

Association between sex and race and ethnicity and intravenous sedation use in patients receiving invasive ventilation

Sarah L. Walker,
Federico Angriman,
Lisa Burry,
Leo Anthony Celi,
Kirsten M. Fiest,
Judy Gichoya,
Alistair Johnson,
Kuan Liu,
Sangeeta Mehta,
Georgiana Roman-Sarita,
Laleh Seyyed-Kalantari,
Thanh-Giang T. Vu,
Elizabeth L. Whitlock,
George Tomlinson,
Christopher J. Yarnell

2024-04-04

Abstract: 309 words

Manuscript: 3308 words

Tables: 2

Figures: 3

Author Details

Corresponding Author

Christopher Yarnell

Department of Critical Care Medicine, Scarborough Health Network, 3030 Lawrence Ave E,
M1P2V5, Toronto, ON, Canada

cyarnell@shn.ca

Affiliations

Institute of Health Policy, Management, and Evaluation, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada
(CJY, FA, KL, GT)

University Health Network, Toronto, Canada (GT)

Sinai Health, Toronto, Canada (LB, SM)

Scarborough Health Network, Department of Critical Care Medicine, Toronto, Canada (CJY)

Scarborough Health Network Research Institute, Toronto, Canada (CJY)

Interdepartmental Division of Critical Care Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada
(LB, SM, CJY)

Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada (LB)

Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Lassonde School of Engineering,
York University, Vector Institute for Artificial Intelligence (LSK)

Emory University, Department of Radiology and Biomedical Informatics, Atlanta, GA, USA
(JG)

Division of Pulmonary, Critical Care and Sleep Medicine, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical
Center, Boston, MA, USA (LC)

Department of Biostatistics, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA, USA
(LC)

Department of Anesthesia & Perioperative Care, University of California, San Francisco, San
Francisco, CA, USA (ELW)

Department of Anesthesiology & Pain Medicine, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA
(TV)

Department of Critical Care Medicine, University of Calgary, Calgary, AB, Canada (KMF)

Declaration of conflicts of interest

No conflicts to declare.

Funding

Sarah Walker was funded by the Temerty Centre for AI Research and Education in Medicine Summer Research Studentship. Dr Yarnell was funded by the Canadian Institutes for Health Research Vanier Scholar program, the Eliot Phillipson Clinician Scientist Training Program, and the Clinician Investigator Program of the University of Toronto. Funders had no role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; nor in the decision to submit the manuscript for publication. The opinions, results and conclusions reported in this paper are those of the authors and are independent from the funding sources. No endorsement by any of the funding agencies is intended or should be inferred.

Acknowledgements

1 Abstract

2 *Rationale:* Intravenous sedation is an important tool for managing invasively ventilated patients, yet
3 excess sedation is harmful, and dosing could be influenced by implicit bias.

4
5 *Objective:* To measure the association between sex, race and ethnicity, and sedation practices.

6
7 *Methods:* We performed a retrospective cohort study of adults receiving invasive ventilation for 24
8 hours or more using the MIMIC-IV (2008-2019) database from Boston, USA. We used a repeated-
9 measures design (4-hour time intervals) to study the association between patient sex (female, male) or
10 race and ethnicity (Asian, Black, Hispanic, White) and sedation outcomes. Sedation outcomes included
11 sedative use (propofol, benzodiazepine, dexmedetomidine) and minimum sedation score. We divided
12 sedative use into five categories: no sedative given, then lowest, second, third, and highest quartiles of
13 sedative dose. We used multilevel Bayesian proportional odds modeling to adjust for baseline and time-
14 varying covariates and reported posterior odds ratios with 95% credible intervals [CrI].

15
16 *Results:* We studied 6,764 patients: 43% female; 3.5% Asian, 12% Black, 4.5% Hispanic and 80%
17 white. We analyzed 116,519 4-hour intervals. Benzodiazepines were administered to 2,334 (36%)
18 patients. Black patients received benzodiazepines less often and at lower doses than White patients (OR
19 0.66, CrI 0.49 to 0.92). Propofol was administered to 3,865 (57%) patients. Female patients received
20 propofol less often and at lower doses than male patients (OR 0.72, CrI 0.61 to 0.86). Dexmedetomidine
21 was administered to 1,439 (21%) patients, and use was largely similar across sex or race and ethnicity.
22 As expressed by sedation scores, male patients were more sedated than female patients (OR 1.41, CrI
23 1.23 to 1.62), and White patients were less sedated than Black patients (OR 0.78, CrI 0.65 to 0.95).

24
25 *Conclusion:* Among patients invasively ventilated for at least 24 hours, intravenous sedation and
26 attained sedation levels varied by sex and race and ethnicity. Adherence to sedation guidelines may
27 improve equity in sedation management for critically ill patients.

28 Introduction

29 Intravenous sedation can facilitate invasive ventilation in critically ill patients. However, deep
30 sedation and use of benzodiazepines instead of propofol or dexmedetomidine are associated with
31 longer duration of ventilation and delirium.(1–3) Deep sedation is associated with delayed
32 extubation and increased mortality.(4,5) Guidelines recommend a protocolized approach where
33 sedation dose is titrated to light sedation using a standardized scale.(6) Implementation of this
34 approach is not universal, and patients are often too deeply sedated.(7–10)

35 One potential explanation for over-sedation could be that practice varies according to patient sex
36 or race and ethnicity due to implicit bias.(11,12) Hispanic compared to non-Hispanic clinical
37 trial participants with moderate-to-severe acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) were more
38 likely to be deeply sedated (odds ratio 4.98).(13) Hispanic patients with COVID-19 receiving
39 invasive ventilation were also more likely to receive benzodiazepines than non-Hispanic White
40 or non-Hispanic Black patients.(14) In a cohort of patients receiving invasive ventilation, Black
41 compared to White patients had an increased risk of deep sedation in the first 48 hours.(15)

42 Fewer studies have assessed differences in sedation practices between male and female patients.

43 To further investigate the association between sex, race and ethnicity, and intravenous sedation
44 practices, we performed a retrospective cohort study of patients who received at least 24 hours of
45 invasive ventilation. We hypothesized that sedation practices would differ by sex and by race
46 and ethnicity, such that marginalized groups receive higher doses of sedation.

47 Methods

48 Study Setting and Patients

49 We used deidentified patient data from the Medical Information Mart for Intensive Care version
50 IV (MIMIC-IV) database.(16,17) It contains 73,181 intensive care unit (ICU) admissions from
51 an academic quaternary centre in Boston, USA, between 2008 and 2019. It is approved for
52 database research by the Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center (2001-P-001699/14) and the
53 Massachusetts Institute of Technology (0403000206).(18)

54 We included patients who received 24 or more hours of invasive ventilation, to focus on patients
55 more likely to have intravenous sedation exposure, and to exclude patients admitted to the ICU
56 post-operatively who were promptly extubated. We excluded patients with a tracheostomy noted
57 in the first 7 days of ICU admission, which could affect the use of intravenous sedation. Patients
58 also were excluded if they did not have a documented sex, or if their race or ethnicity was
59 documented as “Other”, “Unknown”, or “Mixed.” We made these exclusions because the
60 composition of these excluded groups was unknown, making the external validity of results from
61 those groups difficult to interpret. We excluded patients categorized as “Native American /
62 Pacific Islander” because their numbers were too few. For patients with multiple eligible ICU
63 admissions, we included only the first.

64 Design

65 We performed a longitudinal repeated-measures study using sedation dose per kilogram received
66 within each time interval as the primary outcome.(19) We divided time into 4-hour intervals and
67 followed patients from 24 hours after the onset of invasive ventilation until the earliest of 8 days
68 from the onset of invasive ventilation, death, ICU discharge, or discontinuation of invasive
69 ventilation.

70 Variables

71 The primary exposures were (1) sex and (2) race and ethnicity (grouped as Asian, Black,
72 Hispanic, and White). We considered interactions between exposures in a secondary model.

73 We used clinical expertise and prior research to select relevant potentially confounding variables
74 for inclusion in the model (Figure S1). Baseline covariates included patient age, English
75 proficiency, insurance type (Medicaid, Medicare, other); comorbidities ascertained from
76 discharge diagnoses (see Supplement) including dementia, substance use disorder (including
77 alcohol), and traumatic brain injury; type of ICU, year of admission; and amount of propofol and
78 intravenous benzodiazepine administered in the first 24h of ventilation.(4)

79 We included time-varying covariates relevant to future sedation administration to account for
80 time-varying severity: respiratory rate, inspired oxygen fraction, peripheral oxygen saturation,
81 and sedation level as quantified by the Riker Sedation Agitation Scale (SAS).(20) We also
82 included the time since ventilation initiation, and the dose of the following medications given

83 within each time interval: vasopressors, intravenous opioids, and neuromuscular blockers
84 (yes/no). We converted vasopressors to norepinephrine equivalents and opioids to morphine
85 equivalents.(21,22) We built separate models for propofol, benzodiazepines, and
86 dexmedetomidine. Each model was adjusted for time-varying use of the other two sedating
87 agents.

88 The time-varying covariate values used to predict the outcome in a given interval were drawn
89 from the previous interval, in order to ensure that covariates always preceded outcomes. For each
90 time-varying covariate, we aggregated values measured within the same time interval using the
91 maximum or minimum value, chosen by variable to reflect the highest severity.

92 Outcomes

93 Our co-primary outcomes were the receipt and weight-based dose of (1) intravenous
94 benzodiazepine and (2) propofol in each time interval. We converted benzodiazepines to
95 lorazepam equivalents.(23) Each sedative dose was classified into one of five ordinal categories:
96 none, or one of four quartiles of dose in cases where the dose was non-zero (Tables 2a and 2b).
97 Secondary outcomes were dexmedetomidine receipt (yes/no) and the minimum SAS (categorized
98 as 1, 2, 3, or ≥ 4) in each time interval.

99 Analysis

100 To analyze the dose category of benzodiazepine and propofol, we used a multilevel proportional
101 odds model, clustering by patient stay.(24) This allowed the analysis to incorporate both the

102 probability of receiving a sedative, and the amount of sedative given, conditional on receipt. This
103 approach used more information than a binary analysis of receipt of sedative, and had less
104 selection bias than an analysis restricted to those who received a sedative.

105 For all models, we used skeptical prior distributions (normal with mean 0 and standard deviation
106 0.3) for fixed effects. These priors reflected our belief that large associations between a single
107 coefficient and the outcome were unlikely.

108 We performed multilevel logistic regression for the dexmedetomidine outcome, clustering by
109 patient stay. For the minimum SAS model, we only analyzed time periods where the patient was
110 not receiving a neuromuscular blocker and had a recorded SAS value. We used a multilevel
111 proportional odds model clustering by patient. We did not incorporate time-varying medications
112 other than vasopressors, because we deemed those variables to be on the causal path between
113 exposure and outcome.

114 The model was implemented in R 4.2.1 and parallelized on the Niagara computing cluster.(25)
115 We summarized the posterior odds ratios (OR) using the mean and 95% credible intervals (CrI).

116 Missing data

117 We used multiple imputation to address baseline and time-varying predictors missing in the first
118 time interval for each patient.(26) We then used forward-fill imputation for missing time-varying
119 covariates, similar to past analyses using this dataset.(21,27) We performed the Bayesian

120 analysis on each dataset and then pooled the posterior distributions to capture uncertainty
121 introduced by missing data in the final model outputs.(28)

122 Sensitivity Analyses

123 We repeated the two primary analyses, adding interaction effects between sex and race and
124 ethnicity. We also repeated the two primary analyses on an expanded cohort that included all
125 patients previously excluded for having a race and ethnicity that was not Asian, Black, Hispanic,
126 or White. This was to investigate if differences in sex persisted when including patients of
127 unknown, other, or multiple races or ethnicities.

128 Results

129 We studied 6,764 individuals who met the eligibility requirements (Figures S2), of whom 43%
130 (2,924) were female; 3.5% (236) were Asian, 12% (806) were Black, 4.5% (300) were Hispanic,
131 and 80% (5,422) were White (Tables 1a, 1b). We excluded 2,169 patients with “Other” race and
132 ethnicity (Figure S3). Median age was 65 years (interquartile range [IQR], 53 to 76). Dementia
133 (25%) and substance use (26%) were common.

134 There were 116,519 intervals amounting to 466,076 hours of patient observation. Median
135 minimum SAS was 3 (IQR 3 to 4), median respiratory rate was 22 (IQR 18 to 26), median
136 inspired oxygen fraction was 0.4 (IQR 0.4 to 0.5), and median oxygen saturation was 97% (IQR
137 95% to 99%). Median duration of invasive ventilation was 3 days (IQR 2 to 6), median ICU

138 length-of-stay was 6 days (IQR 4 to 11), and median hospital length-of-stay was 13 days (IQR 8
139 to 21). One-year mortality was 47%.

140 The variables with missing baseline data were weight (278, 4%), respiratory rate (329, 5%),
141 inspired oxygen fraction (117, 2%), oxygen saturation (335, 5%), and minimum SAS (1,407,
142 21%) (Supplemental Table S3). We used 5 datasets for multiple imputation.(26,29)

143 Benzodiazepines

144 Benzodiazepines were administered in 23% of time intervals to 2,334 (36%) patients (Table 2a)
145 37% of female patients and 36% of male patients received benzodiazepines. Across race and
146 ethnicity, benzodiazepine use varied from 28% in Asian patients to 37% in White patients. In
147 intervals where benzodiazepines were administered, median dose in lorazepam equivalents was
148 0.13mg/kg/hr (IQR 0.05 to 0.29).

149 Female and male patients received similar doses of benzodiazepine (OR 1.09, CrI 0.89 to 1.33).
150 Black patients received less benzodiazepine than White patients (OR 0.66, CrI 0.49 to 0.92).
151 Using the observed 37% probability of receiving benzodiazepine for an average White patient,
152 this translated to a 9.1% absolute reduction (CrI 1.9 to 14.6) in the probability of receiving
153 benzodiazepine for a Black patient. Using the observed 9.3% probability of receiving more than
154 0.29mg/kg/hr of benzodiazepine for an average White patient, this also translated to a 2.9%
155 absolute reduction (CrI 0.7 to 4.5) in the probability of a Black patient receiving a similar dose.
156 The probability of receiving benzodiazepines less often and in lower doses than White patients

157 was 96% for Asian patients and 95% for Hispanic patients (Figure 1 & S4), however, the
158 credible interval for both odds ratios included equivalence.

159 The sensitivity analysis including interactions showed a greater than 90% probability that male
160 White and female White patients received more benzodiazepines than male Asian, male Black,
161 male Hispanic, female Black, and female Hispanic patients (Figure 2 & S5). The sensitivity
162 analysis including patients with “Other” race and ethnicity was consistent with the primary
163 analysis (Figure S6).

164 Propofol

165 Propofol was administered in 39% of time intervals to 3,865 (57%) patients. 54% of female
166 patients and 60% of male patients received propofol. Across race and ethnicity, propofol use
167 varied from 51% in Asian patients to 62% in Hispanic patients. In time intervals where propofol
168 was administered, median dose was 35mcg/kg/min (IQR 20 to 60) (Table 2a).

169 Female patients received less propofol than male patients (OR 0.72, CrI 0.61 to 0.86). Using the
170 observed 60% probability of receiving propofol for the average male or White patient, this
171 equated to an absolute reduction in the probability of receiving propofol of 8.1% (CrI 3.7 to
172 12.2) for a female patient. Similarly, the probability of receiving propofol at more than
173 60mcg/kg/min, which was 10% in the average White or male patient, was reduced by 2.6% (CrI
174 1.3 to 3.7) for a female patient. The probability of receiving propofol less often and in lower
175 doses than White patients was 93% for Asian patients and 94% for Black patients, but the

176 credible interval of the odds ratio included equivalence. Propofol administration was similar
177 between Hispanic and White patients (Figure 1 & S7).

178 The sensitivity analysis including interactions showed a greater than 90% probability that male
179 White and male Hispanic patients received more propofol than male Asian, male Black, female
180 White, female Asian, and female Black patients (Figure 2 & S5). The sensitivity analysis
181 including patients with “Other” race and ethnicity was consistent with the primary analysis
182 (Figure S6).

183 [Dexmedetomidine](#)

184 Dexmedetomidine was administered in 10% of time intervals to 1,439 (21%) patients. 20% of
185 female patients and 23% of male patients received dexmedetomidine. Across race and ethnicity,
186 dexmedetomidine use varied from 13% in Asian patients to 23% in Hispanic patients. (Table 2a)

187 All odds ratios in the analysis without interactions had credible intervals overlapping 1.
188 However, male patients probably received more dexmedetomidine than female patients
189 (probability 93%), and White patients probably received more than Asian patients (probability
190 93%) (Figure 1). The sensitivity analysis with interactions showed a greater than 90% probability
191 that female Asian patients received less dexmedetomidine than White and Black patients of both
192 sexes and male Hispanic patients; for the remaining two combinations of sex and race and
193 ethnicity (female Hispanic, male Asian) there was an 80-90% probability that female Asian
194 patients received less dexmedetomidine (Figure 2 & S8). In the sensitivity analysis including

195 patients with race and ethnicity classified as “Other”, it was more certain that female patients
196 received lower doses compared to men (probability > 99%) (Figure S6).

197 [Attained sedation level](#)

198 SAS was recorded in 102,964 (88%) intervals across 6,311 (93%) patients. Across all intervals,
199 the minimum SAS was 1 for 9,361 (9%), 2 for 12,764 (12%), 3 for 36,506 (36%), and 4 or more
200 for 44,333 (43%). Of the intervals with minimum SAS of 4 or greater, the minimum SAS was 5
201 for 2,644 (3%), 6 for 445 (0.4%), and 7 for 42 (< 0.1%). For exposure groups studied, the
202 median minimum SAS in each time interval was 3.

203 Female patients had higher minimum SAS than male patients (OR 1.41, CrI 1.23 to 1.62, Figure
204 3 & S9). Using the observed 19% probability of deep sedation (minimum SAS 2 or lower) in the
205 average male patient, this amounted to an 4.5% decrease (CrI 3.0 to 6.4) in the probability of
206 deep sedation for a female patient. Minimum SAS was lower in Black compared to White
207 patients (OR 0.78, CrI 0.65 to 0.95). Using the observed 19% probability of deep sedation for an
208 average White patient, this translated to a 4.1% absolute increase (CrI 0.8 to 7.5) in the
209 probability of deep sedation for a Black patient. Asian and Hispanic patients had similar
210 minimum SAS to White patients.

211 Discussion

212 Main findings

213 In this retrospective single-center cohort study of 6,764 adults invasively ventilated for at least
214 24 hours, we used multilevel Bayesian proportional odds modeling to show that the use of
215 weight-based propofol, benzodiazepines, and dexmedetomidine, and the levels of sedation
216 attained using these sedatives, varied by sex and race and ethnicity. Female patients compared to
217 male patients received less propofol and were less sedated. Results for Asian patients were more
218 uncertain, but Asian patients compared to White patients probably received less
219 benzodiazepines, propofol, and dexmedetomidine, with similar attained sedation levels. Black
220 patients compared to White patients received less benzodiazepines and propofol, yet were more
221 sedated. Hispanic patients compared to White patients probably received less benzodiazepines,
222 but were similar with respect to propofol, dexmedetomidine, and sedation level.

223 Findings in context of prior research

224 In many prior studies of sedation use, no differences in sedation management by sex were
225 investigated or reported.(4,5,30–32) A recent secondary analysis of control group patients from a
226 multi-centre randomized trial focused on ARDS was designed to investigate differences in
227 sedation levels according to ethnicity, but it also showed that the odds of a male compared to
228 female patient being deeply sedated was 1.27, with wide confidence intervals.(13) In our study,
229 we found a similar point estimate for the odds of male compared to female patients being deeply

230 sedated (1.41, CrI 1.23 to 1.62). We also showed that propofol use was lower in female patients.

231 Taken together, these findings suggest that excess propofol in male patients could be

232 overtreatment.

233 In comparison to existing research on the association between race and ethnicity and the use of

234 invasive ventilation, our findings have both differences and similarities. A secondary analysis of

235 a multicentre trial of patients with ARDS showed that Hispanic patients had 5 times higher odds

236 of deep sedation than non-Hispanic White patients.(13) A multicentre registry of COVID-19

237 ICU patients found that Hispanic patients were more likely to receive benzodiazepines than non-

238 Hispanic White or non-Hispanic Black patients.(14) These differ from our finding that Hispanic

239 patients most likely received less benzodiazepine than White patients, similar benzodiazepine to

240 Black patients, and had similar sedation scores to White patients. These differences could be due

241 to the lack of COVID-19 patients in our cohort, differences in unmeasured confounders between

242 our single-center study and the two multicentre studies, or differences due to increased

243 heterogeneity in our patient population compared to populations with COVID-19 or ARDS. By

244 contrast, our results are more consistent with a multi-centre retrospective study showing that

245 Black compared to White patients spent more time deeply sedated in the first 48 hours of ICU

246 admission.(15) This study focused on a similar population of mixed medical-surgical ICU

247 patients with at least 24 hours of invasive ventilation. Our findings and these three studies

248 demonstrate that sex and race and ethnicity can be associated with sedation management, even if

249 the associations vary by context.

250 Potential explanations and implications of the findings

251 There are several potential explanations for the differences in sedation practices that we found.

252 There may be biological differences in pharmacokinetics or pharmacodynamics of sedatives

253 according to patient sex or race and ethnicity.(33) However, race and ethnicity are socially

254 constructed entities with minimal biological correlation; differences here are unlikely to relate to

255 intrinsic pharmacology.(34) Instead, differences are more likely to relate to unmeasured

256 additional factors associated with exposures, such as the nature of co-administered medications

257 and their interactions, or differences in renal, hepatic, and neurologic function due to critical

258 illness or baseline comorbidities. Further confounding could relate to differences in underlying

259 diseases, patient agitation not reflected in the minimum SAS, or nurse staffing.(35)

260 Implicit bias is also a potential explanation for differences in care according to sex or race and

261 ethnicity.(36,37) Acknowledging the limited external validity of a single-center study, we

262 showed that privileged categories (male, white) generally received sedation most frequently and

263 in the highest doses. This may be an example where patients with relative social or cultural

264 privilege received overtreatment.(12) In the context of sedation, overtreatment is probably

265 detrimental to patient outcomes.(4)

266 Our findings for Black patients were also consistent with overtreatment. However, we found that

267 Black patients compared to White patients received less propofol and benzodiazepines, despite

268 being more sedated. Given the relatively small proportion of Black patients in our sample,

269 clinical practice may have been unintentionally optimized to treat patients with the diagnoses,

270 medications, and comorbidities associated with White patients at this centre. The findings could
271 be explained by inadequate adaptation of sedation practices to the diagnoses, medications, and
272 comorbidities associated with Black patients at this centre.

273 Although many prior observational studies have attempted to infer an association between
274 sedation use and mortality or duration of ventilation, we have not done so, because we were not
275 convinced that sufficient control of unmeasured confounding could be achieved in this data. This
276 makes the implications of our findings more difficult to interpret. However, guidelines
277 recommend using the minimum amount of sedation required to achieve safe clinical care,
278 suggesting that we have identified an opportunity to provide less propofol to male patients and
279 target lighter sedation in Black patients.(6,38)

280 [Limitations](#)

281 This study has important limitations. It was a single-center study with uncertain external validity.
282 We chose not to attempt analyses linking differences in sedation to outcomes such as mortality
283 due to unmeasured confounding between sedation use and mortality. There were also important
284 unmeasured confounders between race and ethnicity and sedation practices, most notably
285 whether the clinical goal was to provide deep sedation or minimal sedation. We did not include
286 information on parameters such as glomerular filtration rate or drug interactions that might alter
287 clearance. Some confounders that we included were measured in imperfect ways, such as
288 insurance status as a proxy for socioeconomic status, or International Classification of Disease
289 codes in discharge summaries to identify comorbidities. We only had data on female and male

290 sex, with no other sexes charted. A further limitation is that race and ethnicity are distinct
291 entities, while the data used for this study combined them into one field. The race and ethnicity
292 categories are broad and contain important heterogeneity not captured in this analysis. The
293 results themselves may be unique to the social, cultural, and healthcare systems of this particular
294 centre in the United States of America, and may not generalize to other contexts.

295 Conclusion

296 Among patients invasively ventilated for at least 24 hours, intravenous sedation and attained
297 sedation levels varied by sex and race and ethnicity. Adherence to sedation guidelines may
298 improve equity in sedation management for critically ill patients.

Tables and Figures

Table 1a: Baseline characteristics by patient sex

VARIABLE	TOTAL	FEMALE	MALE
	6764	2924 (43)	3840 (57)
Age, years, median (IQR)	65 (53, 76)	67 (55, 77)	64 (52, 74)
Race and Ethnicity N (%)			
Asian	236 (3)	71 (3)	165 (4)
Black	806 (12)	426 (15)	380 (10)
Hispanic	300 (4)	114 (4)	186 (5)
White	5422 (80)	2313 (79)	3109 (81)
Comorbidities N (%)			
Dementia	1685 (25)	725 (25)	960 (25)
TBI	448 (7)	141 (5)	307 (8)
Substance Use	1763 (26)	563 (19)	1200 (31)
Admission Year N (%)			
2008-2010	2664 (39)	1184 (40)	1480 (39)
2011-2013	1658 (25)	717 (25)	941 (25)
2014-2016	1435 (21)	615 (21)	820 (21)
2017-2019	1007 (15)	408 (14)	599 (16)
ICU Type N (%)			
Medical-Surgical	3862 (57)	1764 (60)	2098 (55)
Cardiac	1538 (23)	607 (21)	931 (24)
Neuro/trauma	1364 (20)	553 (19)	811 (21)
Insurance N (%)			
Medicaid	539 (8)	222 (8)	317 (8)
Medicare	3112 (46)	1474 (50)	1638 (39)
Other	3113 (46)	1228 (41)	1885 (49)
Weight, median (IQR)	80 (67, 97)	72 (60, 89)	85 (73, 100)
English proficiency N (%)	6116 (90)	2662 (91)	3454 (90)
Propofol in first 24h			
Received N (%)	4754 (70)	1979 (68)	2775 (72)
Mean dose in mcg/kg/min (IQR)	39 (20, 64)	36 (18, 60)	41 (21, 67)
Benzodiazepine in first 24h *			
Received N (%)	2581 (38)	1129 (39)	1452 (38)
Mean dose in mg/kg/hr (IQR)	0.01 (0, 0.03)	0.01 (0, 0.03)	0.01 (0, 0.03)

* Benzodiazepines dosed in lorazepam equivalents. TBI = traumatic brain injury. IQR = interquartile range.

Table 1b: Baseline characteristics by patient race and ethnicity

	TOTAL	ASIAN	BLACK	HISPANIC	WHITE
VARIABLE	6764	236 (3)	806 (12)	300 (4)	5422 (80)
Age, years, median (IQR)	65 (53, 76)	66 (54, 79)	62 (50, 73)	55 (42, 66)	66 (55, 76)
Sex (%)					
Female	2924 (43)	71 (30)	426 (53)	114 (38)	2313 (43)
Comorbidities N (%)					
Dementia	1685 (25)	31 (13)	219 (27)	81 (27)	1354 (25)
TBI	448 (7)	14 (6)	30 (4)	23 (8)	381 (7)
Substance Use	1763 (26)	21 (9)	200 (25)	89 (30)	381 (7)
Admission Year N (%)					
2008-2010	2664 (39)	83 (35)	338 (42)	103 (34)	2140 (39)
2011-2013	1658 (25)	59 (25)	196 (24)	89 (30)	1314 (24)
2014-2016	1435 (21)	62 (26)	174 (22)	59 (20)	1140 (21)
2017-2019	1007 (15)	32 (14)	98 (12)	49 (16)	828 (15)
ICU Type N (%)					
Medical-Surgical	3862 (57)	145 (61)	533 (66)	172 (57)	3012 (56)
Cardiac	1538 (23)	41 (17)	126 (16)	49 (16)	1322 (24)
Neuro/trauma	1364 (20)	50 (21)	147 (18)	79 (26)	1088 (20)
Insurance N (%)					
Medicaid	539 (8)	40 (17)	100 (12)	57 (19)	342 (6)
Medicare	3112 (46)	59 (25)	329 (41)	95 (32)	2629 (48)
Other	3113 (46)	137 (58)	377 (46)	148 (49)	2451 (45)
Weight, median (IQR)	80 (67, 97)	64 (57, 76)	80 (67, 97)	79 (67, 95)	80 (67, 97)
English proficiency N (%)	6116 (90)	83 (35)	705 (87)	122 (41)	5206 (96)
Propofol in first 24h					
Received N (%)	4754 (70)	155 (66)	541 (67)	236 (79)	3822 (70)
Mean dose in mcg/kg/min (IQR)	39 (20, 64)	29 (14, 51)	40 (20, 63)	45 (20, 71)	38 (20, 65)
Benzodiazepine in first 24h *					
Received N (%)	2581 (38)	88 (37)	311 (39)	95 (32)	2087 (38)
Mean dose in mg/kg/hr (IQR)	0.01 (0, 0.03)	0.01 (0, 0.03)	0.01 (0, 0.02)	0.01 (0, 0.03)	0.01 (0, 0.03)

* Benzodiazepines dosed in lorazepam equivalents. TBI = traumatic brain injury. IQR = interquartile range.

Table 2a: Sedation doses and outcomes by patient sex

	TOTAL	FEMALE	MALE
TOTAL (%)	6,764	2924 (43)	3840 (57)
Benzodiazepine received (%)	2334 (36)	1068 (37)	1366 (36)
Benzodiazepine dose* (mg/kg/hr)			
First quartile	0.05	0.05	0.05
Median	0.13	0.14	0.13
Third quartile	0.29	0.31	0.26
Propofol received (%)	3865 (57)	1571 (54)	2294 (60)
Propofol dose (mcg/kg/min)			
First quartile	20	19	20
Median	35	32	37
Third quartile	60	55	64
Dexmedetomidine received (%)	1439 (21)	574 (20)	865 (23)
Minimum SAS (IQR)	3 (3, 4)	3 (3, 4)	3 (3, 4)
1 year mortality (%)	3146 (47)	1398 (48)	1748 (46)
ICU LOS (days, IQR)	6 (4, 11)	6 (4, 11)	6 (4, 11)
Hospital LOS (days, IQR)	13 (8, 21)	12 (8, 20)	13 (8, 22)
Invasive Ventilation Duration (days, IQR)	3 (2, 6)	3 (2, 6)	3 (2, 6)

* Benzodiazepine dose in lorazepam equivalents

Table 2b: Sedation doses and outcomes by patient race and ethnicity


	TOTAL	ASIAN	BLACK	HISPANIC	WHITE
TOTAL (%)	6,764	236 (3)	806 (12)	300 (4)	5422 (80)
Benzodiazepine received	2334 (36)	65 (28)	266 (33)	95 (32)	2008 (37)
Benzodiazepine* dose (mg/kg/hr)					
First quartile	0.05	0.10	0.06	0.07	0.05
Median	0.13	0.18	0.14	0.20	0.13
Third quartile	0.29	0.32	0.28	0.35	0.28
Propofol received	3865 (57)	120 (51)	452 (56)	287 (62)	3106 (57)
Propofol dose (mcg/kg/min)					
First quartile	20	17	20	20	20
Median	35	30	33	42	35
Third quartile	60	50	59	72	60
Dexmedetomidine received	1439 (21)	31 (13)	171 (21)	70 (23)	1167 (22)
Minimum SAS (IQR)	3 (3, 4)	3 (2, 4)	3 (3, 4)	3 (2, 4)	3 (3, 4)
1 year mortality (%)	3146 (47)	124 (53)	390 (48)	113 (38)	2519 (46)
ICU LOS (days, IQR)	6 (4, 11)	6 (4, 11)	6 (4, 11)	6 (3, 11)	6 (4, 11)
Hospital LOS (days, IQR)	13 (8, 21)	12 (7.2, 22)	13 (8, 22)	13 (8, 23)	13 (8, 21)

Invasive Ventilation Duration (days, IQR)	3 (2, 6)	3 (2, 6)	3 (2, 6)	3 (2, 7)	3 (2, 6)
--	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

* Benzodiazepine dose in lorazepam equivalents. In the primary analysis, the four quartiles of dose from all patients for propofol and benzodiazepine were used to separate the variable into its top four quantiles. The lowest ordered category for the analysis was “no drug.” LOS = length of stay. IQR = interquartile range.


Figure 1

Odds Ratios by Sex and Race and Ethnicity



Caption: This figure shows the odds ratios for receiving a higher dose of each medication, according to patient race and ethnicity, after adjusting for baseline and time-varying variables. Odds ratios less than one correspond to lower probability of receiving the medication and lower doses, while odds ratios greater than one correspond to higher probability of receiving the medication and higher doses. For dexmedetomidine, the odds ratio reflects only the probability of receiving the medication.

Figure 2




Caption: This figure compares each combination of sex and race and ethnicity (8 combinations) with respect to the probability of receiving each sedative medication more often and more frequently. There are 8 tiled subplots, each corresponding to one of the 8 combinations. Each subplot has three rows, corresponding to the 3

sedative medications. The colour of each tile corresponds to the probability that the subplot's title exposure (**bolded**) was associated with a higher odds ratio for that sedative medication than the exposure named on the x-axis. Note that there are no tiles comparing the title exposure to itself (only white space in those areas). As an example, this plot shows that male White patients had higher odds ratios than almost all other exposure combinations across the three sedatives (tiles are mostly dark blue). **If there were no differences in sedation administration by sex or race and ethnicity, then the tiles would be mostly light gray.**

Figure 3: Minimum SAS by Sex and Race and Ethnicity

Posterior odds ratios for higher minimum sedation score



Caption: This figure shows the posterior odds ratios for higher minimum sedation score by sex (top section) and race and ethnicity (bottom section), after adjusting for baseline and time-varying variables. Odds ratios less than 1 correspond to an association with lower minimum SAS, and odds ratios greater than 1 correspond to an association with higher minimum SAS.

References

1. Reade MC, Finfer S. Sedation and Delirium in the Intensive Care Unit. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2014 Jan 30;370(5):444–54.
2. Lewis K, Alshamsi F, Carayannopoulos KL, Granholm A, Piticaru J, Al Duhailib Z, et al. Dexmedetomidine vs other sedatives in critically ill mechanically ventilated adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized trials. *Intensive Care Med*. 2022 Jul 1;48(7):811–40.
3. Ho KM, Ng JY. The use of propofol for medium and long-term sedation in critically ill adult patients: a meta-analysis. *Intensive Care Med*. 2008 Nov 1;34(11):1969–79.
4. Shehabi Y, Chan L, Kadiman S, Alias A, Ismail WN, Tan MATI, et al. Sedation depth and long-term mortality in mechanically ventilated critically ill adults: a prospective longitudinal multicentre cohort study. *Intensive Care Med*. 2013 May;39(5):910–8.
5. Aragón RE, Proaño A, Mongilardi N, De Ferrari A, Herrera P, Roldan R, et al. Sedation practices and clinical outcomes in mechanically ventilated patients in a prospective multicenter cohort. *Critical Care*. 2019 Apr;23(1).
6. Devlin JW, Skrobik Y, Gélinas C, Needham DM, Slooter AJC, Pandharipande PP, 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 Sep;46(9):e825–73.
7. Payen JF, Chanques G, Mantz J, Hercule C, Auriant I, Leguillou JL, et al. Current practices in sedation and analgesia for mechanically ventilated critically ill patients: a prospective multicenter patient-based study. *Anesthesiology*. 2007 Apr;106(4):687–95; quiz 891–2.
8. Weinert CR, Calvin AD. Epidemiology of sedation and sedation adequacy for mechanically ventilated patients in a medical and surgical intensive care unit. *Crit Care Med*. 2007 Feb;35(2):393–401.
9. Martin J, Franck M, Fischer M, Spies C. Sedation and analgesia in German intensive care units: how is it done in reality? Results of a patient-based survey of analgesia and sedation. *Intensive Care Med*. 2006 Aug 1;32(8):1137–42.
10. Bolesta S, Burry L, Perreault MM, Gélinas C, Smith KE, Eadie R, et al. International Analgesia and Sedation Weaning and Withdrawal Practices in Critically Ill Adults: The Adult Iatrogenic Withdrawal Study in the ICU. *Crit Care Med*. 2023 Nov 1;51(11):1502–14.

11. Enzinger AC, Ghosh K, Keating NL, Cutler DM, Clark CR, Florez N, et al. Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Opioid Access and Urine Drug Screening Among Older Patients With Poor-Prognosis Cancer Near the End of Life. *J Clin Oncol*. 2023 May 10;41(14):2511–22.
12. Abdelmalek FM, Angriman F, Moore J, Liu K, Burry L, Seyyed-Kalantari L, et al. Association between Patient Race and Ethnicity and Use of Invasive Ventilation in the United States of America. *Annals ATS* [Internet]. 2023 Nov 29 [cited 2023 Dec 18]; Available from: <https://www.atsjournals.org/doi/10.1513/AnnalsATS.202305-485OC>
13. Armstrong-Hough M, Lin P, Venkatesh S, Ghous M, Hough CL, Cook SH, et al. Ethnic Disparities in Deep Sedation of Patients with Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome in the United States: Secondary Analysis of a Multicenter Randomized Trial. *Annals ATS* [Internet]. 2024 Feb 7 [cited 2024 Mar 4]; Available from: <https://www.atsjournals.org/doi/abs/10.1513/AnnalsATS.202307-600OC>
14. Valley T, Iwashyna TJ, Cook S, Hough CTL, Armstrong-Hough M. Associations Among Patient Race, Sedation Practices, and Mortality in a Large Multi-Center Registry of COVID-19 Patients. In 2021. p. A2567–A2567.
15. Ramadurai D, Kohn R, Hart JL, Scott S, Kerlin MP. Associations of Race With Sedation Depth Among Mechanically Ventilated Adults: A Retrospective Cohort Study. *Critical Care Explorations*. 2023 Nov;5(11):e0996.
16. Johnson AEW, Bulgarelli L, Shen L, Gayles A, Shammout A, Horng S, et al. MIMIC-IV, a freely accessible electronic health record dataset. *Sci Data*. 2023 Jan 3;10(1):1.
17. Johnson A, Bulgarelli L, Pollard T, Horng S, Celi LA, Mark R. MIMIC-IV [Internet]. PhysioNet; [cited 2023 Aug 11]. Available from: <https://physionet.org/content/mimiciv/2.2/>
18. Johnson AE, Stone DJ, Celi LA, Pollard TJ. The MIMIC Code Repository: enabling reproducibility in critical care research. *J Am Med Inform Assoc*. 2018 Jan 1;25(1):32–9.
19. Fitzmaurice GM, Laird NM, Ware JH. *Applied Longitudinal Analysis*. John Wiley & Sons; 2012. 742 p.
20. Riker RR, Picard JT, Fraser GL. Prospective evaluation of the Sedation-Agitation Scale for adult critically ill patients. *Crit Care Med*. 1999 Jul;27(7):1325–9.
21. Komorowski M, Celi LA, Badawi O, Gordon AC, Faisal AA. The Artificial Intelligence Clinician learns optimal treatment strategies for sepsis in intensive care. *Nature Medicine*. 2018 Nov;24(11):1716–20.
22. Approximate dose conversions for commonly used opioids. In: UpToDate. Waltham, MA: UpToDate; 2023.

23. Pharmacology of benzodiazepines used to treat anxiety symptoms/disorders. In: UpToDate. Waltham, MA: UpToDate; 2023.
24. Hastie T, Tibshirani R. Non-Parametric Logistic and Proportional Odds Regression. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series C (Applied Statistics)*. 1987;36(3):260–76.
25. Ponce M, Van Zon R, Northrup S, Gruner D, Chen J, Ertinaz F, et al. Deploying a top-100 supercomputer for large parallel workloads: The Niagara supercomputer. In: *ACM International Conference Proceeding Series [Internet]*. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery; 2019. p. 1–8. Available from: <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3332186.3332195>
26. Austin PC, White IR, Lee DS, van Buuren S. Missing Data in Clinical Research: A Tutorial on Multiple Imputation. *Canadian Journal of Cardiology*. 2020 Dec;
27. Yarnell CJ, Johnson A, Dam T, Jonkman A, Liu K, Wunsch H, et al. Do Thresholds for Invasive Ventilation in Hypoxemic Respiratory Failure exist? A Cohort Study. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2023 Feb;207(3):271–82.
28. Zhou X, Reiter JP. A Note on Bayesian Inference After Multiple Imputation. *The American Statistician*. 2010;64(2):159–63.
29. Graham JW, Olchowski AE, Gilreath TD. How many imputations are really needed? Some practical clarifications of multiple imputation theory. *Prevention Science*. 2007 Sep;8(3):206–13.
30. Olsen HT, Nedergaard HK, Strøm T, Oxlund J, Wian KA, Ytrebø LM, et al. Nonsedation or Light Sedation in Critically Ill, Mechanically Ventilated Patients. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2020 Mar;382(12):1103–11.
31. Hyun DG, Ahn JH, Gil HY, Nam CM, Yun C, Lee JM, et al. The Profile of Early Sedation Depth and Clinical Outcomes of Mechanically Ventilated Patients in Korea. *J Korean Med Sci*. 2023 May 15;38(19):e141.
32. Hughes CG, Mailloux PT, Devlin JW, Swan JT, Sanders RD, Anzueto A, et al. Dexmedetomidine or Propofol for Sedation in Mechanically Ventilated Adults with Sepsis. *N Engl J Med*. 2021 Apr 15;384(15):1424–36.
33. Soldin O, Mattison D. Sex Differences in Pharmacokinetics and Pharmacodynamics. *Clin Pharmacokinet*. 2009;48(3):143–57.
34. Datta G, Siddiqi A, Lofters A. Transforming race-based health research in Canada. *CMAJ*. 2021 Jan 18;193(3):E99–100.

35. Hetland B, Guttormson J, Tracy MF, Chlan L. “Sedation is tricky”: A qualitative content analysis of nurses’ perceptions of sedation administration in mechanically ventilated intensive care unit patients. *Aust Crit Care*. 2018 May;31(3):153–8.
36. Fitzgerald C, Hurst S. Implicit bias in healthcare professionals: A systematic review. *BMC Medical Ethics* [Internet]. 2017 Mar;18(1). Available from: [/pmc/articles/PMC5333436/?report=abstract](#)
<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5333436/>
37. Sabin JA. Tackling Implicit Bias in Health Care. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2022 Jul 14;387(2):105–7.
38. Shehabi Y, Bellomo R. Reply: Early Deep Sedation Is Often Not Justified. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2013 Apr 15;187(8):893–893.