

1 **Title**

2 Sedation practices in patients intubated in the emergency department compared to the intensive
3 care unit.

4

5 **Short title**

6 Sedation practices in the ED versus ICU

7

8 Jariya Sereeyotin^{1,2}, Christopher Yarnell^{2,3}, Sangeeta Mehta^{2*}

9

10 ¹ Department of Anesthesiology, Division of Critical Care Medicine, King Chulalongkorn

11 Memorial Hospital and Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand

12 ² Department of Medicine, Sinai Health; Interdepartmental Division of Critical Care Medicine,

13 University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada

14 ³ Department of Critical Care Medicine and Research Institute, Scarborough Health Network,

15 Toronto, ON, Canada

16

17 *Corresponding author

18 E-mail: geeta.mehta@utoronto.ca (SM)

19

20 **Author contributions**

21 JS- Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Methodology, Investigation, Writing –

22 original draft, Writing – review & editing

23 CY- Formal analysis, Methodology, Writing – review & editing

24 SM- Conceptualization, Formal analysis, Methodology, Supervisor, Writing – review & editing

25 **Abstract**

26 Purpose

27 This study aimed to compare sedation management during and after intubation in the emergency
28 department (ED) versus the intensive care unit (ICU).

29 Methods

30 This was a single-center retrospective cohort study of adults intubated in the ED or in the ICU
31 and received mechanical ventilation between January 2018 and February 2022. We collected
32 data from the electronic medical record. The primary outcome was duration from intubation to
33 first documentation of light sedation, defined as a Sedation Agitation Scale score (SAS) of 3-4.

34 Results

35 The study included 264 patients, with 95 (36%) intubated in the ED and 169 (64%) in the ICU.
36 Regarding anesthetic agents used for intubation, ketamine was the most commonly used drug in
37 the ED and was used more frequently than in the ICU (61% vs 40%, $p=0.001$). Propofol was the
38 predominant sedative used in the ICU, with a higher prevalence compared to the ED (50% vs
39 33%, $p=0.01$). Additionally, benzodiazepines and fentanyl were more frequently used in the ICU
40 (39% vs 6%, $p<0.001$ and 68% vs 9.5%, $p<0.001$, respectively). Within 24 hours after
41 intubation, 68% (65/95) ED patients and 82% (138/169) patients intubated in ICU achieved light
42 sedation, with median durations of 13.5 hours and 10.5 hours. Patient location in the ED at
43 intubation was associated with decreased probability of achieving light sedation at 24 hours
44 (adjusted odds ratio 0.64, $p=0.04$).

45 Conclusion

46 Critically ill patients intubated in the ED are at risk of deeper sedation and a longer time to
47 achieve light sedation compared to patients intubated in the ICU.

48 **Introduction**

49 Effective sedation management is crucial for facilitating intubation, ensuring comfort, and
50 promoting patient-ventilator synchrony in mechanically ventilated adults. However, this
51 management poses challenges in both the emergency department (ED) and the intensive care unit
52 (ICU) due to limited physiological reserves and the potential for serious complications in
53 critically ill patients.[1, 2] Moreover, inappropriate or excessive sedation has been associated
54 with adverse outcomes in critically ill patients.

55 Several studies have reported that deep sedation in mechanically ventilated patients
56 during the first 48 hours after ICU admission is associated with a higher risk of death and
57 delirium, as well as delayed time to extubation.[3-7] Despite the 2018 Pain, Agitation/Sedation,
58 Delirium, Immobility and Sleep Disruption (PADIS) guidelines[8] recommending light sedation
59 in critically ill mechanically ventilated adults, deep sedation is commonly used for intubated
60 patients in the ED. In a recent multicenter, prospective cohort study of 324 patients receiving
61 mechanical ventilation in the ED, 52.8% of intubated patients were deeply sedated [defined as
62 Sedation Agitation Scale (SAS) score of 1 or 2], and deep sedation continued throughout the first
63 48 hours of ICU admission.[9] Therefore, an early emphasis on sedation minimization in
64 critically ill patients may be beneficial.

65 Many critically ill patients are initially intubated and managed in the ED, yet there are
66 few studies evaluating sedation practices for mechanically ventilated patients in the ED.[9, 10]
67 The overall purpose of our study was to compare sedation management during and after
68 intubation in patients intubated in the ED versus those intubated in the ICU. Given that our study
69 period included the COVID-19 pandemic, during which rapid sequence intubation (RSI) was
70 recommended for all patients with suspected or confirmed COVID-19 infection[11, 12], we also

71 explored the change in sedation management prior to and during the COVID-19 pandemic.

72 Moreover, we aimed to identify patient factors and other potentially modifiable factors

73 associated with deep sedation to improve sedation management in critically ill patients.

74

75 **Materials and Methods**

76 This retrospective cohort study was conducted at a tertiary care university-affiliated
77 hospital and approved by the Sinai Health Research Ethics Board (REB#23-0002-C) on February
78 15th, 2023. Due to the retrospective research design and the fact that no identifying information
79 would be collected, the need for informed consent was waived. We identified eligible
80 consecutive patients from an ICU research screening database and electronic medical record
81 (EMR) prior to (January 1st, 2018-January 31st, 2020) and during the COVID-19 pandemic
82 (February 1st, 2020-February 28th, 2022). We accessed individual patient information between
83 February 15th, 2023 and August 31st, 2023; however, the identifying information was not
84 recorded during data collection.

85 The study included adult patients aged 18 years or older who were intubated either in the
86 ED or within the first 24 hours of ICU admission and received mechanical ventilation. Exclusion
87 criteria were: need for deep sedation or neuromuscular blocking agents after intubation (e.g.,
88 therapeutic hypothermia after cardiac arrest, moderate to severe acute respiratory distress
89 syndrome, or status epilepticus); death within 48 hours of intubation; transferred to another
90 department after intubation; and not expected to achieve light sedation within 48 hours (e.g.,
91 intracranial hemorrhage, brain stem infarction, or encephalopathy).

92 The primary outcome was the time from intubation to the first documentation of light
93 sedation, defined as SAS 3-4. Secondary outcomes included SAS at 6, 12, 24 and 48 hours after

94 intubation; intubation technique (RSI and non-RSI; RSI was defined as the administration of
95 sedative agents followed by rapid onset neuromuscular blocking agents without positive pressure
96 ventilation unless it was necessary); drug types and dosage for intubation and the postintubation
97 period; potential factors associated with deep sedation after intubation; and incidence of
98 hemodynamic instability (defined as hypotension SBP < 90 mmHg or at least 20% decrease of
99 initial MAP for > 30 minutes; new requirement for or increase in dose of vasopressors; fluid
100 bolus > 15 ml/kg to maintain target blood pressure; or new onset of arrhythmia) within 30
101 minutes from the start of intubation.

102

103 **Statistical analysis**

104 Demographic variables were presented by descriptive analysis, using frequency (percentage) for
105 categorical data. For continuous data, Kolmogorov-Smirnov was used for normality testing and
106 data expressed as mean (standard deviation, SD) or median (interquartile range, IQR) as
107 appropriate. The primary outcome was analyzed using a Cox proportional hazards model that
108 adjusted for relevant covariates. Covariates included age, Acute Physiologic Assessment and
109 Chronic Health Evaluation (APACHE) II score, obesity (body mass index ≥ 30 kg/m²), renal
110 insufficiency (defined as GFR < 30 mL/min/1.73m²), end-stage liver disease, baseline Glasgow
111 Coma Scale (GCS) and potential confounders for achieving light sedation including
112 administration of benzodiazepines and neuromuscular blocking agents after intubation. From the
113 primary analysis we reported the odds ratio of achieving light sedation according to patient
114 location at the time of intubation (ED versus ICU).

115 For the secondary analysis, we used logistic regression models to identify potential
116 predictors for the following binary outcomes: RSI versus non-RSI, deep sedation versus light
117 sedation, presence of hemodynamic instability versus none.

118 All analyses were performed using SPSS software version 28 and a two-sided P value <
119 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

120

121 **Results**

122 Between January 2018 and February 2022, a total of 314 patients were eligible for the inclusion
123 criteria, of whom 50 patients were excluded due to the reasons as shown in Fig 1. Ultimately,
124 264 patients were included in the primary analysis, with 95 (36%) intubated in the ED and 169
125 (64%) intubated in the ICU. The mean (SD) age was 60 (18) years and 153 (58%) were male.
126 The two groups were similar at baseline prior to intubation, other than a higher proportion of
127 patients with $GCS \leq 8$ in the ED group (68% vs 25%), and higher mean age in the ICU group (63
128 vs 56 years). The main reason for intubation in the ED was neurological dysfunction while
129 respiratory failure was the most common reason for intubation in the ICU. Patient characteristics
130 are shown in Table 1.

131

132 **Fig 1. Flow of participants in a study of the sedation practices in patients intubated in the**
133 **emergency department compared to the intensive care unit.** ED = Emergency Department,
134 ICU = Intensive Care Unit.

135

136 **Table 1. Patient characteristics prior to endotracheal intubation**

| Variables | Emergency Department N=95 | Intensive Care Unit N=169 | P value |
|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------|
| Age, years, mean (SD) | 56 (21) | 63 (15) | 0.004 |
| Male sex, n (%) | 55 (58) | 98 (58) | 0.99 |
| BMI (kg/m ²), median (IQR) | 26 (21-28) | 26 (23-31) | 0.30 |
| Race, n (%)* | | | |
| White | 68 (72) | 110 (65) | 0.34 |
| Black | 9 (9) | 10 (6) | |
| Other person of color | 18 (19) | 49 (29) | |
| APACHE II, median (IQR) | 22 (17-27) | 22 (17-27) | 0.80 |
| Baseline GCS before intubation | | | |
| GCS ≤ 8, n (%) | 61 (68) | 36 (25) | <0.001 |
| GCS > 8, n (%) | 29 (32) | 110 (75) | |
| COVID infection, n (%) | | | |
| Positive | 6 (6) | 6 (4) | 0.30 |
| Negative | 89 (94) | 163 (96) | |
| Underlying disease, n (%) | | | |
| Hypertension | 34 (36) | 72 (43) | 0.28 |
| Diabetes mellitus | 26 (27) | 40 (24) | 0.51 |
| COPD | 9 (9) | 20 (12) | 0.56 |
| Renal insufficiency | 12 (13) | 28 (17) | 0.39 |
| Hepatic dysfunction | 10 (11) | 27 (16) | 0.22 |
| End-stage liver disease | 0 (0) | 3 (2) | 0.19 |

| Reason for intubation, n (%) | | | |
|------------------------------|---------|----------|--------|
| Airway obstruction | 8 (8) | 11 (7) | 0.56 |
| Respiratory failure | 25 (26) | 107 (63) | <0.001 |
| Cardiogenic shock | 4 (4) | 4 (2) | 0.40 |
| Neurological dysfunction | 46 (48) | 22 (13) | <0.001 |
| Sepsis | 3 (3) | 24 (14) | 0.004 |
| Cardiac arrest | 7 (7) | 4 (2) | 0.05 |
| Other | 2 (2) | 0 (0) | 0.06 |

137 * Race was visually identified and recorded in the ICU research database by the research
 138 coordinator.

139 BMI = Body Mass Index; APACHE II = Acute Physiologic Assessment and Chronic Health
 140 Evaluation II score; GCS = Glasgow Coma Scale; COPD = Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary
 141 Disease; SD = standard deviation; IQR = interquartile range

142

143 **Primary outcome and sedation agitation scale**

144 Within the first 24 hours after intubation, 68.4% (65/95) ED patients and 81.7% (138/169) ICU
 145 patients achieved light sedation, with median durations of 13.5 hours and 10.5 hours,
 146 respectively. Patient location in the ED at the time of intubation was associated with decreased
 147 probability of achieving light sedation at 24 hours, with adjusted odds ratio of 0.64 (p=0.04; 95%
 148 CI, 0.42 to 0.97) (S1 Table in S1 Appendix). Cumulative hazard curves assessing time from
 149 intubation to the first documentation of achieving light sedation are shown in Fig 2.

150

151 **Fig 2. Cumulative hazard of the time to achieve light sedation at 24 hours, by patients'**
152 **location of intubation**

153 Within the first 24 hours after intubation, the median time to achieve light sedation was 13.5
154 hours for patients intubated in the ED and 10.5 hours for those intubated in the ICU. The mean
155 odds ratio for achieving light sedation at 24 hours was 0.69 for the ED ($p=0.01$; 95% confidence
156 interval [CI], 0.51-0.92).

157
158 Deep sedation (SAS 1 or 2) was more frequently observed in the ED group at all time points,
159 especially at 12 and 48 hours (60.2% vs. 46.3%, $p=0.03$; and 26.5% vs. 13.0%, $p=0.02$,
160 respectively) (Fig 3). More detail for the number of patients who were deeply sedated and lightly
161 sedated at each time point is reported in S2 Table in S1 Appendix.

162

163 **Fig 3. Sedation Agitation Scale at each time point in ED and ICU patients.**

164 The Sedation Agitation Scale (SAS) at each time point is shown for patients intubated in the ED
165 and the ICU. Deep sedation (SAS 1 or 2) was more frequently observed in the ED group, and a
166 higher prevalence of light sedation (SAS 3 or 4) was found in the ICU group at all time points,
167 with statistically significant differences at 12 and 48 hours (60.2% vs. 46.3%, $p=0.03$; and 26.5%
168 vs. 13.0%, $p=0.02$, respectively for deep sedation; 39.8% vs. 53.7%, $p=0.03$ and 73.5% vs.
169 87.0%, $p=0.02$, respectively for light sedation).

170

171 **Intubation technique, drug types and drug dosages**

172 RSI was significantly more frequent in the ED compared to the ICU (82.1% vs. 30.2%, p
173 <0.001). During the COVID-19 pandemic, the incidence rate of RSI was significantly increasing

174 from 75% to 92.3% (p=0.03) in the ED and from 17.3% to 50.8% in the ICU (p<0.001).
 175 Intubation technique prior to and during the COVID-19 pandemic in the ED and ICU appear in
 176 S3 Table and S1 Fig in S1 Appendix.
 177
 178 Regarding anesthetic agents used for intubation (Table 2), ketamine was the most commonly
 179 used drug in the ED and was used more frequently than in the ICU (61% vs 40% patients,
 180 p=0.001). Propofol was the predominant sedative used in the ICU, with a higher prevalence
 181 compared to the ED (50% vs 33%, p=0.01). Additionally, benzodiazepines, opiates and topical
 182 xylocaine were more frequently used in the ICU (39% vs 6%, p 0.001; 68% vs 10%, p<0.001;
 183 and 15% vs 3%, p=0.003; respectively).

184
 185 **Table 2. Sedative, analgesic, and paralytic medications used for intubation and post-**
 186 **intubation in the ED versus ICU**

| Intubation period | ED N=95 | ICU N=169 | P value |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Induction drug administration | | | |
| Xylocaine topical | 3 (3.2) | 25 (14.8) | 0.003 |
| Fentanyl | 9 (9.5) | 115 (68) | <0.001 |
| - Dosage, mcg/kg | 1.1 (0.6-1.4) | 1.0 (0.6-1.4) | 0.50 |
| Ketamine | 58 (61.1) | 68 (40.2) | 0.001 |
| - Dosage, mg/kg | 1.2 (0.8-1.4) | 0.9 (0.5-1.2) | <0.001 |
| Propofol | 31 (32.6) | 85 (50.3) | 0.01 |
| - Dosage, mg/kg | 1.2 (0.9-1.7) | 0.7 (0.4-1.0) | <0.001 |

| | | | |
|---|------------------|------------------|--------|
| Midazolam | 6 (6.3) | 66 (39.1) | <0.001 |
| - Dosage, mg/kg | 0.07 (0.03-0.1) | 0.02 (0.02-0.03) | 0.02 |
| Rocuronium | 44 (46.3) | 64 (37.9) | 0.18 |
| - Dosage, mg/kg | 1.2 (1.0-1.4) | 0.8 (0.7-1.1) | <0.001 |
| Succinylcholine | 36 (37.9) | 0 | <0.001 |
| - Dosage, mg/kg | 1.4 (1.2-1.9) | 0 | <0.001 |
| Post-intubation drug administration | | | |
| Opioids | 24 (25.3) | 116 (68.6) | <0.001 |
| Opioid dosage (fentanyl equivalent ^a) | | | |
| - Bolus, mcg/kg | 0.9 (0.3-1.3) | 0.5 (0.3-1.2) | 0.37 |
| - Infusion, mcg/kg/hr | 0.8 (0.6-1.5) | 0.9 (0.6-1.3) | 0.76 |
| Ketamine | 16 (16.8) | 8 (4.7) | 0.001 |
| Ketamine dosage | | | |
| - Bolus, mg/kg | 0.2 (0.1-0.4) | 0.7 (0.5-1.2) | 0.09 |
| - Infusion, mg/kg/hr | 0.4 (0.3-0.5) | 0.06 (0.05-0.15) | 0.07 |
| Propofol | 48 (50.5) | 110 (65.1) | 0.02 |
| Propofol dosage | | | |
| - Bolus, mg/kg | 0.6 (0.3-1.1) | 0.7 (0.4-0.8) | 0.78 |
| - Infusion, mcg/kg/min | 30 (20-50) | 30 (20-40) | 0.046 |
| Benzodiazepines | 32 (33.7) | 14 (8.3) | <0.001 |
| Benzodiazepine dosage (midazolam equivalents ^b) | | | |
| - Bolus, mg/kg | 0.04 (0.03-0.09) | 0.04 (0.02-0.05) | 0.37 |

| | | | |
|--|------------------|------------------|--------|
| - Infusion, mg/kg/hr | 0.05 (0.03-0.08) | 0.04 (0.03-0.05) | 0.44 |
| Intermittent NMBA administration | 4 (4.2) | 9 (5.3) | 0.69 |
| Method of opioid administration, peri-intubation | | | |
| - Bolus | 12 (12.6) | 43 (25.4) | |
| - Infusion | 11 (11.6) | 30 (17.8) | <0.001 |
| - Both | 3 (3.2) | 77 (45.6) | |
| - None | 69 (72.6%) | 19 (11.2) | |
| Method of sedative administration, peri-intubation | | | |
| - Bolus | 12 (12.6) | 35 (20.7) | |
| - Infusion | 3 (3.2) | 9 (5.3) | 0.15 |
| - Both | 78 (82.1) | 117 (69.2) | |
| - None | 2 (2.1) | 8 (4.7) | |

187 Data are shown as N (%) or median (IQR). ED = Emergency Department, ICU = Intensive Care

188 Unit, NMBA = neuromuscular blocking agent, mg/kg = milligram per kilogram, mcg/kg =

189 microgram per kilogram, mg/kg/hr = milligram per kilogram per hour, mcg/kg/min = microgram

190 per kilogram per minute, mcg/kg/hr = microgram per kilogram per hour

191 The most common benzodiazepine used in ED and ICU was midazolam.

192 ^aFentanyl equivalent parenteral dose; fentanyl 0.1 mg = morphine 10 mg = hydromorphone 1.5

193 mg (Barr et al. Clinical Practice Guidelines for the Management of Pain, Agitation, and Delirium

194 in Adult Patients in the Intensive Care Unit. Critical Care Medicine. 2013;41(1); 263-306)

195 ^b Midazolam equivalent parenteral dose; midazolam 1.5 mg = diazepam 5 mg (Reuben Straye.
196 www.maimonidesem.org/benzodiazepines)

197
198 In terms of drug dosages, higher doses of sedatives and neuromuscular blocking agents were
199 used for intubation in the ED, while no significant difference in opioid dosage was found. We
200 identified 3 patients intubated in the ED who received neuromuscular blocking agents alone
201 without documented sedatives: two were diagnosed with drug intoxication and had baseline GCS
202 3 with no improvement after therapeutic naloxone administration, and the other had baseline
203 GCS 5 and was intubated due to COVID-19 infection and septic shock.

204
205 After intubation, opioids were less commonly used (25.3% vs. 68.6%, $p < 0.001$), while ketamine
206 and benzodiazepines were more frequently used (16.8% vs 4.7%, $p = 0.001$; and 33.7% vs. 8.3%,
207 $p < 0.001$, respectively) in the ED compared to the ICU. The bolus and infusion dosages were
208 similar in ED and ICU except for a higher dose of propofol infusion in the ED [30 (20-50) vs 30
209 (20-40) mcg/kg/min, $p = 0.046$].

210
211 Compared to prior to COVID-19 pandemic, rocuronium was used for intubation at higher doses
212 both in the ED and the ICU during the COVID-19 pandemic [0.9 (0.6-1.0) vs 1.3 (1.2-1.6)
213 mg/kg, $p < 0.001$ for ED; and 0.7 (0.6-0.8) vs 1.1 (0.7-1.4) mg/kg, $p < 0.001$ for ICU]. After
214 intubation, higher prevalence of using propofol and benzodiazepines as well as higher doses of
215 propofol infusion were observed in the ICU while higher prevalence of ketamine was observed
216 in the ED (S4.1 and S4.2 Tables in S1 Appendix).

217

218 Following intubation in the ICU, SAS scores were documented in the patient record every 4
219 hours. In the ED, GCS was recorded before transfer to the ICU, whereas no sedation assessment
220 tools were documented.

221

222 **Other outcomes**

223 A multivariable logistic regression analysis was performed to identify the effects of APACHE II
224 score, baseline GCS, renal insufficiency, end-stage liver disease, use of midazolam for induction
225 and sedative administration methods (bolus, infusion, or both) on the likelihood that patients
226 would be deeply sedated 24 hours after intubation. In adjusted analysis, patients with renal
227 insufficiency ($\text{GFR} < 30 \text{ mL/min/1.73m}^2$) were 2.78 times ($p=0.03$) more likely to be deeply
228 sedated at 24 hours than those without renal insufficiency. In addition, patients with baseline
229 $\text{GCS} \leq 8$ were 2.17 times ($p=0.03$) more likely to be deeply sedated than those with baseline
230 $\text{GCS} > 8$ (S5 Table in S1 Appendix). Neurologic dysfunction as a reason for intubation and
231 being intubated during the COVID-19 pandemic were two independent factors strongly
232 associated with greater use of the RSI technique (OR 2.9, $p<0.001$; and OR 3.6, $p<0.001$,
233 respectively) (S6 Table in S1 Appendix).

234

235 Regarding outcomes after intubation, the incidence of cardiovascular instability requiring
236 vasopressor treatment was higher in the ICU group compared to the ED group (68.6% vs. 45.3%,
237 $p<0.001$) (Table 3). Increasing age, a diagnosis of sepsis and fentanyl use for induction were
238 found to be associated with the risk of cardiovascular instability, while sedative agents used for
239 induction, including propofol, ketamine, and benzodiazepine, were not (S7 Table in S1
240 Appendix). Days of mechanical ventilation, hospital length of stay and 28-day mortality were

241 higher in the ICU group compared with the ED group (4 (2-9) vs 2 (1-3) days, $p<0.001$; 14 (8-
 242 47) vs 8 (3-16) days, $p<0.001$ and 37.7% vs. 12.3%, $p<0.001$, respectively). However, patients
 243 who were deeply sedated at any time point had longer days of mechanical ventilation, longer
 244 hospital length of stay and fewer ventilator-free days at 28 days than the lightly sedated group
 245 (Fig 4). In addition, deeply sedated patients were less likely to be discharged home and were
 246 more commonly transferred to a rehabilitation facility than the lightly sedated group. More
 247 details are provided in S8 Table in S1 Appendix

248

249 **Table 3. Cardiovascular instability and ICU outcomes between the ED and ICU group**

| Outcomes | ED N=95 | ICU N=169 | P value |
|---|--------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Cardiovascular instability, n (%) | 52 (54.7) | 130 (76.9) | <0.001 |
| Vasopressor requirement | 43 (45.3) | 116 (68.6) | <0.001 |
| Requirement for fluid bolus | 36 (37.9) | 66 (39.1) | 0.85 |
| Duration of mechanical ventilation, day, median (IQR) | 2 (1-3) | 4 (2-9) | <0.001 |
| Ventilator-free days at 28 days, median (IQR) | 26 (24-27) | 17 (0-25) | <0.001 |
| Hospital length of stay, day, median (IQR) | 8 (3-16) | 14 (8-47) | <0.001 |
| 28-day mortality, n/total collected data (%) | 10/81 (12.3) | 61/162 (37.7) | <0.001 |
| Discharge disposition, n (%) | | | |
| Home | 52 (54.7) | 30 (17.8) | <0.001 |
| Death | 10 (10.5) | 77 (45.6) | |
| Rehabilitation or long-term care institution | 21 (22.1) | 23 (13.6) | |
| Acute care hospital | 12 (12.6) | 39 (23.1) | |

250 Data are shown as N (%) or median (IQR). ED = Emergency Department, ICU = Intensive Care
251 Unit.
252 Cardiovascular instability was defined as hypotension SBP < 90 mmHg or at least 20% decrease
253 of initial MAP for > 30 minutes; new requirement for or increase in dose of vasopressors; or
254 fluid bolus > 15 ml/kg to maintain target blood pressure; new onset of arrhythmia within 30
255 minutes from the start of intubation.

256
257 **Fig 4. Duration of mechanical ventilation, ventilator-free days at 28 days, and hospital**
258 **length of stay between deeply sedated and lightly sedated groups.**

259 Deeply sedated is defined as SAS 1-2; Lightly sedated is defined as SAS ≥ 3 ., * statistical
260 significance

261 A. Duration of mechanical ventilation was longer in deeply sedated group compared to lightly
262 sedated group at any time point with statistical significance at 12, 24 and 48 hours after
263 intubation., B. Patients who were lightly sedated at 6, 24 and 48 hours after intubation had more
264 ventilator-free days at 28 days than those who were deeply sedated., C. At 6, 12 and 24 hours
265 after intubation, deeply sedated patients had significantly longer hospital length of stay than
266 lightly sedated patients.

267

268 **Discussion**

269 In this single-center retrospective cohort study, patients who were intubated and had initiation of
270 invasive ventilation in the ED had a longer time to achieve light sedation than patients intubated
271 in the ICU. Moreover, deep sedation was more frequently observed in the ED group during the
272 first 48 hours of mechanical ventilation.

273

274 Our study emphasizes the impact of ED sedation practice for mechanically ventilated patients on
275 ICU outcomes, including fewer ventilator-, ICU- and hospital-free days.[9, 10] Our results are
276 consistent with the ED-SED study, which evaluated ED sedation practices in mechanically
277 ventilated patients.[9] They found that deep sedation was frequently started in the ED and
278 continued throughout the first 48 hours of ICU admission. More than 70% of deeply sedated
279 patients in their ICU received sedation management starting from the ED. Likewise, this study
280 also found a higher frequency of deep sedation in patients intubated in the ED at 6, 12, 24 and
281 until 48 hours after intubation compared to those intubated in the ICU.

282

283 There is limited high-quality evidence to clarify the optimal dose of sedatives for intubation in
284 critically ill adults.[13-15] Higher doses of sedatives and neuromuscular blocking agents were
285 used for intubation in the ED despite the finding that the most common indication for intubation
286 in the ED was neurologic dysfunction (48%). Concerningly, 3 patients with low baseline GCS
287 (3-5) were intubated in the ED with the administration of neuromuscular blocking agents alone
288 without sedation, highlighting an opportunity for improvement.

289

290 In a study of intubation practice in 3,659 critically ill patients across 29 countries, the main
291 reasons for intubation were respiratory failure (52%) and neurological dysfunction (31%),
292 similar to our study (50% respiratory failure, 26% neurological dysfunction). In their study the
293 most common drugs used for induction were propofol (41.5%), midazolam (36.4%), etomidate
294 (17.8%) and ketamine (14.2%). Propofol was significantly associated with cardiovascular
295 instability compared with etomidate (64% vs 50% respectively, absolute difference 14%; 95% CI

296 1.4-27.0%, p=0.02) when administered to patients with hemodynamic instability.[15] In our
297 study, ketamine was the most commonly used drug in the ED (61.1%), while propofol and
298 ketamine were the two most predominant sedatives used in the ICU (50.3% and 40.2%,
299 respectively). The use of specific sedatives for induction was not found to be a risk factor for
300 deep sedation at 24 hours nor for cardiovascular instability.

301
302 Regarding postintubation sedation, 33.7% of patients in the ED received benzodiazepines,
303 compared with 8.3% in the ICU. In addition, only 25.3% of patients in the ED group received
304 opioids for postintubation analgesia. These sedation practices were inconsistent with the 2018
305 PADIS Guidelines[8], which recommend an assessment-driven, protocol-based, stepwise
306 approach for pain and sedation management in critically ill adults, using analgesia first.
307 Moreover, benzodiazepines are not recommended for sedation.[16, 17] Another area for
308 improvement is that sedation assessment tools should be used in the ED to better target light
309 sedation.

310
311 Our logistic regression analysis identified that patients with renal insufficiency and patients with
312 low baseline GCS (≤ 8) were more likely to have deep sedation following intubation,[18-20]
313 suggesting that a cautious approach to sedative administration may be wise in these groups.
314 Furthermore, it was not surprising that the COVID-19 pandemic and neurologic dysfunction as
315 the reason for intubation were independent factors strongly associated with performing RSI
316 technique. The most likely reason for patients with neurological dysfunction was concern for
317 increased intracranial pressure during laryngoscopy.

318

319 Regarding outcomes after intubation, increasing age, sepsis diagnosis and pretreatment with
320 fentanyl were associated with cardiovascular instability in our study, which is consistent with
321 prior studies.[21-23] This could explain the higher incidence of cardiovascular instability in the
322 ICU group. Although this study has not shown an association between deep sedation and
323 mortality outcome as previous studies did,[5, 6, 10, 24] we found that fewer patients were
324 discharged home and more were discharged to a rehabilitation hospital in the early deep sedation
325 group. Moreover, fewer ventilator-free days and longer hospital length of stay were observed in
326 this group.

327
328 To our knowledge, this is the first study comparing sedation practices for intubation and post-
329 intubation between the ED and the ICU. Strengths of this study include detailed data on drug
330 types and dosages, evaluation during and prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, complete patient
331 follow-up, and identification of predictors of deep sedation. This study has limitations. First, it
332 was a single-center study, so these data may not represent broader clinical practice. However, the
333 prevalence of deep sedation in the ED in our study was similar to previous studies. Second, the
334 duration from intubation to the first documentation of light sedation was analyzed for the
335 primary outcome, which mainly depended on the frequency of nurse assessments and might not
336 be the actual time for achieving light sedation. For this reason, we also collected the sedation
337 score at four specific time points. The data was in the same direction: a higher frequency of deep
338 sedation at every time point and a longer time required to achieve light sedation were found in
339 the ED group. Third, unmeasured confounders between the location of intubation and the use of
340 post-intubation sedation could partially explain our findings. Finally, due to the retrospective

341 study design, the association between deep sedation and longer-term outcomes (e.g., 90-day
342 mortality, cognitive outcomes, etc.) could not be evaluated.

343

344 **Conclusion**

345 Patients intubated in the ED were more deeply sedated and took longer to achieve light sedation
346 than patients intubated in the ICU.

347

348 **Acknowledgements**

349 We thank Sumesh Shah, research coordinator and Stanley Oei, respiratory therapist for sharing
350 their screening database.

351

352

353 **References**

- 354 1. Rinderknecht AS, Dyas JR, Kerrey BT, Geis GL, Ho MH, Mittiga MR. Studying the
355 Safety and Performance of Rapid Sequence Intubation: Data Collection Method Matters. *Acad*
356 *Emerg Med.* 2017;24:411-21.
- 357 2. Tayal VS, Riggs RW, Marx JA, Tomaszewski CA, Schneider RE. Rapid-sequence
358 intubation at an emergency medicine residency: success rate and adverse events during a two-
359 year period. *Acad Emerg Med.* 1999;6:31-7.
- 360 3. Shehabi Y, Bellomo R, Reade MC, Bailey M, Bass F, Howe B, et al. Early intensive care
361 sedation predicts long-term mortality in ventilated critically ill patients. *Am J Respir Crit Care*
362 *Med.* 2012;186:724-31.
- 363 4. Shehabi Y, Bellomo R, Kadiman S, Ti LK, Howe B, Reade MC, et al. Sedation Intensity
364 in the First 48 Hours of Mechanical Ventilation and 180-Day Mortality: A Multinational
365 Prospective Longitudinal Cohort Study. *Crit Care Med.* 2018;46:850-9.
- 366 5. Tanaka LM, Azevedo LC, Park M, Schettino G, Nassar AP, Réa-Neto A, et al. Early
367 sedation and clinical outcomes of mechanically ventilated patients: a prospective multicenter
368 cohort study. *Crit Care.* 2014;18:R156.
- 369 6. Balzer F, Weiß B, Kumpf O, Treskatsch S, Spies C, Wernecke KD, et al. Early deep
370 sedation is associated with decreased in-hospital and two-year follow-up survival. *Crit Care.*
371 2015;19:197.
- 372 7. Stephens RJ, Dettmer MR, Roberts BW, Fowler SA, Fuller BM. Practice patterns and
373 outcomes associated with early sedation depth in mechanically ventilated patients: a systematic
374 review protocol. *BMJ Open.* 2017;7:e016437.

- 375 8. Devlin JW, Skrobik Y, Gélinas C, Needham DM, Slooter AJC, Pandharipande PP, et al.
376 Clinical Practice Guidelines for the Prevention and Management of Pain, Agitation/Sedation,
377 Delirium, Immobility, and Sleep Disruption in Adult Patients in the ICU. *Crit Care Med*.
378 2018;46:e825-e73.
- 379 9. Fuller BM, Roberts BW, Mohr NM, Knight WAt, Adeoye O, Pappal RD, et al. The ED-
380 SED Study: A Multicenter, Prospective Cohort Study of Practice Patterns and Clinical Outcomes
381 Associated With Emergency Department SEDation for Mechanically Ventilated Patients. *Crit*
382 *Care Med*. 2019;47:1539-48.
- 383 10. Stephens RJ, Ablordeppey E, Drewry AM, Palmer C, Wessman BT, Mohr NM, et al.
384 Analgosedation Practices and the Impact of Sedation Depth on Clinical Outcomes Among
385 Patients Requiring Mechanical Ventilation in the ED: A Cohort Study. *Chest*. 2017;152:963-71.
- 386 11. Cook TM, El-Boghdadly K, McGuire B, McNarry AF, Patel A, Higgs A. Consensus
387 guidelines for managing the airway in patients with COVID-19: Guidelines from the Difficult
388 Airway Society, the Association of Anaesthetists the Intensive Care Society, the Faculty of
389 Intensive Care Medicine and the Royal College of Anaesthetists. *Anaesthesia*. 2020;75:785-99.
- 390 12. Orser BA. Recommendations for Endotracheal Intubation of COVID-19 Patients. *Anesth*
391 *Anal*. 2020;130:1109-10.
- 392 13. Higgs A, McGrath BA, Goddard C, Rangasami J, Suntharalingam G, Gale R, Cook TM.
393 Guidelines for the management of tracheal intubation in critically ill adults. *Br J Anaesth*.
394 2018;120:323-52.
- 395 14. Tarwade P, Smischney NJ. Endotracheal intubation sedation in the intensive care unit.
396 *World J Crit Care Med*. 2022;11:33-9.

- 397 15. Russotto V, Myatra SN, Laffey JG, Tassistro E, Antolini L, Bauer P, et al. Intubation
398 Practices and Adverse Peri-intubation Events in Critically Ill Patients From 29 Countries. *JAMA*.
399 2021;325:1164-72.
- 400 16. Pandharipande PP, Pun BT, Herr DL, Maze M, Girard TD, Miller RR, et al. Effect of
401 Sedation With Dexmedetomidine vs Lorazepam on Acute Brain Dysfunction in Mechanically
402 Ventilated PatientsThe MENDS Randomized Controlled Trial. *JAMA*. 2007;298:2644-53.
- 403 17. Riker RR, Shehabi Y, Bokesch PM, Ceraso D, Wisemandle W, Koura F, et al.
404 Dexmedetomidine vs Midazolam for Sedation of Critically Ill Patients: A Randomized Trial.
405 *JAMA*. 2009;301:489-99.
- 406 18. Bauer TM, Ritz R, Haberthür C, Ha HR, Hunkeler W, Sleight AJ, et al. Prolonged
407 sedation due to accumulation of conjugated metabolites of midazolam. *Lancet*. 1995;346:145-7.
- 408 19. Motayagheni N, Phan S, Eshraghi C, Nozari A, Atala A. A Review of Anesthetic Effects
409 on Renal Function: Potential Organ Protection. *Am J Nephrol*. 2017;46:380-9.
- 410 20. Domi R, Huti G, Sula H, Baftiu N, Kaci M, Bodeci A, Pesha A. From Pre-Existing Renal
411 Failure to Perioperative Renal Protection: The Anesthesiologist's Dilemmas. *Anesth Pain Med*.
412 2016;6:e32386.
- 413 21. Smischney NJ, Kashyap R, Khanna AK, Brauer E, Morrow LE, Seisa MO, et al. Risk
414 factors for and prediction of post-intubation hypotension in critically ill adults: A multicenter
415 prospective cohort study. *PLoS One*. 2020;15:e0233852.
- 416 22. Perbet S, De Jong A, Delmas J, Futier E, Pereira B, Jaber S, Constantin JM. Incidence of
417 and risk factors for severe cardiovascular collapse after endotracheal intubation in the ICU: a
418 multicenter observational study. *Crit Care*. 2015;19:257.

- 419 23. Takahashi J, Goto T, Okamoto H, Hagiwara Y, Watase H, Shiga T, Hasegawa K.
420 Association of fentanyl use in rapid sequence intubation with post-intubation hypotension. Am J
421 Emerg Med. 2018;36:2044-9.
- 422 24. Stephens RJ, Dettmer MR, Roberts BW, Ablordeppey E, Fowler SA, Kollef MH, Fuller
423 BM. Practice Patterns and Outcomes Associated With Early Sedation Depth in Mechanically
424 Ventilated Patients: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Crit Care Med. 2018;46:471-9.

425

426

427 **Supporting information**

428 **S1 Appendix** Table E1-E8 and Fig E1

429

430

431

432

433




Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3






Figure 4