

A core outcome set for adult general ICU patients

Abstract

Purpose Randomised clinical trials should ideally use harmonised outcomes that are important to patients and to facilitate meta-analyses and ensuring generalisability. Core outcome sets for specific subsets of ICU patients exist, e.g., respiratory failure, delirium, and COVID-19, but not for ICU patients in general. Accordingly, we aimed to develop a core outcome set for adult general ICU patients.

Methods We developed a core outcome set in Denmark following the Core Outcome Measures in Effectiveness Trials (COMET) Handbook. We used a modified Delphi consensus process with multiple methods design, including literature review, survey, semi-structured interviews, and discussions with initially five Danish research panels, involving adult ICU survivors, family members, clinicians, and researchers. The core outcome set was internationally validated in local panels in 14 countries and revised accordingly.

Results We identified 329 published outcomes, of which 50 were included in the 264 participant Delphi survey. After 82 semi-structured survey participant interviews no additional outcomes were added. The first survey round was completed by 249 (94%) participants, and 202 (82%) contributed to the final third round. The initial core outcome set comprised six core outcomes. International validation involved 217 research panel members and resulted in the final core outcome set of survival, free of life support, free of delirium, out of hospital, health-related quality of life, and cognitive function.

Conclusions We developed and internationally validated a core outcome set with six core outcomes to be used in research, specifically clinical trials involving adult general ICU patients.

Keywords: intensive care, intensive care unit, critical care, core outcome set, patient and public involvement, patient-important outcomes

Authors

Maj-Brit Nørregaard Kjær^{1,2}, Camilla Rahbek Lysholm Bruun¹, Anders Granholm^{1,2}, Morten Hylander Møller^{1,2,3}, Bodil Steen Rasmussen^{2,4}, Camilla Bekker Mortensen⁵, Lone Musaeus Poulsen^{2,5}, Thomas Strøm^{2,6}, Eva Laerkner⁶, Anne Craveiro Brøchner^{2,7}, Trine Haberlandt⁷, Anne-Marie Gellert Bunzel⁴, Louise Stenbryggen Herløv⁵, Anna Holm⁸, Praleene Sivapalan¹, Stine Estrup¹, Maria Cronhjort^{2,9,10}, Anna Schandl^{9,11}, Jon Henrik Laake^{2,12}, Kristin Hofsvold^{2,13,14}, Fredrike Blokzijl¹⁵, Frederic Keus¹⁵, Carmen Andrea Pfortmueller^{2,16}, Marlies Ostermann^{2,17}, Jade M Cole¹⁸, Matt P Wise^{2,18}, Wojciech Szczeklik^{2,19}, Anna Wludarczyk¹⁹, Tomas Jovaiša²⁰, Maurizio Cecconi^{21,22}, Martin Ingi Sigurdsson^{2,23,24}, Marek Nalos^{2,25}, Johanna Hästbacka^{2,26}, Marja Mäkinen²⁷, Naomi Hammond^{28,29}, Edward Litton^{30,31}, Kimberley Haines^{32,33}, Sheila Nainan Myatra³⁴, Bharath Kumar Tirupakuzhi Vijayaraghavan^{35,36}, Kavita Yadav³⁶, Vivekanand Jha^{29,36,37,38}, Balasubramanian Venkatesh^{28,39}, Ingrid Egerod¹, Anders Perner^{1,2,3}, and Marie O Collet¹

¹ Department of Intensive Care, Copenhagen University Hospital - Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen, Denmark

² Collaboration for Research in Intensive Care (CRIC), Copenhagen, Denmark

³ Department of Clinical Medicine, Faculty of Health and Medical Science, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark

⁴ Department of Anaesthesia and Intensive Care, Aalborg University Hospital, Aalborg

⁵ Department of Anaesthesiology, Zealand University Hospital, Denmark

⁶ Department of Anaesthesiology and Intensive Care, Odense University Hospital, Odense

⁷ Department of Anaesthesia and Intensive Care, Lillebælt Hospital, Kolding, Denmark

⁸ Department of Intensive Care, Aarhus University Hospital, Aarhus

⁹ Department of Clinical Science and Education, Södersjukhuset, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden

¹⁰ Department of Clinical Sciences, Danderyd Hospital, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden

¹¹ Department of Perioperative and intensive care, Södersjukhuset, Stockholm, Sweden

¹² Department of Anaesthesiology and Intensive Care Medicine and Department of Research and Development, Division of Emergencies and Critical Care, Rikshospitalet, Oslo University Hospital, Norway

¹³ Department of Postoperative and Intensive Care Nursing, Division of Emergencies and Critical Care, Oslo University Hospital, Oslo, Norway

¹⁴ Lovisenberg Diaconal University College, Oslo, Norway

¹⁵ Department of Critical Care, University Medical Center Groningen, University of Groningen, The Netherlands

¹⁶ Department of Intensive Care Medicine, Inselspital, University Hospital Bern, Bern, Switzerland

¹⁷ Department of Intensive Care, Guy's and St Thomas' Hospital, London, The United Kingdom

¹⁸ Adult Critical Care, University Hospital of Wales, Cardiff

¹⁹ Jagiellonian University Medical College - Centre for Intensive Care and Perioperative Medicine

²⁰ Vilnius University, Faculty of Medicine, Clinic of Anaesthesiology and Intensive Care

²¹ Department of Biomedical Sciences, Humanitas University, 20072 Pieve Emanuele, Milan, Italy

²² Department of Anaesthesiology and Intensive Care, IRCCS Humanitas Research Hospital, 20089 Rozzano, Milan, Italy

²³ Faculty of Medicine, University of Iceland, Reykjavik Iceland

²⁴ Landspítali – the National University Hospital of Reykjavik, Iceland

²⁵ Medical Intensive Care Unit, 1st Department of Internal Medicine, Charles University, Faculty of Medicine, Teaching Hospital and Biomedical Center in Pilsen, Pilsen, Czech Republic

²⁶ Tampere University Hospital, Wellbeing Services County of Pirkanmaa and Tampere University, Faculty of Medicine and Health Technology, Tampere, Finland

²⁷ Department of Emergency Medicine and Services, Helsinki University and Helsinki University Hospital, Helsinki, Finland

²⁸ The George Institute for Global Health, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia

²⁹ Malcolm Fisher Department of Intensive Care, Royal North Shore Hospital, Sydney, Australia

³⁰ Intensive Care Unit, Fiona Stanley Hospital, Robin Warren Drive, Murdoch, Western Australia

³¹ School of Medicine, University of Western Australia, Crawley, Western Australia

³² Department of Physiotherapy, Western Health

³³ Department of Critical Care, Melbourne Medical School, The University of Melbourne

³⁴ Department of Anaesthesiology, Critical Care and Pain, Tata Memorial Hospital, Homi Bhabha National Institute, Mumbai, India

³⁵ Apollo Hospitals, Chennai, India

³⁶ The George Institute for Global Health, New Delhi, India

³⁷ Prasanna School of Public Health, Manipal Academy of Medical Sciences, India

³⁸ School of Public Health, Imperial College, London, UK

³⁹ Department of Intensive Care, Gold Coast University Hospital, Australia.

Corresponding author:

Maj-Brit Nørregaard Kjær

RN, MSc (Health Science), PhD student

Department of Intensive Care

Copenhagen University Hospital, Rigshospitalet

Blegdamsvej 9, DK-2100, Copenhagen, Denmark

E-mail: maj-brit.noerregaard.kjaer@regionh.dk

Introduction

Outcomes assessed in randomised clinical trials (RCTs) should ideally be important to patients and used consistently across trials to facilitate comparisons, generalisability, and valid meta-analyses to inform clinical guidelines [1, 2]. Acutely admitted intensive care unit (ICU) patients have a high mortality [3–5], hence this outcome is frequently used and often hypothesised to be affected by the interventions assessed in clinical trials in the ICU setting [6]. However, ICU survivors often report experiencing persistent physical, cognitive, and mental impairments [7–9], aspects that are not covered by survival alone.

Outcome choices and definitions in critical care RCTs vary substantially, as illustrated by a recent scoping review revealing 103 distinct outcomes for assessing functional, neurological, and cognitive aspects and 29 distinct outcomes for health-related quality of life (HRQoL) [10]. The inconsistency in choices of outcomes and the definitions across RCTs involving ICU populations presents a challenge for comparison of trial results and evidence synthesis [10–13]. Therefore, it is important to establish a standardised approach to outcomes and measurements in [11, 14–16]. Involvement of patients, family members, clinicians, and researchers adds substantial value to discussions and prioritisation of outcomes [17–19].

Several core outcomes set (COS) have been developed for specific subsets of the ICU population, such as acute respiratory failure, delirium, or COVID-19, or for interventions, e.g., rehabilitation. However, there is no COS for the broad population of adult general ICU patients [7, 20–23], who do not fit into specific subsets, and may have a range of impairments.

The Intensive Care Platform Trial (INCEPT, www.incept.dk) will focus on assessing frequently used interventions in acutely ill ICU patients and has a need for a COS for the general ICU patient.

The aim of this study was to develop and internationally validate a generic COS for adult general ICU patients, regardless of the intervention assessed in the trials and involving a diversity of patients, family members, clinicians, and researchers with lived ICU experience.

Methods

We conducted a study using multiple methods design to develop a COS. Our approach incorporated a modified Delphi consensus process, and integrated a literature review, surveys, semi-structured interviews, and international external validation. The work took place between February 2021 and February 2024; the study was registered in the Core Outcome Measures in Effectiveness Trials (COMET) database (<https://comet-initiative.org/Studies/Details/1882>), and conducted following a published protocol [24]. The COS was developed in accordance with the COMET initiative [11] and reported according to the Core Outcome Set-STAndards for Reporting (COS-STAR) Statement [25], and Guidance for Reporting Involvement of Patients and the Public short form [26] (checklists in the electronic supplementary material (ESM)).

In line with the publicly registered protocol amendment [27], we conducted an international (external) validation of the initial COS. This involved international sites from the Collaboration for Research in Intensive Care (CRIC) network and its collaborators. The international validation process was initiated in November 2023 and completed in February 2024.

Participants

Stakeholder involvement

The steering committee (listed in author contributions) established research panels in Denmark to facilitate the involvement of persons with lived experience being adult ICU survivors (patients), family members, multi professional health care workers (clinicians), and researchers. The Danish research panels actively participated in condensing outcomes identified in the literature review. They were involved in developing survey questions, ensuring their cognitive validity through initial and inter-survey evaluations. Additionally, international research panels were established for the international validation (Table S1, ESM).

Survey and interview

We invited patients, family members, clinicians, and researchers from Denmark to participate in the Delphi survey and/or interviews. We aimed to include 400 participants: 100 patients, 100 family members and 200 multi professional ICU clinicians and researchers in the survey [24]. In addition, we targeted a total of 90 individual interviews: 30 patients, 30 family members, and 30 ICU clinicians or researchers. We recruited ICU survivors and family members directly in ICUs and via other ongoing research projects [24]. Clinicians and researchers were recruited via the steering committees' clinical- and research network. The sampling of participants aimed at balancing the distribution considering age, sex, ethnicities, admission type, risk of

mortality above and below 25% (defined by the Simplified Mortality Score for the Intensive Care Unit (SMS-ICU) score [28]), ICU length of stay, and time since ICU stay (details in ESM). We collected demographic and clinical data for the survey participants and interviewees (Table S2-S3, ESM) [24].

Process

Figure 1 illustrates the process for developing a COS involving a modified Delphi consensus process (step 1-4) and an additional internationally validation of the COS (step 5-6).

Step 1

Two authors (MNK and SE) independently and in duplicate conducted an initial literature review to identify relevant outcomes, results were compared and merged to one list of outcomes (search string and full list of outcomes in the ESM, Table S4) [24].

We conducted multiple meetings in Danish research panels to identify important outcomes, using the nominal group technique with face-to-face discussion in small groups aiming for immediate consensus [29]. These meetings helped to identify the most essential outcomes to inform the survey [29].

Step 2

Meetings were held between survey rounds to reach consensus on removal and inclusion of outcomes suggested in the first survey round. Participants in the Delphi survey rated the importance of an outcome on a Likert scale from 1-9 [11]. Ratings were categorised as follows: 1-3 the outcome was considered 'not important', 4-6 'important, but not critical', and 7-9 'critical' [24].

Consensus definition

Within each stakeholder group (patients, family members, clinicians, and researchers) consensus for an outcome was achieved when two criteria were met: 1) $\geq 70\%$ of the participants rated the outcome as 'critical' (a score ≥ 7), and 2) no more than $\leq 15\%$ of the participants rated the outcome 'not important' (≤ 3) [11, 24]. In the second and third survey rounds, participants were provided with their own score, the score from all four groups, and a summary score.

Step 3

Following the final survey round, four research panels (the fifth research panel withdrew due to no patients in the panel at the time) met to reach consensus on the most important outcomes.

Step 4

Subsequently, the steering committee convened to obtain consensus on the initial COS following review of comments on several suggested outcomes from the research panels.

Step 5

The international steering committee (listed in author contributions) familiarised themselves with the modified Delphi consensus process. This involved studying the condensed outcomes in the survey, reviewing the survey results, and understanding the rationale behind the initial COS (ESM, page 23). Investigators from each country established local research panels (Figure 1, Step 5). International research panels were briefed on the initial COS and its underlying rationale. Utilising the nominal group technique with face-to-face discussion in smaller groups [29], all countries discussed each single core outcome and reached a consensus on whether to adopt them as they were, adapt them (i.e., accept with changes), or reject them. Minutes from the meetings are presented in the ESM Table S5. Two online meetings, due to time zones, including the international steering committee, was convened on January 30, 2024, to address all issues raised during the international validation process.

Consensus definition

For the international validation, a predefined cut-off value for consensus was not established. However, the protocol amendment outlined, a transparent process for all participating countries, ensuring that any issues raised during the consensus process discussions were documented [27].

Step 6

The steering committee considered the feedback from the international research panels and revised the wording of the COS accordingly. The revised COS was then reassessed by the Danish and international research panels and approved.

Analysis

For the qualitative analysis, the semi-structured interviews were transcribed (Microsoft Word 2016, Microsoft Corporation, Redmond, Washington), and were then reviewed by the research team (MNK, CRLB, AMGB, AH, MOC) who identified potentially new outcomes. All survey rounds in the Delphi consensus process were delivered electronically using the web based DelphiManager software version 5.0 (COMET, University of Liverpool, Liverpool; www.comet-initiative.org/delphimanager). For statistical analyses, we used R (R Core Team, Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria) version 4.2.2, and Microsoft Excel 2016 (Microsoft Corporation, Redmond, Washington).

We used descriptive statistics to report the population, ratings, and responses of survey rounds with frequencies and proportions for categorical data and medians and interquartile ranges for numeric data. Less than 20% of data were missing. As per protocol, missing data were handled by carrying the last observation forward (further details in the ESM, Table S6) [24].

Ethics and consent

All Danish participants in the survey and interviews provided written informed consent either by signature (interviews) or ticking confirmed consent in the survey registration. All data were handled confidentially, and participants could withdraw their consent anytime. The Danish Data Protection Agency and Ethical Committee for the Capital Region waived the need for ethical committee assessment (H-21010116).

Results

Participants

A total of 380 participants took part in the Delphi survey, of whom 90 were invited for interviews by quota sampling [30]; 82 completed the interviews. The inclusion flow and response rate are presented in Figure 2 and characteristics of the survey participants are presented in Table 1 (all characteristics are presented in ESM, Table S2-S3).

A total of 217 research panel members participated in the development of the COS (ESM, Table S1). The 4 research panels in Denmark had a total of 39 members (47 in the 5 initial panels) consisting of 8 patients, 5 family members, 17 clinicians, and 9 researchers. The 17 international research panels had a total of 178 members consisting of 46 patients, 26 family members, 60 clinicians, and 46 researchers (ESM, Table S4).

Step 1

First, the 329 outcomes from the literature review were screened for duplicates by MNK, CBM, PS, SE, LMP, EL, and MOC and with thematic analysis the outcomes were condensed in categories and translated to Danish. The Danish research panels reached consensus on condensing the outcomes 50 outcomes, more details in the ESM.

Step 2

The 82 interviews provided 9 additional outcomes to be considered (ESM, Table S7), but the Danish research panels concluded that they were already covered by the initial 50 outcomes.

In response to comments received during the first survey round and uncertainties raised by our Danish research panels, we adjusted the second survey round while maintaining the same set of 50 outcomes (ESM, Table S8). For all three rounds, we generated graphs depicting the scores on the Likert scale from 1-9 for each outcome and distributed them to all survey participants (Figure S1-S150, ESM).

Overall, the 50 outcomes were all considered important for inclusion (Figure S151, ESM). There was more variation among clinicians compared with patients and family members (Figure S152, ESM). The largest decline in response rates from the first to the final round was among family members and clinicians (Table S6, ESM).

Step 3

Informed by the survey findings, the Danish research panels convened at separate consensus meetings. Each panel, prioritized between 9 and 13 outcomes for inclusion in the COS (Figure 1 and ESM, Table S8). After removing overlaps, a total of 19 unique outcomes emerged. One additional outcome, suggested by one research panel, was included to be assessed by the steering committee for the initial COS.

Step 4

From the 19 outcomes, the steering committee agreed on six core outcomes, including the four that were deemed 'critical' by all Danish panels, thus defining the initial, Danish COS (Figure 3). Other outcomes were discussed, such as 'health-economic consequences of a treatment in ICU', 'discharge location after hospitalisation', and particularly 'overall well-being'. 'Well-being' may be considered part of HRQoL after ICU, and there was consensus not to include the additional discussed outcomes in the COS (ESM, Table S9).

Step 5

Seventeen research panels in 13 countries (excluding Denmark) validated the initial COS (ESM, Table S1 and Table S10). Detailed minutes from all international research panels are provided in ESM, Table S5.

Three core outcomes were generally accepted: 'survival', 'free of life support', and 'HRQoL'. During the international validation process, discussions were centred on the other initial core outcomes. It was considered for 'days alive without coma or delirium' that coma and delirium could not reasonably be amalgamated into a single outcome measure, and it was difficult to define coma and assess delirium, with delirium being a fluctuating mental state. 'Days alive out of hospital', and 'cognitive function' were rejected by one panel (5%), while three panels (14%) suggested that both outcomes should be adapted. 'Days alive out of hospital' should incorporate returning to home or previous level of function and 'cognitive function' could be considered as a domain of the HRQoL outcome.

The initial COS was revised based on the minutes from the international consensus meeting. An updated COS was then presented for feedback from the Danish and international research panels (Table 2, Figure 3).

Step 6

The final internationally validated COS included survival, free of life support, free of delirium, out of hospital, HRQoL, and cognitive function. The COS reached unanimous consensus on 'survival', 'free of life support', and 'health-related quality of life'. The remaining three outcomes had at least 90% consensus. For 'out of hospital', two panels (10%) recommended adapting it to include 'returning to pre-ICU condition'.

One panel (5%) rejected 'free of delirium' because of practicalities and tools around assessing delirium (ESM, Page 228). Regarding 'cognitive function', two panels (10%) recommended adaptation to include this measure in HRQoL (Table 2, Figure 3).

Discussion

We employed a multiple methods study incorporating a 3-round modified Delphi survey and an international validation process. This resulted in consensus of 6 core outcomes for adult, general ICU patients being: ‘survival’, ‘free of life support’, ‘free of delirium’, ‘out of hospital’, ‘HRQoL’, and ‘cognitive function’.

The inclusion of ‘survival’, ‘HRQoL’, and ‘cognitive function’ align with the COS for acute respiratory failure developed by Needham and colleagues [23, 31, 32]. However, our COS diverges by not including ‘muscle and/or nerve function’ and ‘pulmonary function’, likely relevant for patients with acute respiratory failure [32]. Conversely, our COS includes ‘free of life support’, ‘free of delirium’, and ‘out of hospital’, which were not included by Needham et al. Other core outcomes, including pain, mental health, and physical function, were all discussed during our consensus meetings. Although, ultimately not included in our COS, these will be considered when developing the subsequent core outcome measurement set.

Delirium was a critical outcome during all three rounds of the Delphi survey involving various stakeholders. In the international validation, it was highlighted due to its frequent occurrence and its burdensome nature for ICU patients, family members, and clinicians. It was acknowledged that delirium is a fluctuating state that can be challenging to detect [33]. Rose and colleagues developed a COS specifically for research interventions that aim to treat or prevent delirium in critically ill patients, underscoring the importance of this outcome [34].

The usability of our COS is somewhat constrained until the next step, which involves exact definitions, including the selection of appropriate instruments for their measurement and the timing of their assessments [11, 24]. Our future development of a standardised core outcome measurement set will also adhere to the COMET Handbook and COnsensus-based Standards for the selection of health status Measurement Instruments (COSMIN) initiatives [11, 35] and will involve the established research panels.

Strengths and limitations

The strengths of this study. First, a diverse stakeholder involvement, which includes patients, family, and clinicians and researchers. Second, we actively involved stakeholders throughout the entire process and ensured well-balanced consensus meetings using nominal group technique [29]. Third, from the outset, we proactively planned for stakeholder inclusion within the modified Delphi process [24]. Fourth, the semi-structured interviews represented an opportunity to potentially reveal outcomes that had not been

identified in our literature search. Fifth, we adhered rigorously to the modified Delphi process as described in the COMET Handbook. We also published the protocol before study commencement, following relevant COS-STAR recommendations [11]. Sixth, the Delphi process exhibited a high response rate without the necessity for response imputation. However, distinguishing between COS and the core outcome measurement set (instruments) posed a challenge during the consensus discussions, as some core outcomes definitions are influenced by how they are assessed. Seventh, we opted to enhance the COS relevance by an international validation process, encouraged by commenting on the published protocol to incorporate a broader context [27, 36]. This additional step aimed to strengthen the applicability of the initial COS. Consensus discussions in native languages further improved the applicability and generalisability of the COS. Furthermore, we anticipate that the international research panels will continue contributing to research in intensive care, as proven successful in other medical specialties [37].

Limitations of this study. First, the modified Delphi consensus process was confined to Denmark. Second, the decision to involve international collaborators in the validation process was made *post hoc*, following the completion of the Danish COS as outlined in the protocol [24]. We subsequently, registered the amendment to the protocol before conducting the international validation [27]. This approach offered a practical way of involving multiple international sites in the consensus development of a COS even though the panels may not have been fully representative of their countries. Third, convincing colleagues in other countries to the use of the COS may be challenged based on what is considered important in clinical practice and practise variations. In the context of randomised trials, random allocation will reduce this challenge. Additionally, we collaborated with a diverse array of countries, each with its unique case mix and economic circumstances, enhancing the generalisability of our findings. Despite varied perspectives and robust discussions during the consensus process, the final COS emerged consistently across all countries, underscoring the rigor of its development.

Conclusions

We have developed and internationally validated a COS for ICU patients in general with six core outcomes. These are ‘survival’, ‘free of life support’, ‘free of delirium’, ‘out of hospital’, ‘health-related quality of life’, and ‘cognitive function’, and we encourage its use in future research, specifically clinical trials in the ICU setting.

Acknowledgements

We thank all 22 research panels who took part in the development of this core outcome set for their time and efforts.

From the Danish national research panels:

From the **Capital Region of Denmark** we thank Rasmus Hansen, Michael Piil Petersen, and Kent Bering (patients), Tine Piil Petersen, and Maria Høpner (family members), and Nicolai Haase (medical doctor). From the **Region Zealand** we thank Jan Müller (patient), Listbeth Christiansen (ICU nurse), Lars Nebrich (intensivist), and Laura Gandrup Kølby (occupational therapist). From the **North Denmark Region** Hans Henrik Svane (patient), Majbritt Svane (family member), Ruth Bliksted (physiotherapist), Karin Rehnolt Pedersen (ICU nurse), Maria Anker Thyø (intensivist), Heidi Yde Herrig (occupational therapist), Stine, Rom Vestergaard (ICU nurse). From the **Region of Southern Denmark** Tatjana Pihlkjær (physiotherapist), Jette West Larsen (ICU nurse), and Ib Højer Witt (patient), and Peter Martin Hansen, Jens Michelsen (medical doctor), Christine Haugaaard (ICU nurse), Mads Bisgaard Borup (physiotherapist), and Mette Bang Jørgensen (patient), Morten Borup (medical doctor), Henning Nielsen (Patient), Anne-Marie Nielsen (Family member). Leme Lehmkuhl from the Department of Anaesthesiology and Intensive Care, OUH Svendborg for recruiting patients and relatives for the modified Delphi survey.

We specifically thank all international research panels and collaborators:

From the research panels in **Australia**: Henry Hamelink, Sharon Knapp, Matt Maiden, Pamela McArdle, Peter McArdle, Alea Mclean, Jing Ning, Anne Marie Palermo, Sue Pellicano, Abbey Spinelli, Matt Spinelli, Lisa Van Der Lee, and Jake Dye (sepsis survivors, Regional/Victoria), Anthony Delaney (intensivist, Metro/New South Wales), Kirsten Thompson (sepsis coordinator/policy, Regional/Northern Territory), Frances Bass (research nurse, Metro/New South Wales), Matthew Ames (sepsis survivor, Metro/Queensland), Diane Ames (family perspective, Metro/Queensland), Amy Freeman-Sanderson (ICU Speech Pathologist, Metro/New South Wales), Andrew Udy (intensivist, Metro/Victoria), Brett Abbenbroek (ICU nurse, Metro/Queensland), Alex Poole (ICU nurse/researcher, Metro/Queensland), Priya Nair (intensivist, Metro/New South Wales), Simon Finfer (intensivist, Metro/New South Wales).

From the research panel in **Czech Republic**: Stepan Marecek, Nikola Musilova, Romana Musilova, Daniel Nalos, Mrs Hana Modrova (patients, and family members). Katerina Rusinova and Martin Balik (medical doctors).

From the research panels in **Finland**: Hanna Lahti, Hemmo Lahti, Heidi Kiiltomäki, Simo Hentonen, Ville Jalkanen (Tampere) and Pirkka Pekkarinen, Marjaana Tiainen, Leena Saarinen, Merja Heitto, Jarmo Heitto (Helsinki).

From the research panel in **Iceland**: Jakob V Finnbogason (ICU patient), Sigríður G Árnadóttir (relative), Árni Már, Ólöf S Sigurðardóttir, and Hrönn Birgisdóttir (ICU nurses), Sigurbergur Karason (ICU physician).

From the research panel in India (Mumbai): JV Divatia (Intensivist) Srinivas Samavedam (Intensivist) Rajiv Shah (ICU patient), Poonam Kharde (family member), Anjana Rane (Nurses). Others do not wish to be named.

From the research panel in India (Chennai): Bhuvana Krishna (Intensivist), JV Peter (Intensivist), H. Aishwarya (Respiratory therapist), Ram Rajagopalan (Intensivist), Vinitha Vijay (Nurse), Shree Lekha Madhav (Family member), Manikandan Ganeshan (Patient), Sarasa Mani (Patient), and Nandkumar N (Family member).

From the research panel in **Italy**: Giuseppe Bianco, Mariano Aresu, Viktoriya Kravchuk, Salvatore Ruggeri, and Barbara Gramegna (Patients) and Elena Costantini, Luca Carengo, Daniela Elli (Department. of Anaesthesiology and Intensive Care, Humanitas Research Hospital, Milan) and Massimo Antonelli

(Department. of Anesthesiology and Intensive Care Medicine, Gemelli Hospital, Rome) and Giacomo Grasselli (Dipartimento de Anestesia, Milan and Department. of Pathophysiology and Transplantation, Policlinico Maggiore, Milan).

From the research panels in **Lithuania**: Mindaugas Serpytis, Ingrida Lissauskiene, Jokubas Stanaitis, Sarunas Judickas, Albinas Kalimavicius

From the research panels in **the Netherlands**: Siep Bos (Patient representative), Otto Polling (Patient representative), and Elza van den Berg (Research nurse).

From the research panels in **Norway**: Tom Rosenvinge (Patient representative, Mogreina), Celine Semb Hagen Linde (Patient representative, Fornebu), and Roar Magne Norheim (Patient representative, Risør), and Kristina Struksnes Fjone (Physiotherapist/Researcher, Oslo), Reidar Kvåle (Clinician and Professor, Bergen), Pål Klepstad (Clinician and Professor, Trondheim).

From the research panels in **Poland** thanks to The Polish research panel and Ryszard Gawda (medical doctor).

From the research panels in **Sweden** thanks to The Swedish core outcome set panel members.

From the research panels in **Switzerland**: Marie-Madlen Jeitziner, Matthias Exl, Daniela Bertschi (Department. of Intensive Care, Inselspital, University Hospital Bern and University of Bern) Sabrina Grossenbach (Department. of Physiotherapy, Inselspital, University Hospital Bern and University of Bern).

From the research panels in **United Kingdom**: PPI representatives Sheila Brooks, Debra Williams, Steven-Lee Dyton-Thomas, David Wynn Morgan, Julian Williams (Cardiff, Wales) and Clinicians Dr Sarka Furmanova, Dr Julie Highfield, Gemma Jones, Rachael Parker, Dr Gareth Scholey, Paul Twose (University Hospital of Wales). PPI representatives Chantal Davies, Danny Castell, Simon Kennedy, Del London (London, UK) Ms Gill Radcliffe, Ms Jo Gilroy, Ms Fabiola DAmato, Dr Joel Meyer, Ms Rebeka Wright (Guy's and St Thomas' Hospital, London). The validation process was supported by the Intensive Care Society UK.

Author contributions

Conceptualisation: MNK, AG, MHM, AP, and MOC.

Data curation: MNK, CRLB, AG, MHM, BSR, CBM, TS, EL, ACB, TH, AMGB, LSH, AH, PS, SE, MC, AS, JHL, KH, FB, CP, MO, JMC, MPW, WS, AW, TJ, MC, MIS, MN, JH, MM, NH, EL, KH, SNM, BKTU, VJ, and MOC.

Formal analysis: MNK, and AG.

Funding acquisition: AG, MHM, AP, and MOC.

Investigation: all authors.

Methodology: MNK, AG, MHM, and MOC.

Project administration: in Denmark: MNK, CLRB, and MOC; internationally: MNK and CLRB.

Resources: MNK, CRLB, AG, MHM, BSR, CBM, TS, EL, ACB, TH, AMGB, LSH, AH, MC, AS, JHL, KH, FB, CP, MO, JMC, MPW, WS, AW, TJ, MC, MIS, MN, JH, MM, NH, EL, KH, SNM, BKTU, KY, VJ, and MOC.

Supervision: AG, MHM, AP, and MOC.

Validation: MNK, CRLB, AG, MHM, BSR, CBM, TS, EL, ACB, TH, AMGB, LSH, AH, PS, SE, MC, AS, JHL, KH, FB, CP, MO, JMC, MPW, WS, AW, TJ, MC, MIS, MN, JH, MM, NH, EL, KH, SNM, BKTU, KY, VJ, and MOC.

Visualization: MNK, and AG.

Writing – first draft: MNK.

Writing – reviewing & editing: all authors.

Steering committee, authors: MNK, CRLB, AG, BSR, CBM, LMP, TS, EL, ACB, TH, AMGB, LSH, IE, and MOC.

International CRIC partners, authors: MC, AS, JHL, KH, FB, CP, MO, JMC, MPW, WS, AW, TJ, MC, MIS, MN, JH, MM, NM, EL, KH, SNM, VH, BV, and BKTV.

International steering committee, authors: MNK, CRLB, AG, BSR, CBM, LMP, TS, EL, ACB, TH, AMGB, LSH, IE, MOC, MC, AS, JHL, KH, FB, CP, MO, JMC, MPW, WS, AW, TJ, MC, MIS, MN, JH, MM, NM, EL, KH, SNM, VH, BV, KY, and BKTV.

Funding

The development of this COS is as part of the Intensive Care Platform Trial (INCEPT) research programme (www.incept.dk), which is funded by grants from Sygeforsikringen “danmark”, and The Novo Nordisk foundation, and supported by Grosserer Jakob Ehrenreich og Hustru Grete Ehrenreichs Fond, Savværksejer Jeppe Juhl og Hustru Ovita Juhls Mindelegat, and Dagmar Marshalls Fond. The funders had no influence on any aspects of this study.

The Australian Core Outcome Set initiative was supported by National Critical Care Research Platform through an MRFF grant (MRFF2023066), EL received funding from NHMRC Investigator Fellowship (GNT2017081), The George Institute for Global Health, and the Fiona Stanley Hospital Intensive Care Unit. The Department of Intensive Care, Guy’s and St Thomas’ Hospital, London, received research funding from Biomerieux and Baxter for AKI research.

Conflicts of interest

The Department of Intensive Care at Rigshospitalet receives funding for other projects from The Novo Nordisk Foundation, Grosserer Jakob Ehrenreich og Hustru Grete Ehrenreichs Fond, and the Beckett Foundation.

References


1. Blackwood B, Marshall J, Rose L (2015) Progress on core outcome sets for critical care research. *Curr Opin Crit Care* 21:439–444. <https://doi.org/10.1097/MCC.0000000000000232>
2. Møller MH (2019) Patient-important outcomes and core outcome sets: increased attention needed! *BJA Br J Anaesth* 122:408–410. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bja.2019.02.007>
3. Meyhoff TS, Hjortrup PB, Wetterslev J, et al (2022) Restriction of Intravenous Fluid in ICU Patients with Septic Shock. *N Engl J Med* 386:2459–2470. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2202707>
4. Kjær M-BN, Meyhoff TS, Sivapalan P, et al (2023) Long-term effects of restriction of intravenous fluid in adult ICU patients with septic shock. *Intensive Care Med* 49:820–830. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-023-07114-8>
5. Andersen-Ranberg NC, Poulsen LM, Perner A, et al (2022) Haloperidol for the Treatment of Delirium in ICU Patients. *N Engl J Med*. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2211868>
6. Harhay MO, Wagner J, Ratcliffe SJ, et al (2014) Outcomes and statistical power in adult critical care randomized trials. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 189:1469–1478. <https://doi.org/10.1164/rccm.201401-0056CP>
7. Hiser SL, Fatima A, Ali M, Needham DM (2023) Post-intensive care syndrome (PICS): recent updates. *J Intensive Care* 11:23. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40560-023-00670-7>
8. Herridge MS, Azoulay É (2023) Outcomes after Critical Illness. *N Engl J Med* 388:913–924. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMra2104669>
9. Rousseau A-F, Prescott HC, Brett SJ, et al (2021) Long-term outcomes after critical illness: recent insights. *Crit Care Lond Engl* 25:108. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13054-021-03535-3>
10. Granholm A, Anthon CT, Kjær M-BN, et al (2022) Patient-Important Outcomes Other Than Mortality in Contemporary ICU Trials: A Scoping Review. *Crit Care Med* 50:e759–e771. <https://doi.org/10.1097/CCM.0000000000005637>
11. Williamson PR, Altman DG, Bagley H, et al (2017) The COMET Handbook: version 1.0. *Trials* 18:280. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13063-017-1978-4>
12. Turnbull AE, Rabiee A, Davis WE, et al (2016) Outcome Measurement in ICU Survivorship Research From 1970 to 2013: A Scoping Review of 425 Publications. *Crit Care Med* 44:1267–1277. <https://doi.org/10.1097/CCM.0000000000001651>
13. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, et al (2011) GRADE guidelines: 2. Framing the question and deciding on important outcomes. *J Clin Epidemiol* 64:395–400. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2010.09.012>
14. Kirkham JJ, Williamson P (2022) Core outcome sets in medical research. *BMJ Med* 1:e000284. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjmed-2022-000284>
15. Williams TA, Leslie GD (2011) Challenges and possible solutions for long-term follow-up of patients surviving critical illness. *Aust Crit Care Off J Confed Aust Crit Care Nurses* 24:175–185. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aucc.2011.03.001>

16. McKenzie JE, Brennan SE, Ryan RE, et al (2023) Chapter 3: Defining the criteria for including studies and how they will be grouped for the synthesis. In: *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions*, Version 6.4. Cochrane, 2023, Available from www.training.cochrane.org/handbook.
17. Karazivan P, Dumez V, Flora L, et al (2015) The patient-as-partner approach in health care: a conceptual framework for a necessary transition. *Acad Med J Assoc Am Med Coll* 90:437–441. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000000603>
18. Estrup S, Barot E, Mortensen CB, et al (2023) Patient and public involvement in contemporary large intensive care trials: A meta-epidemiological study. *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand* 67:256–263. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aas.14183>
19. Tugwell P, Boers M, Brooks P, et al (2007) OMERACT: An international initiative to improve outcome measurement in rheumatology. *Trials* 8:38. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1745-6215-8-38>
20. Dinglas VD, Cherukuri SPS, Needham DM (2020) Core outcomes sets for studies evaluating critical illness and patient recovery. *Curr. Opin. Crit. Care* 26:489–499
21. Needham DM, Davidson J, Cohen H, et al (2012) Improving long-term outcomes after discharge from intensive care unit: report from a stakeholders' conference. *Crit Care Med* 40:502–509. <https://doi.org/10.1097/CCM.0b013e318232da75>
22. Spies CD, Krampe H, Paul N, et al (2020) Instruments to measure outcomes of post-intensive care syndrome in outpatient care settings – Results of an expert consensus and feasibility field test. *J Intensive Care Soc* 1751143720923597. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1751143720923597>
23. Turnbull AE, Sepulveda KA, Dinglas VD, et al (2017) Core Domains for Clinical Research in Acute Respiratory Failure Survivors: An International Modified Delphi Consensus Study. *Crit Care Med* 45:1001–1010. <https://doi.org/10.1097/CCM.0000000000002435>
24. Kjær M-BN, Granholm A, Vesterlund GK, et al Development of a core outcome set for general intensive care unit patients – a protocol. *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand* n/a: <https://doi.org/10.1111/aas.14024>
25. Kirkham JJ, Gorst S, Altman DG, et al (2016) Core Outcome Set–STAndards for Reporting: The COS-STAR Statement. *PLOS Med* 13:e1002148. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1002148>
26. Staniszewska S, Brett J, Simera I, et al (2017) GRIPP2 reporting checklists: tools to improve reporting of patient and public involvement in research. *BMJ* j3453. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.j3453>
27. Kjær M-BN, Bruun CRL, Granholm A, et al (2023) External validation of a core outcome set developed in Denmark for the general ICU patient – protocol amendment to an ongoing modified Delphi consensus process. <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/QUGYW>
28. Granholm A., Perner A., Krag M., et al (2017) Development and internal validation of the Simplified Mortality Score for the Intensive Care Unit (SMS-ICU). *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand* 62:336–346. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aas.13048>
29. McMillan SS, King M, Tully MP (2016) How to use the nominal group and Delphi techniques. *Int J Clin Pharm* 38:655–662. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11096-016-0257-x>

30. Makwana D, Engineer P, Dabhi A, Hardik C (2023) Sampling Methods in Research: A Review. 7:762–768
31. Dinglas VD, Cherukuri SPS, Needham DM (2020) Core outcomes sets for studies evaluating critical illness and patient recovery. *Curr Opin Crit Care* 26:489–499. <https://doi.org/10.1097/MCC.0000000000000750>
32. Needham DM, Sepulveda KA, Dinglas VD, et al (2017) Core Outcome Measures for Clinical Research in Acute Respiratory Failure Survivors: An International Modified Delphi Consensus Study. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* N Y 196:1122–1130. <http://dx.doi.org.ep.fjernadgang.kb.dk/10.1164/rccm.201702-0372OC>
33. Kotfis K, Marra A, Ely EW (2018) ICU delirium - a diagnostic and therapeutic challenge in the intensive care unit. *Anaesthesiol Intensive Ther* 50:160–167. <https://doi.org/10.5603/AIT.a2018.0011>
34. Rose L, Burry L, Agar M, et al (2021) A Core Outcome Set for Research Evaluating Interventions to Prevent and/or Treat Delirium in Critically Ill Adults: An International Consensus Study (Del-CORs). *Crit Care Med* 49:1535–1546. <https://doi.org/10.1097/CCM.0000000000005028>
35. Mokkink LB, Prinsen CAC, Bouter LM, et al (2016) The COnsensus-based Standards for the selection of health Measurement INstruments (COSMIN) and how to select an outcome measurement instrument. *Braz J Phys Ther* 20:105–113. <https://doi.org/10.1590/bjpt-rbf.2014.0143>
36. Pari V, Beane A, Salluh JIF, Dongelmans DA (2022) Development of a core outcome set for general intensive care unit patients-Need for a broader context? *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand* 66:539–540. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aas.14031>
37. Gregory S, Bunnik EM, Callado AB, et al (2020) Involving research participants in a pan-European research initiative: the EPAD participant panel experience. *Res Involv Engagem* 6:62. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40900-020-00236-z>

Figures, tables, and legends

Figure 1.




COS: core outcome set, CRIC: Collaboration of Research in Intensive Care

The 329 outcomes were condensed to 50 outcomes by the steering committee and the 5 Danish research panels. Semi-structured interviews were initiated during the preparation of the Delphi survey and ran concurrently with the first survey round. These interviews were used to identify additional outcomes for potential inclusion. Nine outcomes (ESM) were identified and discussed with the 5 Danish research panels but was unanimously decided against inclusion because they were adjudicated irrelevant.

During the process, one panel left the process due to withdrawal of patients and family members from that panel. After the development of the initial Danish COS the international CRIC partners and 17 international research panels were involved in the following consensus process.


^a There were 9 outcomes considered from the 82 interviews (ESM, Table S7), however, a consensus was reached across the national research panels that they were already covered by the 50 outcomes in the survey. Therefore, there were no additional outcomes revealed from the interviews.

Figure 2. Flow diagram for the participants being interviewed and registered for the Delphi survey



Attrition between the rounds is calculated from the number of completion from the first round as defined in the protocol [27]. Distributions of panel members in all rounds are shown in ESM, Table S6.

Figure 3. The initial Danish COS and the adjusted international COS



COS: core outcome set, HRQoL: health-related quality of life.

The suggested outcomes covered by HRQoL are to be found in ESM, Table S9.

Wording of the initial Danish COS was considered and agreed to be changed for three outcomes (grey arrows). The changes entailed in highlighting the essential outcome, more than how to measure the outcome, which will be clarified when the core outcome measurement set is defined.

Table 1. Characteristics of stakeholders in the Delphi survey and the semi-structured interviews

Characteristics of stakeholders for the first round of the Delphi survey (n=264)				
	Patients n=65	Family members n=49	Clinicians ^e n=136	Researchers ^f n=14
Age (years)	62 (50 to 70)	59 (47 to 65)	46 (39 to 52)	41 (37 to 48)
Sex (female)	21 (32%)	34 (69%)	93 (68%)	9 (64%)
Other ethnicity than Danish ^a	4 (6%)	1 (2%)	5 (4%)	3 (21%)
Admission type				
- Surgical	29 (47%)	-	-	-
- Medical	33 (53%)	-	-	-
SMS-ICU ^b at ICU admission ^c	20 (13.5 to 22.0)	-	-	-
- <17 point	23 (37%)	-	-	-
- ≥17 point	40 (63%)	-	-	-
Self-reported critical illness severity ^d	10.0 (8.5 to 10.0)	-	-	-
ICU length of stay (days) ^c	9.0 (6.0 to 22.5)	-	-	-
Time since ICU stay (months) ^c	14 (3 to 20)	-	-	-
Assistance to fill in the survey	11 (17%)	-	-	-
Family to a deceased patient	-	5 (10%)	-	-
Characteristics of stakeholders participating in the semi-structured interviews (n=82)				
	Patients n=27	Family members n=25	Clinicians ^e n=26	Researchers ^f n=4
Age (years)	60 (50 to 68)	54 (41 to 60)	45 (43 to 48)	43 (38 to 48)
Sex (female)	13 (48%)	18 (72%)	21 (81%)	4 (100%)
Other ethnicity than Danish ^{a,g}	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	3 (10%)	0 (0%)
Admission type				
- Surgical ^b	13 (48%)	-	-	-
- Medical ^b	14 (52%)	-	-	-
SMS-ICU ^b at ICU admission ^c	19 (15 to 22)	-	-	-
- <17 points	10 (37%)	-	-	-
- ≥17 points	17 (63%)	-	-	-
Self-reported critical illness severity ^d	9 (8 to 10)	-	-	-
ICU length of stay (days) ^c	9 (7 to 25)	-	-	-
Time since ICU admission (months) ^c	11 (4 to 17)	-	-	-
Family to a deceased patient	-	3 (12%)	-	-

ICU: intensive care unit, SMS-ICU: The Simplified Mortality Score for the Intensive Care Unit [28].

Numeric data are presented as medians with interquartile ranges, categorical data as counts with percentages.

^a Other than Danish origins covers both 'immigrants' (born abroad and neither parent being a Danish citizen or born in Denmark) and 'descendants' (born in Denmark and neither of the parents is a Danish citizen or born in Denmark) (Statistics Denmark, www.dst.dk). Danish origin means at least one parent born in Denmark with Danish citizenship (Statistics Denmark, www.dst.dk).

^b We aimed for a balanced distribution of patients with higher mortality risk ≥17 (predicted 90-day mortality risk of 25.3% and above) vs. lower risk <17 (predicted 90-day mortality risk of 22.8% and below) [24, 28]. Further details in the methods section.

^c These variables were obtained from the patients' medical records. For the survey there were two patients with missing medical record data. One withdrew consent, one where there were only paper medical records, which couldn't be located. No missing data for patients interviewed.

^d A numeric score (0-10 where 0 is non-critical and 10 is most critical). From either the patients' view or from the view of family members to ICU patients.

^e Multi professional clinicians cover doctors, nurses, physiotherapists, occupational therapists, and others (ESM, Table S2 and S3).

^f Multi professional researchers (ESM, Table S2 and S3).

^g Missing data for 2 patients, 1 family member, and 1 clinician.

Table 2. International validation of the core outcome set across the participating countries

Country	Adjusted core outcome set					
	Survival	Free of life support	Free of delirium	Out of hospital	HRQoL	Cognitive function
Australia ^b General ICU patient	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adapt ^h	Adopt	Adapt ^h
Australia ^b Sepsis survivors	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adapt ^h	Adopt	Adapt ^h
Czech Republic	Adopt ^h	Adopt ^h	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt
Denmark (Copenhagen) ^c	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt
Denmark (Køge) ^d	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt
Denmark (Kolding) ^e	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt
Denmark (Aalborg) ^f	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt
Finland (Helsinki)	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt
Finland (Tampere)	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt
Iceland	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt
India (Chennai) ^g	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt
India (Mumbai)	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt
Italy	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt
Lithuania	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt ^h
Norway	Adopt	Adopt	Reject ^h	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt
Netherlands	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt
Poland	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt
Sweden	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt
Switzerland	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt ^h	Adopt	Adopt
United Kingdom (Cardiff)	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt
United Kingdom (London)	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt	Adopt
Total adopted	21 (100%)	21 (100%)	20 (95%)	19 (90%)	21 (100%)	19 (90%)
Total adapted	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (10%)	0 (0%)	2 (10%)
Total rejected	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

HRQoL: Health-related quality of life

Colour interpretation: green/Adopt=adopting the outcome, yellow/Adapt=adapting the outcome, and red/Reject=rejecting the outcome.

Numbers (percentages) of panels.

^a Detailed minutes in ESM, Table S5

^b Number of participants from different areas of Australia: 1 Aboriginal, 11 Western Australia, 5 New South Wales, 4 Victoria, 3 Queensland, and 1 Northern Territory.

^c The Capital Region of Denmark

^d Region Zealand

^e The Region of Southern Denmark

^f The North Denmark Region

^g Indian areas represented: Chennai, Bangalore, Vellore, Pune, and New Delhi.

^h Remarks to the core outcome (ESM, Page 228-229).