

Consent in Canadian-Led Critical Care Research During the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Scoping Review

Karla Krewulak¹, Lisa Albrecht², Saoirse Cameron³, Jessica Gibson², Dori-Ann Martin^{4,5}, Rebecca Porteous⁶, Margaret Sampson², Katie O’Hearn²

¹Department of Critical Care Medicine, Cumming School of Medicine, University of Calgary, Calgary, AB, Canada

²Children's Hospital of Eastern Ontario Research Institute, 401 Smyth Road, Ottawa, ON, Canada

³Children's Hospital - London Health Sciences Centre, London, ON, Canada

⁴Department of Pediatrics, Cumming School of Medicine, University of Calgary, Calgary, AB, Canada

⁵Pediatric Intensive Care Unit, Alberta Children's Hospital Research Institute, University of Calgary, Calgary, AB, Canada

⁶Department of Critical Care Medicine, The Ottawa Hospital, Ottawa, ON, Canada

Corresponding Author:

Karla Krewulak

McCaig Tower, 0496 3260 Hospital Drive NW

Calgary, AB T2N 4Z6

kkrewula@ucalgary.ca

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Despite the importance of critical care research during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, several pandemic-related factors made the process of obtaining prior written informed consent for research infeasible. To overcome these challenges, research studies utilized alternate informed consent models suggested by available guidance.

Objective: To describe the consent models used in Canadian intensive care unit (ICU) and pediatric ICU (PICU) studies during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Data Sources: We searched MEDLINE, EMBASE, CENTRAL, clinicaltrials.gov, and medRxiv from 01-Jan-2020 to 28-Apr-2023 using Medical Subject Headings and keywords related to the setting (ICU, PICU), study design (e.g., RCT) and study region (i.e., Canada). We included Canadian-led studies that were enrolling during the SARS-CoV-2 and reported on consent. Two independent reviewers reviewed titles/abstracts and full text articles for inclusion.

Results: We included 13 studies from adult (n=12, 92.3%) and pediatric (n=1, 7.7%) populations. Some study authors reported that informed (n=3/13, 23.1%) or a priori (n=2/13, 15.4%) consent was obtained, without further details. Study authors also reported using written informed (n=4/13, 30.8%), deferred (n=3/13, 23.1%), verbal/waived/assent (each n=2/13, 15.4%), or that ethics approval was not necessary which means consent was not required (n=1/13, 7.7%). Five studies (n=5/13, 38.5%) used multiple consent models: a priori/deferred (n=2/5, 40%), written/verbal (n=2/5, 40%), or waived/assent (n=1/5, 20%).

Conclusion: This scoping review underscores the importance of transparent reporting of or modifications to trial procedures during crises, such as the COVID-19 pandemic. Improved reporting practices and exploration of alternate consent models, including electronic consent, are crucial for advancing critical care trials beyond the pandemic and preparing for future health emergencies.

INTRODUCTION

On March 11, 2020, the World Health Organization declared the worldwide outbreak of the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) a global pandemic. A substantial proportion of Canadians with coronavirus disease of 2019 (COVID-19) required intensive care unit (ICU) care. As a result, many ongoing research studies shifted to include COVID-19 patients, and many new studies specifically focused on COVID-19 were initiated. COVID-19 research became a global priority (1). At the same time, non-pandemic critical care research was still viewed as extremely important, as many of these studies would still be relevant for patients with COVID-19 (2,3).

Despite the importance of critical care research during the COVID-19 pandemic, several pandemic-related factors made the process of obtaining prior written informed consent for research infeasible. Canadian institutions implemented a work from home policy that prevented research staff from being onsite. Visitor restrictions prevented critically ill patients' Surrogate Decision Maker (SDM), who most commonly provide consent for intensive care unit (ICU) studies (4), from being present at the patient's bedside. When research staff were able to attend the ICU, infection control procedures prevented research staff from transferring the informed consent document into and out of a patient's room.

To overcome these challenges, research studies utilized alternate informed consent models suggested by available guidance (e.g., remote, waived consent) (2,5). Some of these changes, such as more flexibility in how consent can be documented for regulated clinical trials, may be beneficial for critical care research after the pandemic is over. However, to identify the consent process changes that may facilitate critical care research in the long-term, we first need a better understanding of how Canadian adult and pediatric ICU (PICU) studies (non-pandemic and pandemic related) adjusted their consent models and procedures during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Methods

Protocol and registration

We conducted a scoping review of the literature to describe the consent models reported by Canadian ICU and PICU studies conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic. The protocol and objectives were established and registered a priori (Open Science Framework: <https://osf.io/6kggha>) before commencing the systematic literature search. Our intention was to contact corresponding authors for the standard operating procedures or information on how consent changed. However, with the publication of the CONSERVE statement (6), we decided to instead summarize what was reported in included studies. This scoping review is reported according to PRISMA-ScR (7).

Eligibility criteria

Studies were included if they met the following criteria:

1. Study Design: Any original, published study including RCTs and quasi RCTs, observational cohort studies, survey studies, biobanking studies.
2. Outcome of Interest: Study reports any information about consent, including the consent model used (e.g., prior informed, waiver of consent, deferred), the consent rate (or information required to calculate the consent rate), and/or consent procedures.
3. Population of Interest: Study includes (P)ICU patients, or family members of (P)ICU patients.

4. Country of Origin: Study is Canadian led. The study can include sites from other countries but will be excluded unless the study is led or co-led by a Canadian investigative team (e.g., corresponding author is Canadian).
5. Language: Study is published in English or French.
6. Timeframe: The trial was actively recruiting during the COVID-19 pandemic, defined as March 11, 2020 (the date that the World Health Organization declared the worldwide outbreak of a global SARS-CoV-2 pandemic) to the date of the search.
7. Study Setting: Study occurs in an adult or pediatric ICU. A unit will be considered a PICU or ICU based on the authors' definition.

Information sources and search

We searched MEDLINE, EMBASE, and CENTRAL from 11-Mar-2020 to 28-Apr-2023 using the search strategy from a related study conducted by our research team (8). We performed manual searches in medRxiv (the preprint server for health sciences) for the terms "ICU," "PICU," "study," "trial," "canada" and "canadian." Though our intention was to use MeSH terms and keywords related to COVID-19 (per the registered protocol), we removed these two groups of search terms to capture non-pandemic related studies. We also removed to study design MeSH and keywords to capture articles that did not fit into predefined study design filters.

Selection of sources of evidence

Titles/abstracts screening, full-text screening, and data extraction were completed independently in duplicate using Covidence (www.covidence.org; Veritas Health Innovation, Melbourne, Australia). Conflicts were resolved through discussion until consensus was reached or by a third reviewer.

Data items

Data were abstracted using Covidence (www.covidence.org; Veritas Health Innovation, Melbourne, Australia) and piloted in duplicate using five eligible studies. Data were abstracted by two independent reviewers in duplicate. Consensus and/or resolution of conflicts were performed by a third reviewer, where necessary. From each included study, we included the following: 1) Study characteristics (study design, study population, sample size, number of sites, funding source, regulatory information), 2) Enrollment information (enrollment time windows, recruitment dates), 3) Consent information (i.e., consent model used, who obtained consent, consent rate, assent), 4) Changes due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Critical appraisal

Given the exploratory nature of this scoping review, we did not conduct critical appraisal of individual studies (9).

Synthesis of results

Data is summarized descriptively, which includes quantitative (i.e., frequencies, proportions) and qualitative analysis. For qualitative analysis, two coders used an iterative process to apply the framework method (10), which included the following steps: 1) familiarizing of extracted text; 2) open

coding (i.e., line by line coding of extracted text); 3) developing an analytical framework; 4) applying the analytical framework to the remaining extracted text; and 5) interpreting the data.

Results

Of 5,538 unique studies, 13 met inclusion criteria (**Figure 1**). Nearly all studies (n=12/13, 92.3%) were conducted in a critically ill adult population. This included pandemic (n=7/13, 54%) and non-pandemic (n=6/13, 46%) related studies. Most studies were randomized controlled trials (n=6/13, 46.2%) or prospective cohort studies (n=4/13, 30.8%).

Some studies reported that informed (n=3/13, 23.1%) or a priori (n=2/13, 15.4%) consent was obtained, without further details. Studies also reported using written informed (n=4/13, 30.8%), deferred (n=3/13, 23.1%), verbal/waived/assent (each n=2/13, 15.4%; assent from PICU youth), or that ethics approval was not necessary which means consent was not required (n=1/13, 7.7%). Five studies (n=5/13, 38.5%) used multiple consent models. This included a priori/deferred (n=2/5, 40%), written/verbal (n=2/5, 40%), or waived/assent (n=1/5, 20%). Only three (n=3/13, 23%) of the included studies began recruitment prior to the declaration of the pandemic on March 14, 2020. Though all three studies provided detail on the consent model used, none reported if the consent model was changed in response to the pandemic. As such, information on participant recruitment before/during the pandemic was also not reported. Information on included studies is displayed in **Table 1**.

Nine of the included studies (n=9/13, 69.2%; non-pandemic related: n=5; pandemic related: n=4) reported consent rate or included data to calculate consent rate. The consent rate for these nine studies ranged from 71% to 98% (non-pandemic related: 71%-98%; pandemic related: 76%-98%). The median (interquartile range [IQR]) consent rate for non-pandemic related studies was 81% (72%-81%) and for pandemic-related studies was 97% (92%-98%).

Discussion

The COVID-19 pandemic necessitated rapid changes to consent practices in Canadian (P)ICU studies while upholding ethical standards, to ensure that patient autonomy was not compromised while following institutional pandemic guidelines around physical distancing. The current study reports on the consent models used for trials during the pandemic. Although we hoped to identify how consent processes were changed as a direct result of the pandemic, no included manuscripts reported this.

A recent study described the consent rate for an observational research study enrolling pediatric cardiac ICU patients pre-pandemic (94%) and during the one-visitor policy during the COVID-19 pandemic (79%) (25). The studies included in our current scoping review did not report changes to consent rate pre- and during COVID-19. As this is reported in future work, it will be important to understand the reason for change to consent rate (e.g., due to the stress of the pandemic or the change in consent conversations with SDMs [e.g., telephone]), and if alternate consent models (e.g., electronic consent) could mitigate these effects.

Recent guidelines emphasize the importance of/need for transparent reporting of how trial procedures are modified during extenuating circumstances like the pandemic (6). This reporting is important to understand how/which protocol modifications can benefit research longer term (after the pandemic). These changes, such as greater acceptability of remote consent and alternate consent models (24), have

the potential to enhance critical care trial feasibility and accelerate recruitment (e.g., when SDMs are not present in person) beyond the pandemic.

This scoping review had strengths and limitations. The strengths include that this manuscript is reported according to PRISMA-ScR, that the search strategy was previously developed by an experienced health information specialist (MS) who is a co-author on this manuscript, and that the scoping review was conducted by and manuscript coauthored by (P)ICU research coordinators from across Canada. Limitations include that the scoping review focuses on consent models in Canadian-led trials and cannot be generalized to other countries which may have used different consent models.

Conclusion

This scoping review reports on the consent models employed in Canadian-led trial recruiting during the COVID-19 pandemic. Although we hoped to identify how consent processes were changed as a direct result of the pandemic, no included studies reported this. As future work unfolds, understanding the changes to consent models, such as electronic consent, is important for enhancing the feasibility and efficiency of critical care trials beyond the pandemic.

Conflict of interest: No authors have conflicts of interest to declare. This work was unfunded.




Figure 1. PRISMA diagram

Table 1. Study characteristics

Author (year) Reference	Study design	Sample size	Statement(s) of consent
<i>Adult ICU studies</i>			
Alhazzani (2022) (11)	RCT	400	"Study research coordinators obtained a priori or deferred consent for all enrolled patients."
Ali (2022) (12)	RCT	1,282	"Consent was either obtained a priori or deferred, as per the requirements of local ethics boards."
Angus (2020) (13)	RCT (Platform trial)	614	"Written or verbal informed consent, in accordance with local legislation, was obtained for all patients or from their surrogates."
Blanchet (2023) (14)	Prospective	193	"The study was approved by the IUCPQ Research Ethics Committee with a waiver of consent"
Chaudhuri (2023) (15)	Case series	16	"We obtained research ethics board approval using a waived consent model" "Written informed consent for participation was not required for this study in accordance with the national legislation and the institutional requirements."
Froese (2022) (16)	Prospective	42	"All patients had informed consent obtained as part of B2018:103."
Gordon (2021) (17)	RCT (Platform trial)	895	"Written or verbal informed consent, in accordance with regional legislation, is obtained from all the patients or their surrogates."
Hallot (2023) (18)	QI	160	"Research ethics approval was waived for this study"
Heyland (2022) (19)	RCT	1,200	"Written informed consent was obtained from each patient or the patient's designated surrogate before randomization."
Lau (2023) (20)	Prospective	226	"Waived consent for data was obtained given that TTE, TCD, and TEE are all within standard of care for severe hypoxemia at our institution (and de-identified registry data was available for all patients). Clinical assent/consent for TEE was obtained from either the patient's substitute decision-maker and/or attending physician."
Stoppe (2023) (21)	RCT	1,394	"Each patient gave written informed consent to participate in the study before surgery"
Trahtenberg (2021) (22)	Prospective	42	"Informed consent was obtained from the patients or their legal representatives. In cases where it was not possible to obtain consent, patients were enrolled using a deferred consent model and kept in the study until they regained capacity, or a surrogate decision maker was identified."
<i>Pediatric ICU studies</i>			

Moradi (2022) (23)	Qualitative	13	"Assent to be interviewed was obtained from the index patient if above 7 years old. Otherwise, consent was obtained from their caregiver and health care provider involved in the patient's care"
-----------------------	-------------	----	---

Abbreviations: ICU, Intensive Care Unit; NA, Not Applicable; NCT-National Clinical Trial (ClinicalTrials.gov) identifier; PMID, PubMed identifier; QI, quality improvement; RCT, randomized controlled trial; TCD, transcranial Doppler; TEE, transesophageal echocardiography; TTE, transthoracic echocardiography.

References

1. Cook DJ, Marshall JC, Fowler RA. Critical Illness in Patients With COVID-19. *JAMA*. 2020;323(16):1559.
2. Cook DJ, Kho ME, Duan EH, Alhazzani W, Takaoka A, Clarke FJ, Zytaruk N, Vanstone M. Principles Guiding Nonpandemic Critical Care Research During a Pandemic. *Crit Care Med*. 2020 Oct;48(10):1403-1410.
3. McDermott MM, Newman AB. Preserving Clinical Trial Integrity During the Coronavirus Pandemic. *JAMA*. 2020;323(21):2135-6.
4. Burns KE, Zubrinich C, Tan W, Raptis S, Xiong W, Smith O, et al. Research recruitment practices and critically ill patients. A multicenter, cross-sectional study (the Consent Study). *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2013;187(11):1212-8.
5. Government of Canada. Management of clinical trials during the COVID-19 pandemic: Notice to clinical trial sponsors 2021 [updated 2021-05-06. Available from: <https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/drugs-health-products/drug-products/announcements/management-clinical-trials-during-covid-19-pandemic.html>.
6. Orkin AM, Gill PJ, Ghersi D, et al. Guidelines for Reporting Trial Protocols and Completed Trials Modified Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic and Other Extenuating Circumstances: The CONSERVE 2021 Statement. *JAMA*. 2021;326(3):257–265.
7. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Annals of Internal Medicine*. 2018.
8. O'Hearn K, Gibson J, Krewulak K, Porteous R, Saigle V, Sampson M et al. Canadian Critical Care Trials Group. Consent models in Canadian critical care randomized controlled trials: a scoping review. *Can J Anaesth*. 2022 Apr;69(4):513-526.
9. Peters MDJ, Marnie C, Tricco AC, Pollock D, Munn Z, Alexander L, et al. Updated methodological guidance for the conduct of scoping reviews. *JBI Evidence Synthesis*. 2020;18(10):2119-26.
10. Gale NK, Heath G, Cameron E, Rashid S, Redwood S. Using the framework method for the analysis of qualitative data in multi-disciplinary health research. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2013;13:117.
11. Alhazzani W, Parhar KKS, Weatherald J, Al Duhailib Z, Alshahrani M, Al-Fares A, et al. COVI-PRONE Trial Investigators and the Saudi Critical Care Trials Group. Effect of Awake Prone Positioning on Endotracheal Intubation in Patients With COVID-19 and Acute Respiratory Failure: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA*. 2022 Jun 7;327(21):2104-2113.
12. Ali K, Azher T, Baqi M, Binnie A, Borgia S, Carrier FM, et al. Association of Medical Microbiology and Infectious Disease Canada (AMMI) Clinical Research Network and the Canadian Critical Care Trials Group. Remdesivir for the treatment of patients in hospital with COVID-19 in Canada: a randomized controlled trial. *CMAJ*. 2022 Feb 22;194(7):E242-E251.
13. Angus DC, Derde L, Al-Beidh F, Annane D, Arabi Y, Beane A, et al. Effect of Hydrocortisone on Mortality and Organ Support in Patients With Severe COVID-19: The REMAP-CAP COVID-19 Corticosteroid Domain Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA*. 2020 Oct 6;324(13):1317-1329.
14. Blanchet MA, Mercier G, Delobel A, Nayet E, Bouchard PA, Simard S, L'Her E, Branson RD, Lellouche F. et al. Accuracy of Multiple Pulse Oximeters in Stable Critically Ill Patients. *Respir Care*. 2023 May;68(5):565-574.
15. Chaudhuri D, Sharma R, Burns KEA, Pitararu J, Cook DJ, Rochweg B. Introducing helmet non-invasive ventilation during COVID-19 pandemic: Early experience of two centres. *Front Med (Lausanne)*. 2023 Feb 7;10:1075797.
16. Froese L, Gomez A, Sainbhi AS, Batson C, Slack T, Stein KY, et al. Optimal bispectral index level of sedation and cerebral oximetry in traumatic brain injury: a non-invasive individualized approach in critical care? *Intensive Care Med Exp*. 2022 Aug 13;10(1):33.

17. REMAP-CAP Investigators; Gordon AC, Mouncey PR, Al-Beidh F, Rowan KM, Nichol AD, et al. Interleukin-6 Receptor Antagonists in Critically Ill Patients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med*. 2021 Apr 22;384(16):1491-1502.
18. Hallot S, Debay V, Debigaré S, Foster N, Soboleva N, Burns KEA, et al. Validation of an Instrument to Measure Family Engagement in Acute Cardiac Care. *CJC Open*. 2022 Dec 5;5(3):208-214.
19. Heyland DK, Wibbenmeyer L, Pollack JA, Friedman B, Turgeon AF, Eshraghi N, et al. RE-ENERGIZE Trial Team. A Randomized Trial of Enteral Glutamine for Treatment of Burn Injuries. *N Engl J Med*. 2022 Sep 15;387(11):1001-1010.
20. Lau VI, Mah GD, Wang X, Byker L, Robinson A, Milovanovic L, et al. Intrapulmonary and Intracardiac Shunts in Adult COVID-19 Versus Non-COVID Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome ICU Patients Using Echocardiography and Contrast Bubble Studies (COVID-Shunt Study): A Prospective, Observational Cohort Study. *Crit Care Med*. 2023 Aug 1;51(8):1023-1032.
21. Stoppe C, McDonald B, Meybohm P, Christopher KB, Fremes S, Whitlock R, et al. SUSTAIN CSX Study Collaborators. Effect of High-Dose Selenium on Postoperative Organ Dysfunction and Mortality in Cardiac Surgery Patients: The SUSTAIN CSX Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Surg*. 2023 Mar 1;158(3):235-244.
22. Trahtenberg U, Fritzler MJ; On behalf of the COVID-19 chapter of the “Longitudinal Biomarkers in Lung Injury” study group. COVID-19-associated autoimmunity as a feature of acute respiratory failure. *Intensive Care Med*. 2021 Jul;47(7):801-804.
23. Moradi J, Mikhail M, Lee LA, Traube C, Sarti AJ, Choong K. Lived Experiences of Delirium in Critically Ill Children: A Qualitative Study. *J Pediatr Intensive Care*. 2022 Nov 24.
24. Meneses E, McKenney M, Boneva D, Elkbuli A. Surgical consent during the COVID19 pandemic: Saving lives while in crisis editorial. *Ann Med Surg (Lond)*. 2020 Jul 26;57:163-165.
25. Van Driest SL, Madell SM, Crum K, Smith AH, Bichell DP, Kannankeril PJ. Research consent rates before and during a COVID-19 one-visitor policy in a children's hospital. *Pediatr Res*. 2021 May;89(6):1386-1388.