets for trials, ongoing research and clinical experience within the Thrive Post-ICU Clinic Collaborative.

To converge on recommendations, the group reviewed the history and results of the core outcomes set for clinical research among survivors of acute respiratory failure (16). In that three-round modified Delphi consensus approach, which engaged international experts, patients/families and other stakeholders, the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS) (52) and the Impact of Events Scale-Revised (IES-R) (53) reached an a priori consensus threshold as recommended measures for mental health status. During the PICS prediction and identification conference in Dallas, we additionally reviewed more recent literature that demonstrated that the shorter, six-item Impact of Event Scale-6 (IES-6) was a reliable and valid screening tool for PTSD symptoms in ARDS survivors, when compared to the original, 22-item IES-R and a reference-rater semi-structured diagnostic interview for PTSD (54).

In the work to define a core outcomes set for clinical research (16), the Montreal Cognitive Assessment test (MoCA) (55) and the six-minute walk test received the highest scores as screening measures for cognition and physical function, respectively, but did not achieve the threshold for consensus in the modified Delphi approach. The EQ-5D and SF-36 (56-57), which incorporate physical function measures, reached a priori consensus as measures of quality of life, but not for physical function, per se.

At the meeting in Dallas, review of the core outcomes set for clinical research (16) was followed by a presentation of original research which sought to validate the Healthy Aging Brain Care Monitor Self Report as a PICS screening tool (58), followed

by a presentation related to screening based on the clinical experience of the Thrive Post-ICU Clinic Collaborative (9-10). See also **Appendix D**.

RESULTS

Patient Perspective Conceptual Framework

To improve long-term outcomes after critical illness, survivors encouraged attendees to consider post-ICU assessments for impairments within a broader disabilities framework that accounts for an individual's health status and trajectory pre-hospitalization, social determinants of health, and goals which may evolve. Survivors emphasized that the road to recovery, for some, has no end. For those survivors, learning to live with enduring impairments is an important part of rehabilitation.

As PICS exists on a continuum without a defined endpoint, patient participants proposed a core commitment, one shared by ICU survivors and the clinicians who care for them post-discharge, to be that of longitudinal, iterative assessments. Rather than focus on assessment at a single time point, the serial sustained assessment framework prioritizes the need for repeated and dynamic assessments aligned with important patient-centered events, both anticipated and unanticipated.

Examples of anticipatable events, within a framework of multiple visits at key timepoints, include hospital discharge and the end of paid medical leave for those who were employed. In the serial sustained assessment framework, this would suggest a pre-hospital discharge assessment to determine the need for post-acute care services, and a second visit. A goal of the second visit, scheduled prior to the end of any employment-based medical disability benefits, would be to discern whether a patient

was able to return to work and, if not, direct them to a social worker or another appropriate person who could discuss next steps and resources, such as Social Security Disability Income or employer-sponsored short-term disability. Other potential triggers for assessment include changes (decline and improvement) or plateaus in ability levels, major life or critical illness-related anniversaries, and struggles related to new disabilities.

Serial sustained assessment after critical illness has several potential benefits. First, as return to employment is a challenge after critical illness (59), one associated with long-term psychosocial health (59-60), the longitudinal framework has the potential to more effectively prepare survivors to re-engage in society. Second, a commitment to serial assessments by clinicians and their health systems could prove therapeutic and mitigate the abandonment and social isolation that survivors often experience (61-62). Finally, survivors' needs may be more timely recognized and addressed and complications (e.g., rehospitalizations) averted through a deliberate, coordinated, longitudinal approach to post-discharge care.

Meeting Outcomes & Recommendations

Informed by our literature review, including the new systematic review (17), there was consensus that the existing tools, as well as clinical judgment, are insufficient to reliably predict PICS-related problems. There also was consensus that the heterogeneity across studies, particularly in statistical reporting, outcome definition, and time horizon, complicated comparisons and synthesis of the literature.

While we could not reliably predict PICS-related problems, using 17 pre-existing systematic reviews (**Appendix**), we identified patients at high-risk for long-term

cognitive, mental health, and physical impairments after critical illness in whom screening is recommended (Tables 1-2). By functional domain, risk-stratification variables were categorized as before (e.g., pre-existing impairment), during (e.g., duration of delirium), and after critical illness (e.g., early symptoms of anxiety, depression, or post-traumatic stress disorder).

In **Tables 3-4**, we summarize the recommended screening tools to detect long-term cognition, mental health, and physical function. Specifically, the MoCA (55) and HADS (52) were strongly recommended as screening tools for cognition, anxiety, and depression, respectively. The IES-R (53) and IES-6 (54), 6-minute walk (67-69) and/or EuroQol-5D-5L (56) were recommended, weakly, as screening tools for PTSD and physical function, respectively. We strongly recommended that an assessment of selected patients for PICS problems should occur within two to four weeks after discharge and serial assessments for PICS problems should occur with important health and life changes.

As summarized in **Table 5**, we also reaffirmed the core domains of PICS, including physical, cognitive, and mental health status, along with social health/return to social roles (100% agreement), agreed that prediction of post-ICU problems and anticipatory guidance is a task ICU clinicians should try to take on (92% agreement), yet agreed that there is no generally accepted method to predict who will develop new post-ICU problems (80% agreement).

Discussion

While new knowledge of the sequelae of critical illness and critical care is growing, pragmatic recommendations to clinicians caring for adult survivors of critical illness remain scarce. In convening this international, multidisciplinary consensus conference of patients, clinicians, and researchers, SCCM sought to synthesize the state-of-the-art of prediction and identification of long-term impairments in cognition, mental health, and physical health after critical illness.

Key Outcomes

In summary, there was agreement that prediction of post-ICU problems and providing anticipatory guidance to survivors of critical illness are tasks ICU researchers and clinicians should take on. There was agreement that the broad framework of PICS remains useful for organizing an approach to caring for these patients, albeit with an increasing emphasis on the social aspects of their recovery.

There is no one best tool that can be systematically applied to identify patients with, or at risk for, PICS. Individualized clinical judgment in the context of team-based care remains the foundation here, as with other aspects of clinical care. There remains an urgent need to refine and test the comparative effectiveness of varying strategies to meet the care of diverse survivors of critical illness.

While awaiting the results of such research and practice innovation to improve outcomes of survivors of critical illness, we recommend that assessment for PICS should occur early (e.g., within two to four weeks of hospital discharge), continue along the path of recovery (i.e., serial, sustained assessments), be prioritized amongst the high-risk patients identified, and use the identified screening tools (**Tables 1-4**). Herein,

the serial, sustained assessments would guide and inform the patient's care plan, in concert with rehabilitation specialists, to address the identified problems.

Functional Assessments Across the Care Continuum

We focused our recommendations on fundamental questions related to post-hospital discharge assessments. Combined with recommendations from the second stakeholder conference to improve long-term outcomes (6), clinicians now have an approach to assess survivors of critical illness across the continuum of care.

In the ICU, consistent with the recommendation that "prediction of post-ICU problems and anticipatory guidance is a task ICU clinicians should try to take on," providers should obtain an assessment of a patient's pre-ICU functional abilities as part of their admission history and physical examination (e.g., independent, needs assistance, dependent) (6). This pre-ICU functional assessment should be documented in the history and physical, to serve as a reference for post-ICU clinicians, and communicated during handoff as the patient transitions out of the ICU (**Figure**).

As hospital discharge approaches, clinicians should use brief, standardized assessments and compare these results to patient's pre-ICU functional abilities. This concept, described as "functional reconciliation" to mirror the established practice of "medication reconciliation," was previously recommended as a care coordination strategy to more effectively identify and manage impairments across the continuum (6). Practically, this approach is intended to inform the discharge decision for whether to refer the patient for post-acute care, such as a long-term acute care facility, skilled nursing facility, inpatient rehabilitation, home health, or outpatient rehabilitation.

At-risk patients should be assessed for PICS-related problems within two to four weeks after discharge, with serial assessments occurring with important health and life changes (**Tables 3-4**). Prior systematic reviews identified pre-existing problems in cognition, mental health and/or physical function as risk factors for functional decline after critical illness, highlighting the need to incorporate “functional reconciliation” into practice. As detailed in **Table 1,** we also identified risk factors *during* critical illness, such as incidence and duration of delirium, sepsis, ARDS, and memories of frightening experiences in the ICU, and *after* critical illness (e.g., early symptoms of anxiety, depression, or post-traumatic stress disorder), that can be ascertained through review of a well done discharge summary and direct questioning to identify patients at risk for PICS.

In high-risk patients, defined as survivors with one or more of the risk factors included in **Table 1**, screening should be conducted using the recommended tools (**Tables 3-4**), with positive findings prompting referrals for services and/or more detailed assessments, as indicated. With the exception of the 6-minute walk, given the pandemic, it is notable that each screening tool can be administered via telemedicine to facilitate timely referral.

While the core domains of PICS have remained consistent, the recommended approach is consistent with the emerging understanding that PICS is not a static set of problems, but rather a chronic illness that starts in, or even before, the ICU and changes through the ICU stay and after discharge. Thus, serial assessments and flexible interventions are likely required to meet the needs of patients recovering from critical illness.

Strengths and Limitations

We engaged an international, multidisciplinary panel of clinical and research experts. Our deliberations were informed by patient perspectives, practical experience from leaders of the Thrive Post-ICU Clinic and Peer Support Collaboratives, the expertise of leading researchers, a systematic review of prior research, and a novel systematic review. Nevertheless, we acknowledge as a limitation that these recommendations are based on expert opinion, a modest literature base, and did not utilize formal GRADE methodology. Although we included PICS experts providing care to survivors as part of the Thrive Collaboratives, we did not include the perspectives of out-patient providers not involved in the Collaboratives. Because most survivors receive care outside of the growing Thrive network, ongoing partnership with organizations representing these important stakeholders is needed.

Our focus on pragmatic, clinically relevant recommendations to improve long-term outcomes built upon the foundation of the first two SCCM stakeholder meetings. While the findings of this report can be used to inform a future research agenda, that was not the primary objective of this meeting. However, we acknowledge the importance of addressing the research gaps in terms of PICS prediction and identification, and have provided recommendations to advance the science in the field herein and in the appendices and accompanying manuscripts. Although we did not address it at this time, implementation of the recommendations may benefit from the design and dissemination of standardized educational tools and related resources (i.e. documentation and communication tools). As one resource, we recommend the survey instrument database created as part of the core outcomes set (16, 63). The database

provides information for each of the recommended screening tools, including a description of the instrument, administration and scoring information, and details regarding requirements and fees, if applicable (63). Studies designed to examine implementation of these recommendations, including feasibility, acceptability, sustainability, and fidelity, will be needed, in addition to studies designed to examine whether these recommendations result in improvement in long-term outcomes for survivors. Last, while research data suggests clinicians should anticipate improvement over time among survivors after discharge (61-62, 64), consistent with the patient perspective provided in Dallas, each survivor's journey will be unique.

Conclusion

Combined with recommendations from the second SCCM stakeholder conference to improve long-term outcomes, clinicians now have an approach to assess survivors of critical illness across the continuum of care. Post-discharge, we recommend that serial assessments for PICS-related problems begin early (i.e., within 2-4 weeks of hospital discharge), be prioritized amongst high-risk patients, using the identified screening tools.

References

1. Pandharipande PP, Girard TD, Jackson JC, et al. Long-term cognitive impairment after critical illness. N Engl J Med 2013; 369:1306-1316.
2. Jackson JC, Pandharipande PP, Girard TD, et al. Depression, post-traumatic stress disorder, and functional disability in the BRAIN-ICU study: a longitudinal cohort study. Lancet Respir Med 2014; 5:369-379.
3. Maley JH, Brewster I, Mayoral I, et al. Resilience in survivors of critical illness in the context of the survivors' experience and self-reported neuropsychological and physical function. Ann Am Thorac Soc 2016;13(8): 1351-1360.
4. Marra A, Pandharipande PP, Girard TD, et al. Co-occurrence of post-intensive care syndrome problems among 406 survivors of critical illness. Crit Care Med 2018; 46(9):1393-1401.
5. Needham DM, Davidson J, Cohen H, et al. Improving long-term outcomes after discharge from intensive care unit: report from a stakeholders' conference. Crit Care Med 2012; 40(2):502-509.
6. Elliott D, Davidson JE, Harvey MA, et al. Exploring the scope of post-intensive care syndrome therapy and care: engagement of non-critical care providers and survivors in a second stakeholders meeting. Crit Care Med 2014;42:2518-2526.
7. Mikkelsen ME, Jackson C, Hopkins RO, et al. Peer support as a novel strategy to mitigate post intensive care syndrome. AACN Advanced Critical Care 2016; 27(2):221-29.
8. McPeake J, Hirshberg E, Christie L, et al. Models of peer support to remediate post-intensive care syndrome: a report developed by the SCCM international peer support collaborative (THRIVE). Crit Care Med 2019;47(1):e21-e27.
9. Haines KJ, McPeake J, Hibbert E, et al. Enablers and barriers to implementing ICU follow-up clinics and peer support groups following critical illness: The Thrive Collaboratives. Crit Care Med 2019;47(9):1194-1200.
10. Haines KJ, Sevin CM, Hibbert E, et al. Key mechanisms by which post-icu activities can improve in-icu care: results of the international Thrive collaboratives. Intensive Care Med 2019;45(7):939-947.
11. Govindan S, Iwashyna TJ, Watson SR, et al. Issues of survivorship are rarely addresed during intensive care unit stays. Baseline results from a statewide quality improvement collaborative. Ann Am Thorac Soc 2014;11(4):587-591.
12. National Institutes of Health. Guidelines for the planning and management of NIH development consensus conference. NIH office of medical applications, Bethesda, Maryland 1995.
13. Carlet J, Artigas A, Bihari D, et al. The first European consensus conference in intensive care medicine: introductory remarks. Intensive Care Med 1992;18:180–181.

14. Evans TW. International consensus conferences in intensive care medicine: noninvasive positive pressure ventilation in acute respiratory failure. Intensive Care Med 2001;27:166-178.
15. Brochard L, Abroug F, Brenner M, et al. An official ATS/ERS/ESICM/SCCM/SRLF statement: prevention and management of acute renal failure in the ICU patient. An international consensus conference in intensive care medicine. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2010;181:1128-1155.
16. 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(9):1122-1130.
17. Haines KJ, McPeake J, Hibbert E, et al. Prediction models for physical, cognitive, and mental health impairments after critical illness: a systematic review and PROBAST assessment. Crit Care Med; under review
18. Wolff RF, Moons KGM, Riley RD, et al. PROBAST: a tool to assess the risk of bias and applicability of prediction model studies. Ann Intern Med 2019;170(1):51-58.
19. Ferrante LE, Murphy TE, Vander Wyk BC, et al. Predictors of functional decline among older intensive care unit (ICU) survivors. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2019;199:A5674.
20. McGowan J, Sampson M, Salzwedel DM, Cogo E, Foerster V, Lefebvre C. PRESS Peer Review of Electronic Search Strategies: 2015 Guideline Statement. J Clin Epidemiol 2016;75:40-6.
21. Salluh JI, Wang H, Schneider EB, et al. Outcome of delirium in critically ill patients: systematic review and meta-analysis. BMJ 2015;350:h2538.
22. Calsavara AJC, Nobre V, Barichello T, Teixeira AL. Post-sepsis cognitive impairment and associated risk factors: A systematic review. Australian critical care : official journal of the Confederation of Australian Critical Care Nurses 2018;31:242-53.
23. Kok L, Slooter AJ, Hillegers MH, van Dijk D, Veldhuijzen DS. Benzodiazepine use and neuropsychiatric outcomes in the ICU: a systematic review. Crit Care Med 2018;46:1673-80.
24. Sakusic A, O'Horo JC, Dziadzko M, et al. Potentially modifiable risk factors for long-term cognitive impairment after critical illness: a systematic review. Mayo Clin Proc 2018;93:68-82.
25. Davydow DS, Desai SV, Needham DM, Bienvenu OJ. Psychiatric morbidity in survivors of the acute respiratory distress syndrome: a systematic review. Psychosom Med 2008;70:512-9.
26. Davydow DS, Gifford JM, Desai SV, Needham DM, Bienvenu OJ. Posttraumatic stress disorder in general intensive care unit survivors: a systematic review. Gen Hosp Psychiatry 2008;30:421-34.

27. Davydow DS, Gifford JM, Desai SV, Bienvenu OJ, Needham DM. Depression in general intensive care unit survivors: a systematic review. Intensive Care Med 2009;35:796-809.
28. Wade D, Hardy R, Howell D, Mythen M. Identifying clinical and acute psychological risk factors for PTSD after critical care: a systematic review. Minerva Anestesiol 2013;79:944-63.
29. Parker AM, Sricharoenchai T, Raparla S, W. SK, Bienvenu OJ, Needham DM. Posttraumatic stress disorder in critical illness survivors: a metaanalysis. Crit Care Med 2015;43:1121-9.
30. Nassar AP, Jr, Zampieri FG, Ranzani OT, Park M. Protocolized sedation effect on post-ICU posttraumatic stress disorder prevalence: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. J Crit Care 2015;30:1278-82.
31. Rabiee A, Nikayin S, Hashem MD, et al. Depressive symptoms after critical illness: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Crit Care Med 2016;44:1744-53.
32. Nikayin S, Rabiee A, Hashem MD, et al. Anxiety symptoms in survivors of critical illness: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Gen Hosp Psychiatry 2016;43:23-9.
33. Kok L, Slooter AJ, Hillegers MH, van Dijk D, Veldhuijzen DS. Benzodiazepine use and neuropsychiatric outcomes in the ICU: a systematic review. Crit Care Med 2018;46:1673-80.
34. Porhomayon J, Joude P, Adlparvar G, El-Solh AA, Nader ND. The impact of high versus low sedation dosing strategy on cognitive dysfunction in survivors of intensive care units: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Cardiovasc Thorac Res 2015;7:43-8.
35. Hopkins RO, Suchyta MR, Kamdar BB, Darowski E, Jackson JC, Needham DM. Instrumental activities of daily living after critical illness: a systematic review. Ann Amer Thor Soc 2017;14:1332-43.
36. Muscedere J, Waters B, Varambally A, et al. The impact of frailty on intensive care unit outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Intensive Care Med 2017;43:1105-22.
37. Fried LP, Tangen CM, Walston J, et al. Frailty in older adults: Evidence for a phenotype. J Gerontol Ser A-Biol Sci Med Sci 2001;56:M146-M56.
38. Rockwood K, Mitnitski A. Frailty in relation to the accumulation of deficits. J Gerontol Ser A-Biol Sci Med Sci 2007;62:722-7.
39. Rockwood K, Song XW, MacKnight C, et al. A global clinical measure of fitness and frailty in elderly people. Can Med Assoc J 2005;173.
40. Katz S, Ford AB, Moskowitz RW, Jackson BA, Jaffe MW. Studies of illness in the aged. The index of ADL – a standardized measure of biological and psychosocial function. JAMA 1963;185:914-9.

41. Ohtake PJ, Lee AC, Scott JC, et al. Physical impairments associated with post-intensive care syndrome: systematic review based on the world health organization's international classification of functioning, disability and health framework. Phys Ther 2018;98:631-45.
42. Iwashyna TJ, Ely EW, Smith DM, Langa KM. Long-term cognitive impairment and functional disability among survivors of severe sepsis. JAMA 2010;304:1787-94.
43. Barnato AE, Albert SM, Angus DC, Lave JR, Degenholtz HB. Disability among elderly survivors of mechanical ventilation. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2011;183:1037-42.
44. Ferrante LE, Pisani MA, Murphy TE, Gahbauer EA, Leo-Summers LS, Gill TM. Factors associated with functional recovery among older intensive care unit survivors. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2016;194:299-307.
45. Ferrante LE, Pisani MA, Murphy TE, Gahbauer EA, Leo-Summers LS, Gill TM. Functional trajectories among older persons before and after critical illness. JAMA Intern Med 2015;175:523-9.
46. Herridge MS, Chu LM, Matte A, et al. The RECOVER Program: disability sisk groups and 1-year outcome after 7 or more days of mechanical ventilation. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2016;194:831-44.
47. Altman MT, Knauert MP, Murphy TE, Ahasic AM, Chauhan Z, Pisani MA. Association of intensive care unit delirium with sleep disturbance and functional disability after critical illness: an observational cohort study. Ann Intensive Care 2018;8:63.
48. Fan E, Dowdy DW, Colantuoni E, et al. Physical complications in acute lung injury survivors: a two-year longitudinal prospective study. Crit Care Med 2014;42:849-59.
49. Gandotra S, Lovato J, Case D, et al. Physical function trajectories in survivors of acute respiratory failure. Ann Am Thorac Soc 2019;16:471-7.
50. Needham DM, Wozniak AW, Hough CL, et al. Risk factors for physical impairment after acute lung injury in a national, multicenter study. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2014;189:1214-24.
51. Pfoh ER, Wozniak AW, Colantuoni E, et al. Physical declines occurring after hospital discharge in ARDS survivors: a 5-year longitudinal study. Intensive Care Med 2016;42:1557-66.
52. Zigmond AS, Snaith RP. The Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale. Acta Psychiatr Scan 1983;67:361-370.
53. Weiss, D.S., & Marmar, C.R. (1997). The Impact of Event Scale-Revised. In J.P. Wilson & T.M. Keane (Eds.), Assessing Psychological Trauma and PTSD (pp.399-411). New York: Guilford.

54. Hosey MM, Leoutsakos JMS, Li X, et al. Screening for posttraumatic stress disorder in ARDS survivors: validation of the Impact of Event Scale-6 (IES-6). Critical Care 2019;23:276.
55. Nasreddine ZS, Phillips NA, Bedirian V, et al. The Montreal Cognitive Assessment, MoCA: a brief screening tool for mild cognitive impairment. J Am Geriatr Soc 2005; 53:695-699
56. EuroQol--a new facility for the measurement of health-related quality of life. The EuroQol Group. Health Policy 1990;16(3):199–208
57. McHorney CA, Ware JE, Raczek AE. The MOS 36-item short form health survey (SF-36). II. Psychometric and clinical tests of validity in measuring physical and mental health constructs. Medical Care 1993;31:247-263.
58. Wang S, Allen D, Perkins A, et al. Validation of a new clinical tool for post-intensive care syndrome. Am J Crit Care 2019;28(1):10-18.
59. McPeake J, Mikkelsen ME, Quasim T, et al. Return to employment after critical illness and its association with psychosocial outcomes. A systematic review and meta-analysis. Ann Am Thorac Soc 2019; in press; published early online Oct 1, 2019
60. McPeake J, Shaw M, Iwashyna TJ, et al. Intensive care syndrome: promoting independence and return to employment (InS:PIRE). Early evaluation of a complex intervention. PloS One 2017;12(11): e0188028
61. Lee CM, Herridge MS, Matte A, Cameron JI. Education and support needs during recovery in acute respiratory distress syndrome survivors. Crit Care 2009;13(5):R153.
62. Field K, Prinjha S, Rowan K. 'One patient amongst many': a qualitative analysis of intensive care unit patients' experiences of transferring to the general ward. Crit Care 2008;12(1):R21.
63. Improving long-term outcomes research for acute respiratory failure. Instruments. Accessed 2020 Jan 15. Available from: https://www.improvelto.com/instruments
64. Mehrholz J, Muckel S, Oehmichen F, Pohl M. First results about recovery of walking function in patients with intensive care unit-acquired muscle weakness from the General Weakness Syndrome Therapy (GymNAST) cohort study. BMJ Open 2015;5(12):e008828
65. Stienen MN, Geisseler O, Velz J, et al. Influence of the intensive care unit environment on the reliability of the montreal cognitive assessment. Front Neurol 2019;10:734.
66. Bienvenu OJ, Williams JB, Yang A, et al. Posttraumatic stress disorder in survivors of acute lung injury. Chest 2013;144(1):24-31.
67. ATS Statement. Guidelines for the six-minute walk test. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2002;166:111-117.
68. Chan KS, Pfoh ER, Denehy L, et al. Construct validity and minimal important difference of 6-minute walk distance in survivors of acute respiratory failure. Chest 2015;147(5):1316-1326.

69. Enright PL, Sherrill DL. Reference equations for the six-minute walk in healthy adults. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 1998;158(5):1384-1387.

Figure. Recommended approach to functional assessments across the continuum of critical illness and recovery. ICU=intensive care unit.