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Objectives. To document the use of sedation for refractory symptoms in patients admitted to an independent palliative care unit.

Method. A prospective descriptive study.

Setting. The 7-bed inpatient unit at Sungardens Hospice, Pretoria.

Subjects. Patients who required sedation for refractory symptoms in addition to normal palliative care treatment between January and June 2002.

Findings. Twenty of 100 consecutive patients admitted required sedation. All had advanced cancer. Their mean age was 68 years. Thirty-six per cent were men and 64% women.

Indications. Agitated delirium was the most common reason (45%) for using sedation, followed by intractable vomiting due to inoperable malignant intestinal obstruction in 25% of patients. Three patients with persistent convulsions or myoclonic jerking and 2 patients with severe refractory dyspnoea required some sedation. Intractable pain was the main reason for sedation in only 1 patient.

Survival. Mean survival following the start of sedation was 92 hours/3.8 days (range 6 - 369 hours/0.25 - 19.4 days). The combined mean survival recorded in 9 other studies was 57 hours/2.4 days (range 36 - 93.6 hours/1.5 - 3.9 days).

Medication. The main drugs used for sedation were midazolam and haloperidol. The mean dosage for midazolam was 18.5 mg/24 hours (range 7.5 - 40 mg) and for haloperidol 8 mg/24 hours (range 5 - 10 mg).

For pain relief the mean daily dose of parenteral morphine was 76 mg (range 15 - 260 mg).

Conclusion. Use of sedation for the relief of refractory symptoms at Sungardens Hospice is in line with several studies reported in the international literature.


Sedation in the context of terminal care has been a hotly debated topic for many years. In 1990 a report was published claiming that 52% of moribund patients required sleep-inducing sedation to control physical suffering. This stimulated a lot of discussion in palliative care circles, with many physicians being surprised at the apparent high percentage of patients needing sedation. Subsequent studies carried out in various centres throughout the world showed that the prevalence of sedation varied a great deal (1 – 72%). It has been suggested that this wide variation can be attributed to differences in the terminology used, differences in the application of modern palliative care in different parts of the world and possibly varying standards and criteria for the use of sedation. Adding to the concern has been the accusation that in reality sedation of dying patients is the equivalent of ‘slow euthanasia’. There is therefore a need to clarify and carefully define the terms used with regard to sedation of dying patients, and to develop guidelines that are internationally recognised and accepted by both health professionals and the public.

Objectives

The aim of the study was to document the use of sedation for refractory symptoms in patients admitted to an independent palliative care unit.

Method

A prospective descriptive study was carried out of all patients admitted to Sungardens Hospice, Pretoria, between January and June 2002, whose symptoms were unresponsive to standard palliative care measures and who required sedation to relieve their distress.

Setting

Sungardens Hospice originated in 1987 as a nurse-led domiciliary service providing care for dying patients in the
greater Pretoria area (population 1.48 million, 1996 census). It was based on the principles of the modern hospice movement developed in England during the 1960s under Dr Cicely Saunders at St Christopher’s Hospice, London.

Sungardens Hospice gradually expanded and in 1990 a 7-bed inpatient unit (IPU) was opened to provide short-stay care for a wide range of terminal patients. In addition to terminal care, patients are also admitted for symptom control and occasionally to give the patient’s family a period of respite. Three part-time doctors provide the medical care in the IPU.

Since 1998 an average of 218 patients have been admitted to the IPU each year. The majority (76%) of these patients have advanced cancer. Over the last few years the number of AIDS patients has increased steadily. By 2002, patients suffering from AIDS made up 12% of admissions and 33% of the patients in domiciliary care. The average length of stay in the IPU is 15 days and the Unit has a bed occupancy rate of 82%. One-third of the patients admitted are discharged to domiciliary care once their symptoms have been controlled.

Patient selection

All patients who received sedating drugs (apart from sleeping tablets) were included in the study. This selection can be criticised for being too broad. However, as the difference between sedation for mild anxiety or mild confusion and sedation for refractory symptoms is sometimes not clear-cut in dying patients, it was felt that the inclusion of all patients would minimise selection bias and underreporting.

The study began on 1 January 2002 and was completed on 15 June after 100 consecutive patients had been admitted. No patients or their families refused to participate in this research project.

Results

Patient profile

Twenty patients required sedation. All had advanced cancer. Their mean age was 68 years (range 49 - 88 years). The mean age of the whole group was 62.2 years (range 21 - 93 years). The slight difference was due to the younger ages (mean 32.2 years) of the 16 patients admitted with AIDS, none of whom required sedation. The gender ratio was 36% men and 64% women. This is very similar to the gender ratio (34:66) of the entire group of patients admitted during this period.

Reason for sedation

The main refractory symptoms requiring sedation were delirium (45%), nausea and vomiting (25%), convulsions (15%), dyspnoea (10%) and pain (5%) (Table I).

All patients had signs of very advanced cancer and had been referred for palliative care. Malignant intestinal obstruction was present in 5 patients, 2 others had extensive bone metastases, 1 patient had severe jaundice, 1 had brain metastases, 2 patients had gastro-intestinal tract (GIT) bleeding and 1 had myoclonic jerking due to opioid-induced neurotoxicity.

Sedation — response and outcome

It took an average of 19 hours (range 1 - 96 hours, median 11.5 hours) for the sedation to be fully effective. Patients survived an average of 92 hours/3.8 days (range 6 - 369 hours/0.25 - 19.4 days) after sedation was started.

Medication used

Morphine sulphate and transdermal fentanyl were the only opioids used. For ease of comparison, the fentanyl dose was converted to its parenteral morphine equivalent (PME) according to the manufacturer’s recommendation. The mean dosage of morphine used was 76.5 mg/24 hours (range 15 - 260 mg/24 h) (Table II).

For sedation, midazolam and haloperidol were the main drugs used. In all but 1 case these drugs were given by the subcutaneous (SC) route using a syringe driver. One patient was given midazolam intravenously because of sudden severe dyspnoea that was refractory to all other measures. In the 12 cases where midazolam was used, the mean dosage was 18.5 mg/24 hours (range 7.5 - 40 mg/24 h). Haloperidol was used in 13 cases, with a mean dosage of 8 mg/24 hours (range 5 - 10 mg/24 h).

Hydration

Four patients were receiving intravenous (IV) or SC fluids at the time sedation was started. These fluids were not discontinued. Four patients were able to continue some oral fluids, while the remainder received routine mouth care and had water sprayed frequently into their mouths. During this project, parenteral fluids were not commenced after sedation had begun. The possible use of IV or SC fluids was, however, discussed with all patients and their families before sedation. Their wishes were the main determining factor in deciding what should be done about maintaining hydration artificially.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table I. Refractory symptoms requiring the use of sedation in 20 patients admitted to Sungardens Hospice between January and June 2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refractory symptoms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agitated delirium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intractable vomiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convulsions/myoclonic jerking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe dyspnoea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Communication

All patients and/or their families were fully informed and consented to the use of sedation. In the case of the delirious patients, the closest family member gave consent on their behalf.

Ethical approval

Approval to conduct this research project was obtained from the ethics committees of Sungardens Hospice and the University of Cape Town.

Discussion

Terminology

Mild sedation, especially with benzodiazepines, is commonly used in palliative care to relieve insomnia and mild anxiety unresponsive to non-drug measures. Patients with severe symptoms such as agitated delirium, dyspnea, intractable vomiting, convulsions and severe pain may require large doses of a variety of drugs, including anti-emetics, opioids, neuroleptics, anticonvulsants and even anaesthetic agents such as ketamine, all of which may cause some degree of sedation as a side-effect.9,10

Deep sedation, enough to induce complete loss of consciousness, is occasionally needed in extreme situations in dying cancer patients when massive haemorrhage, massive pulmonary embolism or complete airway obstruction occurs.10,14

Only 1 patient included in this study required IV midazolam for sudden severe dyspnoea. Before this he had been extremely ill with advanced carcinoma of the pancreas complicated by partial intestinal obstruction, severe jaundice and a left-sided pleural effusion. He began vomiting, then developed severe dyspnoea and coughed up frothy pink sputum. He may have aspirated or developed acute pulmonary oedema. He did not respond to oxygen, IV furosemide or IV fentanyl, so midazolam was given very slowly intravenously. A total dose of 7.5 mg was eventually given before his distress subsided. The patient died 10 minutes later. This dose is higher than the usual loading dose of 0.5 - 1.5 mg recommended in normal circumstances.9 However, in such an emergency in a dying patient, an anaesthetising dose of a rapidly acting sedative, such as midazolam, is recommended.10

Terminal restlessness has many different causes.7,11 Drug toxicity, hypercalcaemia, urine retention and faecal impaction can be corrected relatively easily; however, in many patients terminal restlessness is multifactorial and irreversible. In such situations, sedation is an effective option.

Many doctors and nurses have reservations about the use of deep sedation in dying patients. Is sedation being used because of lack of skill in controlling terminal symptoms by non-sedating means? Is such sedation merely euthanasia in disguise?14,15 Is ‘terminal sedation’ a self-fulfilling prophecy, especially if the normal means of sustaining life such as food

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table II. Dosages of morphine, midazolam and haloperidol used at Sungardens Hospice compared with dosages used in four other studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parenteral morphine equivalent (mg/24 h)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sungardens</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Turner et al.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thorns and Sykes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Morita et al.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fainsinger</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*The studies by Turner et al., Thorns and Sykes, and Morita et al. involved all consecutive admissions, not just those requiring sedation.

\*Conversion ratio of 2:1 can be used from oral morphine equivalent (OME) to parenteral morphine equivalent (PME). Consensus statement of the European Association for Palliative Care.34

\*Combined results of a multicentre study.
and water have been withdrawn at the same time that sedation has been introduced?

Concern about these issues has prompted some to propose new terms to replace terminal sedation. After conducting a survey of 61 international experts in 1998, Chater et al. proposed that the phrase ‘sedation for intractable distress in the dying’ be used in place of terminal sedation. However, this is a rather cumbersome term.

Morita et al. have suggested that the term ‘palliative sedation therapy’ be used. They define this as ‘the use of sedative medications to relieve untraceable and refractory distress by reduction in patient consciousness’. The term ‘palliative sedation’ removes the stigma associated with terminal sedation and places the emphasis on the purpose of the sedation rather than on the outcome. It sets out clearly the aim, the means and the extent of the sedation.

However, if sedation is seen as the desired outcome, it may discourage regular review and a continued search for non-sedating alternatives. Regular review is a hallmark of good care and should continue even when sedation is used. The amount of sedation can sometimes be reduced after the distress has been relieved for a short while. In other cases the sedation needs to be continued until the patient dies.

Sedation and life expectancy

It is interesting to note that sedation of patients with advanced cancer does not necessarily mean the shortening of life. Several authors have documented no difference in survival of both sedated and non-sedated terminal patients. These are important findings and they go a long way towards establishing the legitimacy of the use of sedation in such patients.

In the series of studies reviewed by Sales, delirium (39%) and dyspnoea (38%) were the main refractory symptoms for which sedation was used. Nausea and vomiting were refractory in 6%. The reason for the high incidence of intractable vomiting at Sungardens was that there were 5 patients (25%) with intestinal obstruction in a relatively small total number (20) of patients.

Lack of uniform diagnostic criteria and the reporting of more than 1 refractory symptom make comparison between the results from Sungardens and other surveys difficult. The median frequency of the use of sedation in the 13 studies reviewed by Sales was 25%. The prevalence of sedation at Sungardens (20%) is below this figure.

The studies reviewed by Sales showed survivals of between 1.5 and 3.9 days after beginning sedation. The short survival of sedated patients has been shown to be a reflection of their advanced stage of disease rather than the shortening of their lives due to sedation. Although comparing results is difficult as the designs of the studies are so different, the drug doses used at Sungardens Hospice appear to be similar to those used in other centres in England, Japan and Australia. They are also within the range suggested in standard textbooks of palliative medicine.

Parenteral fluids are seldom used at Sungardens Hospice. Most terminally ill patients stop eating and drinking during the last few days of life without this causing them any discomfort. The body’s metabolism undergoes a number of significant changes as a result of diminished intake of food and fluids. The metabolic rate slows down. Ketones and free fatty acids, produced by the catabolism of the body’s own tissues, become the main energy source. The process of catabolism also produces water. Together with the reduction in the amount of urine excreted, this means that the need for additional fluids is greatly reduced. Although the actual needs of a sedated dying person for food and fluids are not known, there is no evidence that artificial feeding positively influences their comfort or outcome. There is some evidence that artificial feeding may do just the opposite. The main problem, however, may be the symbolic nature of food and water. Denying them to anyone, even someone who is dying, may be perceived as cruel. Open communication with patients and their families helps to ensure that joint decisions are made as far as possible. At the same time it should be emphasised that the main goal of care for the imminently dying person is comfort. Any plan of action must be aimed primarily at making the dying person comfortable. ‘A doctor has neither the duty nor the right to prescribe a lingering death.”

The dose of drugs for analgesia and sedation used at Sungardens Hospice is similar to that used in other centres around the world. Turner and colleagues from Sydney reported a mean daily dose of 66.2 mg of parenteral morphine and a dose range of midazolam of 2.5 - 47 mg during the last 3 days of life. Thorns and Sykes from London report a mean daily dose of 55.5 mg of parenteral morphine in a series of terminal patients. Morita and colleagues in Japan reported using a mean dose of 68 mg of morphine, 26 mg of midazolam and 5 mg of haloperidol per day (Table II). These three studies were reporting on the drug use of a sequence of consecutive admissions and not specifically on those being sedated for refractory symptoms. In a multicentre international study of the use of sedation for refractory symptoms, Fainsinger reported that the mean daily dose of midazolam was 33 mg (range 5 - 180 mg). Although comparing results is difficult as the designs of the studies are so different, the drug doses used at Sungardens Hospice appear to be similar to those used in other centres in England, Japan and Australia. They are also within the range suggested in standard textbooks of palliative medicine.
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The small numbers in this study preclude generalisation. The study highlights the need for clear definitions and guidelines to ensure the best possible care for those patients nearing the end of their lives who have intractable symptoms.
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Conclusion
This survey shows that the use of sedation in dying patients at Sungardens Hospice is in line with several studies reported in the international literature. An international consensus is gradually emerging as common terminology and approaches are being adopted. A new multicentre international study using a standardised protocol is needed to confirm this consensus especially with regards to the indications for sedation and the drug dosages.
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