DOI: https://doi.org/10.36811/ojnmc.2021.110007
OJNMC: March-2021: Page No: 01-14

Open Journal of Nursing and Medical Care

Research Article Open Access

Effects of ABCDE Bundle Implementation on Reduction of Delirium among Mechanically Ventilated Patients at Damietta Hospital, Egypt

Khalil NS^{1*}, El-Kady EM², Fadia Ahmed Abdelkader Reshia^{3,5}, and EL-shafey MM⁴

Received Date: Mar 06, 2021 / Accepted Date: Mar 19, 2021 / Published Date: Mar 22, 2021

Abstract

Background: One of the principal complications in intensive care unit particularly those connected to mechanical ventilation is delirium. Delirium. It is associated with increased mortality, prolonged mechanical ventilation, and prolonged hospital length of stay (LOS). The ABCDE is a bundle intervention that stands for awakening, breathing coordination, delirium monitoring/management, and early exercise/mobility bundle that has been proposed as a multi-component intervention to reduce the incidence of delirium.

Aim of the study: This study aimed to evaluate the effect of implementing the ABCDE bundle on the reduction of delirium among mechanically ventilated patients at Damietta hospital.

Material and Methods: A quasi-experimental pre/post-intervention design was used to conduct this study. A purposive sample of 65 adult male and female mechanically ventilated patients aged between 18 and 60 years was recruited. Sedation and Delirium instruments measures were utilized in data collection.

Result: significant differences were found in delirium scores among the studied patients (x2= 52.52; p-value=0.001). So, the mechanically ventilated patients who exposed to the implementation of the ABCDE bundle were experienced fewer delirium signs than before the ABCDE bundle implementation.

Conclusion: Based on the findings of the current study, it can be concluded ABCDE bundle implementation reduced the occurrence of delirium among mechanically ventilated patients.

Recommendations: ABCDE bundle should be recommended on mechanically ventilated patients.

Keywords: ABCDE bundle; Mechanically Ventilated Patients; Critically Ill Patients

Cite this article as: Khalil NS, El-Kady EM, Reshia FAA, EL-shafey MM. 2021. Effects of ABCDE Bundle Implementation on Reduction of Delirium among Mechanically Ventilated Patients at Damietta Hospital, Egypt. Open J Nurs Med Care. 3: 01-14.

Copyright: This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited. Copyright © 2021; Khalil NS

¹Department of Critical Care and Emergency Nursing, Faculty of Nursing, Cairo, University, Egypt ²Dameita Chest Hospital

³Department of Critical Care and Emergency Nursing, Faculty of Nursing, Mansoura, University, Egypt ⁴Department of Pulmonary and critical Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Mansoura, University, Egypt ⁵Assistant professor at Department of Nursing, College of Applied Medical Sciences, Jouf University, Sakākā. Saudi Arabia

^{*}Corresponding Author: Nahla Shaaban Khalil, Department of Critical Care and Emergency Nursing, Faculty of Nursing, Cairo University, Egypt, Tel: 1066225938; Email: nahlakhalil28@yahoo.com

DOI: https://doi.org/10.36811/ojnmc.2021.110007
OJNMC: March-2021: Page No: 01-14

Introduction

Delirium is a frequent and serious problem in the intensive care unit (ICU). It is common in the early stages of hospitalization for a variety of acute and chronic diseases [1]. Delirium in ICU affects 60 to 80% of patients receiving mechanical ventilation and 20 to 50% of patients who are not receiving mechanical ventilation [2]. It is associated with increased mortality, prolonged mechanical ventilation, and prolonged hospital length of stay (LOS) [3]. Moreover, its consequences can be prevented proper assessment, diagnosis management [4]. Delirium is a dysfunction that occurs due to various pathophysiological factors such as the inflammatory reaction of the brain to injury, hormonal affection, and alterations in neurotransmission connections [5]. It's categorized into three subtypes: hyperactive, hypoactive, and mixed type. Hyperactive delirium is characterized by aggression, agitation delusion, hallucination, and psychomotor hyperactivity. Hypoactive delirious patients may show decreased slowed psychomotor attention. lethargy, activities and reduced responsiveness. Patients with mixed type delirium fluctuate between hyperactive and hypoactive delirium [6]. The Society of Critical Care Medicine for the management of pain, agitation. delirium (SCCM PAD) guidelines 2013, in adult patients in the ICU, described bundle of interventions to be adopted in the care of patients connected to mechanical a ventilator is known as "ABCDE" that awakening, breathing trial coordination with suitable sedation, management of delirium, and early mobility [7]. The ABCDE principally depends upon three rules improving interaction health team members in critical care providing standard settings, care. decreasing connection to mechanical ventilation and over sedation that result in delirium [8]. ABCDE bundle is a group of practices that based on evidencebased guidelines when practices totally have

been verified to promote patient outcomes. Those bundles are utilized in critical care units. The use of bundles may be similarly beneficial for developing patient-centered protocols for preventing and treating PAD in critically ill patients [6].

The aim of the study

The aim of the study is to evaluate the effect of implementing the ABCDE bundle on the reduction of delirium into everyday practice for mechanically ventilated patients at Damietta hospital in Egypt.

Research hypothesis

Mechanically ventilated patients who are exposed to the implementation of the ABCDE bundle will experience fewer delirium signs than those who received routine care.

Research design

A quasi-experimental research design was chosen to demonstrate causality between intervention and outcome. It is an experimental study used to appraise the causal- effect of an experiment on the population without randomization. It permits the researcher to control the intervention or experimentation but utilizing some norms other than randomization. In some cases, the researcher may have control over an assignment to treatment [9-10].

Setting

This study was conducted in the intensive care units at Damietta Chest Disease Hospital.

Subjects

A purposive sample of 65 adult male and female mechanically ventilated patients aged between 18 and 60 years were included. The exclusion criteria included

DOI: https://doi.org/10.36811/ojnmc.2021.110007 OJNMC: March-2021: Page No: 01-14

Patients with congestive heart failure, sepsis, prolonged restraints and immobility, seizures, and head trauma [11-12].

Sample Size Calculation

With alpha error 5% and study power 80% with the expected incidence of delirium in the intervention arm=40% and 80% in the non-intervention arm, then the sample size = 60 in each group. Add 10% (5 cases for each group to compensate for defaulters) then the final sample size = 65 in pre-intervention and post-intervention groups.

Tools of data collection

Instrument 1: patients' demographic & Health Relevant Data.

This tool was developed by the researcher; it included patient's demographic data (name, age, gender, diagnosis, and date of admission, past medical history, level of consciousness, mobility status, medications, analgesics, and sedation).

Instrument 2: Sedation assessment (Riker Sedation-Agitation Scale (SAS).

That instrument was selected from [13]. It was utilized to evaluate levels of sedation. The first scale that proven to be valid and reliable in critically ill patients was Riker Sedation Agitation Scale. It consists of seven points, (7) Dangerous Agitation, (6) Very Agitated, (5) Agitated, (4) Calm and Cooperative, (3) Sedated, Very Sedated, and (2) Unarousable. It is carried out every 4 hours after patient's connection to mechanical ventilator and persists for three days in both groups.

Tool III: Delirium assessment (Intensive Care Delirium Screening Checklist (ICDSC).

The researcher assessed the delirium in patients by using the Intensive Care Delirium Screening Checklist (ICDSC). It was selected from [14], to evaluate the conscious level. disorientation. agitation, inattention. speaking/Affect and mood disturbances. disturbances of sleep, and hallucinations. The researcher utilized this checklist every 12 hours after awakening of the patient and recurred for three days before and after executing of the ABCDE bundle. The ICDSC involves 8 items, each item was scored as absent or present (0 or summed, score (>4) denotes Α (delirium), while (0-3) denotes (no delirium).

Validity and Reliability of the instruments

The instruments were examined for face and content validity by 5 experts in the Critical Care and Emergency Nursing field, and Intensive Care Medicine at Mansoura and Cairo Universities. A reliability test was applied by the researcher for testing the internal consistency of the developed instrument; the Delirium Screening Checklist. The reliability was 0.876.

The procedure of Data collection

Permission to implement the study was taken from the hospital research committee after an explanation of nature and purpose of the study. The patients or their families were contacted to explain the nature and purpose of the study. Later, written approval form was taken from them if patients were unconscious. After that, researcher collected the patients' demographic & health-relevant data. Later, the researcher evaluated the patient's sedation level utilizing Riker Sedation-Agitation Scale (SAS). Finally, the researcher assessed the delirium status by utilizing the delirium screening checklist. The researcher assessed sedation level by using the Riker Sedation-Agitation Scale trough observing the patient's consciousness and recorded the results, if the

DOI: https://doi.org/10.36811/ojnmc.2021.110007 OJNMC: March-2021: Page No: 01-14

patient awoke and able to follow three or four simple commands, or was agitated, the researcher informed the respiratory therapist and initiate to wean the patient from the mechanical ventilation, but if the patient unarousable or much sedated, the researcher continued sedatives under medical supervision and re-assed the patient in the next 24 hours. When the patient achieved a score (3-4) in the Riker Sedation Agitation Scale (SAS), and able to follow three or four simple commands, the researcher informed the respiratory therapist and started to liberate the patient from the mechanical ventilator through (wake up and breath protocol).

Implementation of ABCDE bundle

Awakening and Breathing Coordination Trials (ABCs)

It was adopted from Girard, et al [15]. This protocol included Awakening and Breathing Coordination Trials (ABCs). The researcher was responsible for performing Spontaneous Awakening Trials (SATs), and the Respiratory Therapist was responsible for performing the Spontaneous Breathing Trials (SBTs) for every mechanically ventilated patient by determining if patient is prepared to breathe spontaneously. (Wake UP and Breathe Protocol).

Early Mobility Protocol

This protocol was selected from Pohlman, et al, [16]. It encouraged the initiation of early mobility and increase ambulation of patients. The physical therapist and the researcher applied this protocol at least once per day and lasted for three days. That protocol contained four levels of activity. The level one was a passive range of motion that was carried out by the mobility team nursing assistants. Active resistance exercises were initiated in the second level and later; the patient was being put upright three times a day. Movement of patient is gradually increased in the levels three and four

ranging from sitting on the edge of the bed to actively transferring to out of the bed.

Results

Table 1: illustrates patients' demographic and health Relevant data. It revealed that almost two-thirds of the patients aged 50 to 59 years old, and two-thirds of them were male. Regarding the past medical history, 24.62% of the patients were suffering from COPD, and 15.38% were diagnosed with renal failure. Moreover, in relation to the level of consciousness and mobility status, most of the patients (86.15%) were conscious and nearly two-thirds of them (64.62%) were mobile. Regarding the use of sedatives and opioids, nearly half (53.85%) of patients received sedatives, while Opioids were used by one-third (30.77%). Moreover, 15.38% were using antipsychotic drugs.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.36811/ojnmc.2021.110007
OJNMC: March-2021: Page No: 01-14

Table 1: Patients' demograph		ī	MagCD
Variables	No.	%	Mean ±SD
Age (years)		0.000	10.50.1
≤ 20 years	2	3.08%	12.50±16.26
21-29 years	1	1.54%	25
30-39 years	5	7.69%	10.20±6.61
40-49 years	7	10.77%	17.00±10.98
50-59 years	40	61.54%	37.80±16.39
≥ 60 years	10	15.38%	37.30±20.77
Mean ±SD	41.64±0.97	,	•
Gender			
Male	39	60.00%	
Female	26	40.00%	
Past History			
Respiratory			
COPD	16	24.62%	
RF	10	15.38%	
Cardiac			
MI	8	12.31%	
IHD	5	7.69%	
AF	3	4.62%	
Others			
Myasthenia. Gravis	2	3.08%	
Carcinoma	4	6.15%	
Stroke	8	12.31%	
Hepatic	5	7.69%	
Renal	4	6.15%	
Level of consciousness			
Conscious	56	86.15%	
Unconscious	9	13.85%	
Mobility status			
Mobile	42	64.62%	
Immobile	7	10.77%	
Need assistance	16	24.62%	
Medication			
Opioids	20	30.77%	
Sedatives	35	53.85%	
Antipsychotic drugs	10	15.38%	

DOI: https://doi.org/10.36811/ojnmc.2021.110007
OJNMC: March-2021: Page No: 01-14

Table 2: Distribution of patient's res	sponse ı	ıtilizing l	Riker S	Sedation	-Agitati	ion Scale	e (SAS).	
Patient's Behavior According to	1st Day		2 nd Day		3 rd Day		Chi-square	
SAS Score	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	c^2	P- Value
Unarousable	1	1.54	4	6.15	4	6.15		
Very sedated	7	10.77	1	1.54	2	3.08		
Sedated	49	75.38	32	49.23	5	7.69		
Calm and cooperative	5	7.69	27	41.54	54	83.08	89.57	0.001*
Agitated	1	1.54	1	1.54	-	-		
Very agitated	2	3.08	-	-	-	-		
Mean ±SD	3.06 ±	±0.77	3.31	±0.81	3.68 ±	±0.81		

*Significance at P level ≤0.05.

Table (2) shows patients' response in Riker Sedation-Agitation Scale (SAS) evaluation. It revealed significant differences in patients' Riker Sedation -Agitation responses (x2= 89.57; P= 0.001). So; most of the patients (83.08%) showed calm and cooperative behavior on the third day when compared to other days. On the other hand, three fourth (75.38%) showed sedation on the first day.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.36811/ojnmc.2021.110007
OJNMC: March-2021: Page No: 01-14

Table 3: Frequency distribution of the incidence of delirium among the studied subjects after the intervention through three days.

Days	Incidence of	ICDSC	No.	%	Chi	-square	ANOVA	
Days	Delirium	Score #	NO.	70	c^2	P-Value	F	P-Value
			1	1.54				
	No	3	35	53.85				
		Total	36	55.38				
		4	12	18.46				
1st Day		5	1	1.54	92.77	0.001*		
	Vac	6	3	4.62				
	Yes	7	7	10.77				
		8	6	9.23				
		Total	29	44.62				
		Mear	n ±SD 4.23:	±1.80				
	No 2 nd Day Yes	2	3	4.62	88.51	0.001*		0.001
		3	38	58.46			5	
		Total	41	63.08				
and Day		4	12	18.46				
2 Day		5	7	10.77				
		6	4	6.15				
		7	1	1.54				
		Total	24	36.92				
		Mear	n ±SD 3.60	±1.06				
		2	14	21.54		0.001*		
	No	3	35	53.85	16.75			
		Total	49	75.38				
3rd Day	3 rd Day	4	2	3.08				
3 Day		5	4	6.15				
	Yes	6	7	10.77				
		7	3	4.62				
		Total	16	24.62				

Table 3: shows the distribution incidence of delirium among the studied patients after the intervention through three days. It revealed that nearly half (55.38%) of the patients hadn't any signs of delirium on the first day. This ratio was changed to better on the second day that revealed (63.08%) of patients were subsyndromal delirium. On the other hand, on the third day, nearly three fourth of patients (75.38%) had no signs of delirium. As well, a significant statistical difference among the means delirium scores in the three days. So, the delirium scores decrease on the second day compared to the first and third day.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.36811/ojnmc.2021.110007
OJNMC: March-2021: Page No: 01-14

Table 4:	Table 4: Comparison of mean delirium scores by their gender.								
Time Con		N	Mean	CD	T-test				
Time	Sex	11	Mean	SD	T	DF	P-value		
1st day	Male	39	4.27	1.9	1.4	63	0.889		
1" day	Female	26	4.19	1.67			0.889		
and down	Male	30	3.56	1.14	0.333	63	0.74		
2 nd day	Female	35	3.65	0.94					
2rd dow	Male	45	3.41	1.33	0.747	63	0.806		
3 rd day	Female	20	3.5	1.58	0.747		0.806		

As can be seen from (Table 4), there is no significant differences among patients' incidence of delirium by their gender through three days.

Table 5: Correlation between patients' age and delirium.							
Variable	Maan ICD		Correlation coefficient				
variable	Mean ±SD	R	P-value				
Age	56.80±3.526	0.32*	0.017				
Delirium	3.64±1.56	0.32**	0.017				
As can be se	en from table 6 tha	t age is positi	vely correlated with the incidence of delirium. (R=0.32).				

D: N-	0/	Delirium	
Disease	No.	%	Mean±SD
COPD	16	24.62%	3.81±1.80
RF	10	15.38%	3.60±1.51
MI	8	12.31%	3.38±1.41
Stroke	8	12.31%	3.13±1.25
			F=0.381; P=0.767

It's apparent from (table 6) that no significant differences were found among patients' delirium scores by their current diseases.

Discussion

The present study aimed to evaluate the effect of implementing the ABCDE bundle on the reduction of delirium among mechanically ventilated patients at Damietta hospital in Egypt. The current study showed that nearly two-thirds of the patients their age ranged between 50 to 59 years old, male, and had delirium. The possible explanation for this finding may have relevant to a decreased level of acetylcholine. So, acetylcholine is one of the great neurotransmitters that decreases with age and causing the incidence of delirium in the old age persons, and anticholinergic agents prone to

become worse the symptoms of delirium. This finding is matched with Kim, et al, [17] who investigated the frequent risk factors of delirium among a susceptible group of patients to delirium. The following studies done by [18-19] who revealed that age and male gender as the great demographic risk factors for inducing delirium for medical and surgical patients in various clinical settings. As well; Dessap, et al, [20-21] who studied incidence of both delirium and coma in Japanese ICU patients who is connected to mechanical ventilation agreed with the fact that older age associated with delirium. On the other hand, the current findings contradicted with Branco, et al, [22] who

DOI: https://doi.org/10.36811/ojnmc.2021.110007
OJNMC: March-2021: Page No: 01-14

examined young patients with trauma who were injured in road accidents with the mean age of 37 years old and found that there was a mainly voung individuals, age was remaining an essential variable for the occurrence of delirium. Concerning to mobility status of studied patients; our study showed that twothirds of patients were mobile. phenomenon helped in the implementation of early mobility in the ABCDE bundle and shortened the time spent in patients' connection to a mechanical ventilator. As a result, it decreased the occurrence of delirium and increased the initiation of early ambulation intervention [23-24]. This study finding is in line with [25] who recommended the early ambulation to make the patient become better and safe. Regarding the medications being administered, the current study revealed that more than half of patients received sedatives. On the other hand, patients who received opioids were less than one-third of the studied patients. So, these drugs have a harmful effect and are considered risk factors for the incidence of delirium [26]. These results are in line with (27,28). Fraser, et al, [27-28] who found that the administering benzodiazepines such as midazolam for ICU patients accelerate the appearance of delirium, spending longer ICU stay, and more dependence on the mechanical ventilator. On the other hand, these findings are not matched with Seraphim, et al, [29] who analysed the utilization of dexmedetomidine and propofol in place of benzodiazepines to calm and relax patients, that resulted in decreased length of ICU stay and MV duration. Moreover, the current study showed that more than one-tenth of the studied patients antipsychotic drugs. The same received agreed with the American findings are Association of Critical-Care Nurses (AACN) [30] who declared that all patients who received antipsychotics such as; haloperidol or any of the atypical antipsychotics may develop delirium and recommended that these patients should be routinely and systematically monitored for side effects. As well, [31] mentioned that the harms

of delirium can be reduced in surgical hospitalized patients by utilizing administration of antipsychotic drugs. Though, the use of antipsychotic drugs did not cause an overt effect on the duration of delirium and length of hospital stay. On the other hand, [32] stated that utilization of psychotropic agents in critically ill patients without a particular diagnosis might increase the length of hospital stay. Concerning the assessment of patients' sedation and agitation utilizing the Riker Sedation Agitation Scale before and after ABCDE implementation in three days, the study findings revealed that more than three-quarters of patients were sedated on the 1st day compared to the majority of patients who were very calm and cooperative on the third day. This finding may have relevant to the recommendation of sedating patients' and alleviating their pain to prevent ICU delirium [33-34]. This intervention resulted in a decreased a requirement for utilizing restraining appliances, allowed for an early mobilization leading to improved patient condition. Furthermore, it decreased the expenditures concerned with the prevention and management of delirium. Similarly, these findings are agreed with Morando, et al, [7] who confirmed a strong association between delirium and exposure to sedatives. On the other hand, [35] added that critical care nurses can't able to recognize delirium frequently in their patients due to inappropriate utilization of sedation which leading to longer ICU and hospital stays, increased mortality, and longstanding cognitive impairments [36]. As well, the present finding is congruent with another study carried out by [37] who studied sedation in patients with delirium and found a deeper level of sedation in delirious patients than those without delirium and also after sedation interruption. This finding illustrated a fact that sedative drugs can remain in the body for a long time in critically ill patients. Moreover, a Persistent Delirium was appeared to be at a deeper level of sedation at their 2-hour assessment than those with rapidly reversible delirium (RRD). So, heavy sedation played an

DOI: https://doi.org/10.36811/ojnmc.2021.110007
OJNMC: March-2021: Page No: 01-14

essential role in causing negative consequences seen in these patients. On the other hand, this finding is not agreed with [38] who detected that patients not only persisted \to remain moderately sedated for up to 2 hours though the withdrawing of sedative drugs but those at a deeper sedation level developed an increased occurrence of delirium, disregarding the screening instrument of delirium being utilized. However, 20% and 32% of the patients in their study administered continuous and intermittent medications with midazolam. respectively, which may have been accountable for the deferred awakening trials. Moreover, Riker, et al, [39] who mentioned that dexmedetomidine was associated with the onset of delirium but with fewer neurocognitive disorders than propofol. On the other hand, [40] detected that sedation have dexmedetomidine versus propofol maintained or even improved cognitive function in patients with decreased baseline cognition. The current finding was agreed with [41,36,23] who implemented the bundle protocol of ABCDE found that implementation decreased the incidence of delirium from 62.3% to 48.7%, as well as the length of mechanical ventilation connection. Summarily, Bounds, et al, [2] who investigated the effect of implementation of ABCDE bundle on the prevalence of delirium in intensive care unit patients and found that the implementation decreased **ABCDE** prevalence of delirium significantly from two fifths to one fifth and the mean number of days of delirium decreased from three days to one day. As well, this finding is consistent with Lee, et al, [42] who carried out the study in patients in post-cardiac surgery and found decreased incidence of delirium after heart surgery among intervention group of patients when compared to the control group that did not receive it. On the other hand, Colombo, et al, [43] carried a study in medical- surgical critical care units where patients were called by their names, was informed about hospitalization location and the progress of their condition. That study detected these practices were regarded to be safe and

protective towards the incidence of delirium and helped in preventing delirium. Concerning correlation of delirium with their demographic characteristics. The current study found a positive correlation between patients' age, and the incidence of delirium, which approved that patient who ages between 50 to 59 years, had a higher incidence of delirium as it was a risk factor for delirium American Geriatrics Society Expert Panel Postoperative Delirium in Older Adults, [44]. These results agreed with Tomasi, et al, [3] who found that patients with a diagnosis of delirium were older. Also, Hosie, et al, [45] who studied delirium in palliative care settings found that delirium is prevalent among old age patients especially male patient Hager ling, et al, [46-47] but contrasted with our study that showed that there was no correlation found between patients' gender and incidence of delirium. Also, Chu, et al, [48] who examined the occurrence of postoperative delirium in old age patients who underwent orthopaedic surgery found that delirium incidence was higher in male patients and stated the gender of male is a risk factor for delirium. On the other hand, this finding is not agreed with Atay, et al, [49] who studied delirium prevalence, risk factors, and cognitive functions in elderly hip fracture cases under general and spinal anaesthesia and found no significant correlation between delirium and gender. Moreover, our study finding revealed that nearly half of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) patients had a higher incidence of delirium. This finding may have relevant to systemic inflammation and blood-oxygenation disorders and they considered a risk factor delirium Toloache, et al, [50]. This finding is consistent with Austin, et al, [51] who studied the missing links of systemic inflammation and oxidative stress in the relation between COPD and incidence of delirium.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.36811/ojnmc.2021.110007
OJNMC: March-2021: Page No: 01-14

Conclusion

Based on the findings of the present study, there was a significant improvement of delirium after a successful implementation of the elements of the ABCDE bundle that included spontaneous awakening trials (SAT), spontaneous breathing trials (SBT), coordination of SAT and SBT, careful selection of sedative, delirium assessment and prevention, and early mobility.

Recommendations

Implementation of ABCDE bundle among mechanically ventilated patients

Limitation of the Study

The sample was selected from one hospital in the Arab Republic of Egypt that restricts the generalization of findings.

References

- Shi Q, Warren L, Saposnik G, et al. 2013. Confusion assessment method: a systematic review and meta-analysis of diagnostic accuracy, Neuropsychiatric Disease and Treatment. 1359-1370. Ref.: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24092976/ https://doi.org/10.2147/ndt.s49520
- 2. Bounds M, Kram S, Speroni K, et al. 2016. Effect of ABCDE bundle implementation on prevalence of delirium in intensive care unit patients, AJCC American Journal of Critical Care. 25: 6. Ref.:
 - https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27802955/ https://doi.org/10.4037/ajcc2016209
- 3. Tomasi CD, Grandi J, Salluh J, et al. 2012. Comparison of CAM-ICU and ICDSC for the detection of delirium in critically ill patients focusing on relevant clinical outcomes, Journal of Critical Care. 27: 212-217. Ref.: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21737237/ https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrc.2011.05.015
- 4. Clegg A, Westby M, Young JB. 2011. Underreporting of delirium in the NHS. Academic

- Unit of Elderly Care & Rehabilitation, Bradford Institute for Health Research, Bradford, West Yorkshire, UK. 40: 283-286. Ref.: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21169280/ https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afq157
- Sanders RD. 2013. Delirium, neurotransmission, and network connectivity: the search for a comprehensive pathogenic framework, Anesthesiology. 118: 494-496. Ref.:
 - https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23263017/ https://doi.org/10.1097/aln.0b013e31827bd271
- 6. Barr J, Fraser GL, Puntillo K, et al. 2013. Clinical practice guidelines for the management of pain, agitation, and delirium in adult patients in the intensive care unit, Critical Care Med. 41: 263-306. Ref.:
 - https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23269131/ https://doi.org/10.1097/ccm.0b013e3182783b72
- Morandi A, Brummel NE, Ely EW. 2011. Sedation, delirium and mechanical ventilation: The 'ABCDE' approach, Current Opinion in Critical Care. 17: 43-49. Ref.; https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21169829/ https://doi.org/10.1097/mcc.0b013e3283427243
- 8. Collinsworth AW. 2015. A bundled care process for the prevention of delirium in patients in the intensive care unit: implementation strategies and uptake, impact on patient outcomes, and cost-effectiveness, Dissertation, school of public health and tropical medicine. Tulane University.
- 9. Dinardo J. 2008. Natural experiments and quasi-natural experiments. The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economic. 856-859.
- 10. Derue, Scott D, Nahrgang, et al. 2012. A Quasi-Experimental Study of After-Event Reviews, Journal of Applied Psychology. 97: 997-1015. Ref.:
 - https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22506721/ https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028244
- 11. Cavallazzi R, Saad M, Marik PE. 2012. Delirium in the ICU: an overview, Ann Intensive Care. 2: 49. Ref.: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23270646/ https://doi.org/10.1186/2110-5820-2-49

DOI: https://doi.org/10.36811/ojnmc.2021.110007 OJNMC: March-2021: Page No: 01-14

- 12. Lee HJ, Hwang DS, Wang SK, et al. 2011. Early assessment of delirium in elderly patients after hip surgery, Psychiatry Investing. 8: 340-347. Ref.:
 - https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22216044/https://doi.org/10.4306/pi.2011.8.4.340
- 13. Riker RR, Picard JT, Fraser GL. 1999. Prospective evaluation of the Sedation-Agitation Scale for adult critically ill patients, Crit Care Med. 27: 1325- 1329. Ref.: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/10446827/https://doi.org/10.1097/00003246-199907000-00022
- 14. Bergeron N, Dubois MJ, Dumont M, et al. 2001. Intensive Care Delirium Screening Checklist: Evaluation of a new screening tool, Intensive Care Med. 27: 859-864. Ref.: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/11430542/ https://doi.org/10.1007/s001340100909
- 15. Girard TD, Pandharipande PK, Ely EW. 2008. Delirium in the intensive care unit, Critical Care. 12: 3. Ref.: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18495054/ https://doi.org/10.1186/cc6149
- 16. Pohlman MC, Schweickert WD, Pohlman AS, et al. 2010. Feasibility of physical and occupational therapy beginning from initiation of mechanical ventilation, Critical Care Med. 38: 2089-2094. Ref.: https://doi.org/10.1097/ccm.0b013e3181f270c3
- 17. Kim H, Chung S, Joo YH, et al. 2016. The major risk factors for delirium in a clinical setting, Neuropsychiatric Disease and Treatment. 12: 1787-1793. Ref.: https://doi.org/10.2147/ndt.s112017
- 18. Fortini A, Morettini A, Tavernese G, et al. 2014. Delirium in elderly patients hospitalized in internal medicine wards, Intern Emerg Med. 9: 435-441. Ref.: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11739-013-0968-0
- 19. Nagase M, Okamoto Y, Tsuneto S, et al. 2012. A retrospective chart review of terminal patients with cancer with agitation and their risk factors, J Palliat Med. 15: 1185-1190:.Ref.

- https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22917275/ https://doi.org/10.1089/jpm.2012.0114
- 20. Dessap AM, Campo FR, Launay JM, et al. 2015. Delirium and circadian rhythm of melatonin during waning from mechanical ventilation: an ancillary study of wearing trial, Chest. 148: 1231-1241. Ref.: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26158245/ https://doi.org/10.1378/chest.15-0525
- 21. Tsuruta R, Oda Y, Shintani A, et al. 2014. Delirium and coma evaluated in mechanically ventilated patients in the intensive care unit in Japan: A multi-institutional prospective observational study, J Crit Car. 29: 1-5. Ref.: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24602999/ https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrc.2014.01.021
- 22. Branco BC, Inaba K, Bukur M, et al. 2011. Risk factors for delirium in trauma patients: the impact of ethanol use and lack of insurance, American Surgeon. 77: 621-626. Ref.: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21679598/
- 24. Miller MA, Govindan S, Watson SR, et al. 2015. ABCDE, but in that order? A cross-sectional survey of Michigan intensive care unit sedation, delirium, and early mobility practices, Ann Am ThoracSoc. 12: 1066-1071. Ref.: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25970737/https://doi.org/10.1513/annalsats.201501-066oc
- 25. Rodriguez RM. 2017. Implementation of an Early Progressive Mobility Program in the Intensive Care Units, Dissertation. Walden University.
- 26. Ibrahim K, McCarthy CP, McCarthy KJ, et al. 2018. Delirium in the Cardiac Intensive Care Unit, J Am Heart Assoc. 7: 008568. Ref.: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29453307/ https://doi.org/10.1161/jaha.118.008568

DOI: https://doi.org/10.36811/ojnmc.2021.110007
OJNMC: March-2021: Page No: 01-14

- 27. Fraser GL, Devlin JW, Worby CP, et al. 2013. Benzodiazepine versus nonbenzodiazepine: based sedation for mechanically ventilated, critically ill adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized trials, Crit Care Med. 41: 30-80. Ref.: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23989093/
- https://doi.org/10.1097/ccm.0b013e3182a16898
 28. Xia ZQ, Chen SQ, Yao X, et al. 2013. Clinical benefits of dexmedetomidine versus propofol in adult intensive care unit patients: a meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials, J Surg Res. 185: 833-843. Ref.:
 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23910886/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2013.06.062
- 29. Serafim RB, Bozza FA, Soares M, et al. 2015. Pharmacologic prevention and treatment of delirium in intensive care patients: a systematic review, J Crit Care. 30: 799-807. Ref.: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25957498/ https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrc.2015.04.005
- 30. American Association of Critical Care Nurses (AACN). 2012. Delirium Assessment and Management, Crit Care Nurse. 32: 79-82. Ref.: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22298722/
- 31. Gilmore ML, Wolfe DJ. 2013. Antipsychotic prophylaxis in surgical patients modestly decreases delirium incidence-but not duration-in high incidence samples: a meta-analysis, Gen Hosp Psychiatry. 35: 370-375. Ref.: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23351526/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.genhosppsych.2012.12.009
- 32. Swan JT, Fitousis K, Hall JB, et al. 2012. Antipsychotic use and diagnosis of delirium in the intensive care unit, Crit Care. 16: 84. Ref.: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22591601/ https://doi.org/10.1186/cc11342
- 33. Shehabi Y, Bellomo R, Reade MC, et al. 2013. Early goal-directed sedation versus standard sedation in mechanically ventilated critically Ill patients: a pilot study, Crit Care Med. 41: 1983-1991. Ref.:
 - https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23863230/ https://doi.org/10.1097/ccm.0b013e31828a437d

- 34. Hughes CG, Girard TD, Pandharipande PP. 2013. Daily sedation interruption versus targeted light sedation strategies in ICU patients, Crit Care Med. 41: 39-45. Ref.: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23989094/ https://doi.org/10.1097/ccm.0b013e3182a168c5
- 35. Harper S. 2015. Implementation Plan for the ABCDEF Bundle, Dissertation. Faculty of Nursing, University of Arizona.
- 36. Balas MC, Vasilevskis EE, Burke WJ, et al. 2012. Critical care nurses' role in implementing the "ABCDE bundle" into practice, Crit Care Nurse. 32: 35-38. Ref.: https://doi.org/10.4037/ccn2012229
- 37. Patel SB, Poston JT, Pohlman A, et al. 2014. Rapidly reversible, sedation-related delirium versus persistent delirium in the intensive care unit, Am J RespirCrit Care Med. 189: 658-665. Ref.: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24423152/https://doi.org/10.1164/rccm.201310-1815oc
- 38. Haenggi M, Blum S, Brechbuehl R, et al. 2013. Effect of sedation level on the prevalence of delirium when assessed with CAM-ICU and ICDSC, Intensive Care Med. 39: 2171-2179. Ref.: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23921976/ https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-013-3034-5
- 39. Riker RR, Shehabi Y, Bokesch PM, et al. 2009. SEDCOM (Safety and Efficacy of Dexmedetomidine Compared with Midazolam) Study Group. Dexmedetomidine vs midazolam for sedation of critically ill patients: a randomized trial, JAMA. 301: 489-499. Ref.: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19188334/ https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2009.56
- 40. Mirski MA, Lewin JJ, Ledroux S, et al. 2010. Cognitive improvement during continuous sedation in critically ill, awake and responsive patients: The Acute Neurological ICU Sedation Trial (ANIST), Intensive Care Med. 36: 1505-1513. Ref.:
 - https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20376430/https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-010-1874-9

DOI: https://doi.org/10.36811/ojnmc.2021.110007 OJNMC: March-2021: Page No: 01-14

- 41. Salluh JIF, Wang H, Schneider EB, et al. 2015. Outcome of delirium in critically ill patients: systematic review and meta-analysis, BMJ. 350: 2538. Ref.:
 - https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26041151/https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.h2538
- 42. Lee J, Jung J, Noh JS, et al. 2013. Perioperative psycho-educational intervention can reduce postoperative delirium in patients after cardiac surgery: a pilot study, Int J Psychiatry Med. 45: 143-158. Ref.:
 - $\frac{https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23977818/}{https://doi.org/10.2190/pm.45.2.d}$
- 43. Colombo R, Corona A, Praga F, et al. 2012. A reorientation strategy for reducing delirium in the critically ill, Results of an interventional study, Minerva Anestesiol. 78: 1026-1033. Ref.:
 - https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/22772860/
- 44. American Geriatrics Society Expert Panel on Postoperative Delirium in Older Adults. 2015. Postoperative delirium in older adults: best practice statement from the American Geriatrics Society, J Am Coll Surg. 136-148. Ref.: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jamcollsurg.2014.10.019
- 45. Hosie A. 2015. Delirium epidemiology, systems and nursing practice in palliative care inpatient settings: A descriptive mixed methods project (The DePAC Project), Thesis. University of Notre Dame Australia.
- 46. Hagerling FL. 2015. Nurses Attitudes toward Caring for Older Patients with Delirium, Master thesis. Department of Human Development and Family Studies, Colorado State University.
- 47. McCrow JM. 2012. The impact of a model education to improve knowledge and recognition of delirium on older persons by registered nurse, Dissertation. Queens Land University.
- 48. Chu CS, Liang CK, Chou MY, et al. 2016. Short- Form mini nutritional assessment as a useful method of predicting the development of postoperative delirium in elderly patients undergoing orthopedic surgery, Gen Hosp Psychiatry. 15-20. Ref.:

- https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26412147/ https://doi.org/10.1016/j.genhosppsych.2015.0 8.006
- 49. Yeung J, Patel V, Champaneria R, et al. 2016. Delirium prevalence, risk factors and cognitive functions in elderly hip fracture cases under general and spinal anesthesia, Turkish J Geriatr. 5: 273-278.
- 50. Tilouche N, Hassen MF, Ali HBS, et al. 2018. Delirium in the Intensive Care Unit: Incidence, Risk Factors, and Impact on Outcome, Indian J Crit Care Med. Peer-Rev, Off. Pub, Indian So, Crit Care Med. 22: 144-149. Ref.: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29657370/ https://doi.org/10.4103/ijccm.ijccm_244_17
- 51. Austin V, Crack PJ, Bozinovski S, et al. 2016. COPD and Stroke: Are Systemic Inflammation and Oxidative Stress the Missing Links? ClinSci. 130: 1039-1050. Ref.: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27215677/ https://doi.org/10.1042/cs20160043