

## APPENDIX. DEFINITIONS OF EACH MEASUREMENT

---

Efficacy	
Poor	Chart descriptions of 1) patient expressions such as "I didn't sleep.", "I didn't sleep at all.", "I didn't sleep and was distressed.", "I didn't sleep soundly.", "I didn't get to sleep easily.", "I had a bad dream." Or, 2) physician or nurses' records such as "The patient tossed and turned all night.", "The patient woke up off and on.", "The patient moved during the night.", "Reconsideration of hypnotics is necessary.", "no sleep", "not very much sleep". "slept lightly", "The patient was delirious."
Fair	Chart descriptions of 1) patient expressions such as "I slept so-so.", "I slept a little.", "I generally slept.", "I slept slightly better than yesterday." Or, 2) physician or nurses' records such as "The patient mostly slept although he woke up or moved during the night."
Good	Chart descriptions of 1) patient expressions such as "I slept.", "I had a good sleep.", "I slept very well.", "I slept soundly." Or, 2) physician or nurses' records such as "The patient didn't wake up and didn't move during the night."
Unknown	There was no description about sleep.
Hangover	
Presence	Chart descriptions of 1) patient expressions such as "I am drowsy.", "I am sleepy.", "My mind is not clear.", "I have a hangover." Or, 2) physician or nurses' records such as "drowsy", "somnolent", "The patient sleeps until past 9 am.", "The patient dozes off.", "The patient cannot eat breakfast because of sleepiness.", "The patient looks sleepy.", "There is a sign of hangover.", "The patient doesn't wake up.", "The patient dozes off while talking.", "The patient cannot urinate because of sleepiness."
Absence	Chart descriptions of 1) patient expressions such as "My mind is very clear.", "I awoke refreshed." Or, 2) physician or nurses' records such as "The patient awoke refreshed". "The patient is very alert."
Unknown	There was no description about sleepiness next morning.
Respiratory depression	
Presence	Physician or nurses' records such as "apnea", "respiratory arrest", "decreased respiratory rate", "respiratory depression".
Absence	There was not above description.

---

## Original Article

## Terminal Delirium: Recommendations from Bereaved Families' Experiences

Tatsuya Morita, MD, Tatsuo Akechi, MD, PhD, Masayuki Ikenaga, MD, Shinichi Inoue, MD, Hiroyuki Kohara, MD, PhD, Tatsuhiro Matsubara, MD, Naoki Matsuo, MD, Miki Namba, RN, MA, Takuya Shinjo, MD, Kazuhiko Tani, MD, and Yosuke Uchitomi, MD, PhD

Department of Palliative and Supportive Care (T.M.), Palliative Care Team (T.M., M.N.), and Seirei Hospice (T.M.), Seirei Mikatahara General Hospital, Shizuoka; Department of Psychiatry and Cognitive-Behavioral Medicine (T.A.), Nagoya City University Graduate School of Medical Sciences, Nagoya; Hospice (M.I.), Yodogawa Christian Hospital, Osaka; Palliative Care Unit (S.I.), Aki City Hospital, Hiroshima; Palliative Care Unit (H.K.), National Sanyo Hospital, Yamaguchi; Palliative Care Unit (T.M.), Kawasaki Social Insurance Hospital, Kanagawa; Department of Palliative Medicine (N.M.), Saitama Cancer Center, Saitama; Palliative Care Unit (T.S.), Shakahoken Kobe Central Hospital, Kobe; Department of Palliative Care (K.T.), Fukuiken Saiseikai Hospital, Fukui; Psycho-Oncology Division (Y.U.), National Cancer Center Research Institute East, Chiba; and Psychiatry Division (Y.U.), National Cancer Center Hospital East, Chiba, Japan

## Abstract

Although delirium is a common complication in terminally ill cancer patients and can cause considerable distress for family members, little is known about effective care strategies for terminal delirium. The primary aims of this study were 1) to clarify the distress levels of bereaved families and their perceived necessity of care; and 2) to explore the association between these levels and family-reported professional care practice, family-reported patient behavior, and their interpretation of the causes of delirium. A multicenter questionnaire survey was conducted on 560 bereaved family members of cancer patients who developed delirium during their final two weeks in eight certified palliative care units across Japan. We obtained 402 effective responses (response rate, 72%) and, as 160 families denied delirium episodes, 242 responses were analyzed. The bereaved family members reported that they were very distressed (32%) and distressed (22%) about the experience of terminal delirium. On the other hand, 5.8% reported that considerable or much improvement was necessary, and 31% reported some improvement was necessary in the professional care they had received. More than half of the respondents had ambivalent wishes, guilt and self-blame, and worries about staying with the patient. One-fourth to one-third reported that they felt a burden concerning proxy judgments, burden to others, acceptance, and helplessness. High-level emotional distress and family-perceived necessity of improvement were associated with a younger family age; male gender; their experience of agitation and incoherent speech; their interpretation of the causes of delirium as pain/physical discomfort, medication effects, or

This study was supported by a grant from the Comprehensive 10-Year Strategy for Cancer Control Program of the Ministry of Health, Welfare, and Labour of Japan.

Address reprint requests to: Tatsuya Morita, MD, Department of Palliative and Supportive Care,

Palliative Care Team and Seirei Hospice, Seirei Mikatahara General Hospital, Shizuoka, 3453 Mikatahara-cho, Hamamatsu, Shizuoka 433-8558, Japan. E-mail: tmorita@sis.seirei.or.jp

Accepted for publication: January 19, 2007.

*mental weakness/death anxiety; and their perception that medical staff were not present with the family, not respecting the patient's subjective world, not explaining the expected course with daily changes, and not relieving family care burden. In terminal delirium, a considerable number of families experienced high levels of emotional distress and felt some need for improvement of the specialized palliative care service. Control of agitation symptoms with careful consideration of ambivalent family wishes, providing information about the pathology of delirium, being present with the family, respecting the patient's subjective world, explaining the expected course with daily changes, and relieving family care burden can be useful care strategies. J Pain Symptom Manage 2007;34:579-589. © 2007 U.S. Cancer Pain Relief Committee. Published by Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.*

### **Key Words**

*Palliative care, delirium, family, neoplasms, end-of-life care*

## **Introduction**

Delirium or cognitive disorder occurs in 68%–90% of terminally ill cancer patients just before death.<sup>1–5</sup> Although cognitive impairment can sometimes be labeled as part of the “natural” dying process, delirium-related symptoms can cause great distress to both patients and family members.<sup>6,7</sup> According to one prospective observation study of 75 family members of delirious cancer patients, 76% of family members showed high levels of psychological distress as a result of the delirium symptoms.<sup>6</sup> A questionnaire survey involving 300 bereaved Japanese families revealed that more than two-thirds perceived all delirium-related symptoms other than somnolence as distressing or very distressing.<sup>7</sup> These results indicate that, given that one of the primary goals of integrated palliative care is to alleviate family suffering, active support for the family members of delirious terminal patients is of great importance.

Understanding the experience of families of delirious terminally ill patients is vital to explore effective care strategies. To our knowledge, however, despite many experience-based recommendations by palliative care specialists,<sup>8–11</sup> only a few studies have explored the actual experiences of families in the terminal stage.<sup>12–14</sup> Our previous qualitative study revealed that the families experienced various phenomena other than psychiatric symptoms, had a range of emotions, interpreted the delirium variously, and listed some specific useful support strategies in caring terminal delirium.<sup>14</sup> Although this study provides a potentially useful insight, generalizability is limited due to a lack of quantitative data.

The primary aim of the current study was thus to: 1) clarify the distress levels of bereaved families and their perceived necessity of care related to terminal delirium; and 2) explore the association between these levels and family-reported professional care practice, family-reported patient behavior, and their interpretation of the causes of delirium.

## **Methods**

This was a cross-sectional, anonymous, multicenter survey of the bereaved families of cancer patients who had been admitted to eight palliative care units in Japan. We mailed questionnaires to bereaved families in February 2006, and again in March 2006 to nonresponding families. If the families did not want to participate in the survey, they were requested to return the questionnaire with “no participation” indicated, and the second questionnaire was not mailed. The participating institutions were conveniently selected from 150 certified palliative care units. We acknowledged the potential sampling bias, but decided to use convenient institutions due to the practical difficulties of obtaining participants from all palliative care units, and because a relatively large number of patients can minimize the risk of sampling bias.

## **Subjects**

Primary palliative care responsible physicians identified potential participants following these inclusion criteria: 1) bereaved adult family members of an adult cancer patient (one family member was selected for each

patient), with delirium during the final two weeks of life (based on a retrospective chart review and using Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 4 (DSM-IV) criteria<sup>15</sup>), 2) capable of replying to a self-reported questionnaire, 3) aware of the diagnosis of malignancy, and 4) no serious psychological distress recognized by the primary palliative care physicians. The last criterion was adopted in the same way as in our previous surveys,<sup>16,17</sup> on the assumption that primary palliative care physicians could identify families who would suffer serious psychological distress from this survey, because they were closely involved in caring for their relative in an inpatient care setting with a mean admission period of 43 days. We excluded patients with preexisting symptomatic organic brain pathology (i.e., brain metastasis, infarction) or psychiatric disorders other than delirium (i.e., psychosis, dementia), because the psychiatric symptoms might influence the results. To minimize the possibility of sampling bias among institutions, we compared the percentages of patients diagnosed with delirium per all dead patients and the percentages of patients excluded from this study due to the last criterion among the institutions.

Each hospital was requested to consecutively enroll the families of 90 patients who developed delirium and died in 2005 (one institution with clinical activity of less than one year enrolled all patients treated there).

The completion and return of the questionnaire was regarded as consent to participate in this study. Ethical and scientific validity was confirmed by the institutional review board of each hospital.

### Measurement Tools

**Questionnaire.** A questionnaire (available from the authors upon request) was developed for this study based on a systematic literature review,<sup>6-14,18-23</sup> our previous qualitative study based on in-depth interviews with 20 bereaved family members,<sup>14</sup> and discussions among the authors. Content validity was assessed by full agreement of the authors, and the face validity of the questionnaire was confirmed by a pilot test.

As background data, the families reported their ages, genders, relationships to the patient, and intervals from patient death to the study. In the first part of the questionnaire,

we asked the respondents whether they thought the patient was delirious or not, because in our previous interview study, 17 of 37 families denied delirium despite diagnostic confirmation based on chart review.<sup>14</sup> Delirium was paraphrased in the questionnaire as "the rapid development of difficulty in concentration, forgetfulness, disorientation about time and place, hallucinations and delusions, incoherent speech, clouding of consciousness and difficulty in communicating, emotional instability, reversal of daytime and nighttime activities (drowsiness during the day and wakefulness during the night), and inconsistent behavior, with these conditions changing even within a day." We carefully developed this introduction section on the basis of the DSM-IV criteria through full agreement among the author liaison psychiatrists and palliative care specialists.

The primary endpoints of this study were family-perceived emotional distress related to terminal delirium and the necessity for improvement in professional care at that time. Due to the lack of validated instruments, these outcome parameters were developed for this study following previous surveys.<sup>16,17</sup> The level of family-perceived distress was evaluated by the response to "How distressing was the patient's delirium for you?," rated on a 5-point scale from 1, "no distress at all" to 5, "very distressing." The necessity for improvement was evaluated by the answer to "How much improvement do you think is necessary in the care for delirium?," rated on a 4-point scale as 1, "no need for improvement," 2, "need for some improvement," 3, "need for considerable improvement," and 4, "need for much improvement." To explore the families' emotions, we asked the respondents to rate their degree of agreement with 16 statements to describe their feelings on a 5-point Likert-type scale of 1, "disagree," to 5, "strongly agree" (Table 2). In addition, we asked the respondents to rate their degree of agreement with eight potential meanings of delirium for the family member on a 5-point Likert-type scale of 1, "disagree," to 5, "strongly agree" (Table 4).

The families were further requested to report factors potentially contributing to these primary endpoints. They were conceptualized prior to the survey and classified into the

following categories: 1) family-reported patient behavior (rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale of 1: none, 2: occasionally, and 3: often) (Table 3); 2) families' interpretation of the causes of delirium (examined by the degree of agreement on a 5-point Likert-type scale of 1: disagree to 5: strongly agree) (Table 4); 3) family-reported professional care practice (examined using the yes-no format) (Table 5); and 4) the family care subscale of the Care Evaluation Scale.<sup>24</sup>

The Care Evaluation Scale is an originally validated 28-item questionnaire to measure bereaved family-perceived necessity of improvement in end-of-life care;<sup>24</sup> its reliability and validity have been well established. The family care subscale was designed to quantify the family-perceived necessity of improvement in care to relieve the family care burden. A lower score indicated a greater need for improvement (possible range, 0–10).

*Chart Review Data.* Primary palliative care physicians recorded the patient backgrounds (age, gender, primary tumor site, admission periods, and the type and severity of delirium on item 9 of the Memorial Delirium Assessment Scale—Japanese version<sup>25</sup>).

#### Analyses

To describe the estimated frequency of the phenomenon observed, we calculated the 95% confidence intervals (CI) for each figure.

For comparisons, the respondents were classified into two groups: family members who rated their distress level as "very distressed" (high-level distress) and others (low-level distress); and family members who rated the necessity for improvement as "much," "considerable," or "some" (defined as a high level of perceived necessity for improvement) and others (low level). These cutoff points were determined on the basis of the actual data distribution to divide the whole sample into appropriate sizes of comparison groups.

To explore the underlying structure of the families' emotions (Table 2), we reported factor-loading values by exploratory factor analysis with promax rotation on emotion-related items, and calculated Cronbach's alpha. Two ambivalent items with different meanings within one sentence were excluded from this analysis.

To explore the determinants of the levels of family-perceived distress and necessity for improvement, we initially screened: 1) demographic variables (patient age, gender, admission periods, responding family member age, gender, relationship to the patient, interval from patient death to study, health status in the last week, availability of someone with whom they could consult about the patient, and someone who could care for the patient instead of them); 2) type and severity of delirium (measured using item 9 of the Memorial Delirium Assessment Scale by the primary physicians); 3) family-reported patient behavior (Table 3); 4) families' interpretation of the causes of delirium (Table 4); 5) family-reported professional care practice (Table 5); and 6) the family care subscale of the Care Evaluation Scale. Univariate analyses were performed using Student's *t*-test or the Chi-square test, where appropriate. Multiple logistic regression analyses were then performed in a forward-elimination fashion. All potential predictors with statistical significance by univariate analyses were entered in the equation as independent variables, and we reported the factors that achieved  $P < 0.1$  because they had a clinically meaningful interpretation despite marginal statistical significance.

All analyses were performed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (version 11.0).

#### Results

Of 984 patients who died during this study period, 672 patients (68%) were diagnosed with delirium during the final two weeks of life. Of them, 53 patients had preexisting symptomatic organic brain or psychiatric disorders, and 19 patients had no competent adult family members available. Of the remaining 600 patients, we excluded 40 bereaved family members (6.7%) due to serious psychological distress recognized by primary physicians. Among the institutions, the percentages of patients diagnosed with delirium per all deceased patients ranged from 47% to 87% (three institutions below 70%), and the percentages of patients excluded from this study due to psychological reasons ranged from 0% to 12% (all but one institution below 7.0%).

We thus sent questionnaires to 560 families, 10 of which were returned as undeliverable. Four hundred twenty-seven families returned questionnaires (response rate, 78%, 427/550). Of them, nine families refused to participate, and 16 responses were excluded due to missing data in primary endpoints. Thus, we obtained 402 effective responses (effective response rate, 73%, 402/550). As 160 families denied delirium episodes, further analyses were performed on 242 responses. Table 1 summarizes the backgrounds of patients and bereaved family members. The subtypes of delirium were hypoactive, 29% ( $n = 70$ ); hyperactive, 48% ( $n = 117$ ); and mixed, 20% ( $n = 48$ ). Symptom severity was mild, 39% ( $n = 95$ ); moderate, 47% ( $n = 114$ ); and severe, 11% ( $n = 26$ ) on item 9 of the Memorial Delirium Assessment Scale.

#### Overall Levels of Family-Reported Distress and Necessity for Improvement

The degree of family-reported distress was very distressing (32% [95% CI: 26,38],  $n = 77$ ), distressing (22% [95% CI: 17,28],  $n = 53$ ), slightly distressing (31% [95% CI: 25,37],  $n = 74$ ), not so distressing (10% [95% CI: 7.0,15],  $n = 25$ ), and not distressing at all (5.4% [95% CI: 3.0-9.0],  $n = 13$ ). The necessity of improvement in delirium care as rated by the family members was much improvement needed (0.8% [95% CI: 0,3.0],  $n = 2$ ), considerable improvement needed (5.0% [95% CI: 3.0,9.0],  $n = 12$ ), some improvement needed (31% [95% CI: 25,37],  $n = 75$ ), and no improvement needed (59% [95% CI: 53,65],  $n = 143$ ).

#### Family-Reported Emotions

Exploratory factor analysis categorized family-reported emotions into seven categories: ambivalent, guilt and self-blame, worry about staying with the patient, burden about proxy judgment, burden to others, acceptance, helplessness, and relief. More than half of the respondents had ambivalent wishes, guilt and self-blame, and worries about staying with the patient. One-fourth to one-third reported that they felt a burden over proxy judgments, burden to others, acceptance, and helplessness. Less than 5% reported positive feelings such as relief (Table 2).

Table 1  
Backgrounds

	% (n)
Patients	
Age (mean $\pm$ SD)	69 $\pm$ 12
Sex	
Male	64 (155)
Female	36 (87)
Primary sites	
Lung	26 (62)
Stomach	13 (31)
Colon, rectum	11 (27)
Pancreas, bile duct	12 (29)
Liver	5.3 (13)
Neck	6.2 (15)
Uterus, ovary	4.1 (10)
Bladder, kidney, prostate	7.9 (19)
Breast	3.3 (8)
Esophagus	2.5 (6)
Unknown	2.1 (5)
Others	7.0 (17)
Admission periods (d) (mean $\pm$ SD)	43 $\pm$ 48 (median, 28)
Bereaved families	
Age (mean $\pm$ SD)	58 $\pm$ 13
Sex	
Male	25 (60)
Female	74 (178)
Relationship	
Spouse	55 (132)
Child	30 (72)
Parents	1.7 (4)
Siblings	4.1 (10)
Others	9.1 (22)
Interval from patient death (mo) (mean $\pm$ SD)	12 $\pm$ 13 (median, 11)
In the last week	
Health status	
Good	74 (180)
Poor	24 (58)
Availability of person with whom the respondent consulted about the patient	91 (221)
Availability of person who cared for the patient instead of the respondent	71 (171)
Frequency of staying with the patient	
Every day	77 (186)
4-6 days/wk	12 (29)
1-3 days/wk	8.7 (21)

Some data do not add up to 100% due to missing values.

#### Family-Reported Patient Behavior

The bereaved family members reported various patient behaviors other than "psychiatric symptoms." More than half of the respondents reported that, during the delirium episodes, the patient expressed physiologic desires, seemed incoherent but talked about actual past events, and talked about uncompleted life tasks. In addition, about 30% said that the patient apologized

Table 2  
Family-Reported Emotions

	Agree or Strongly Agree	95% CI	Factor Loadings	Alpha
	% (n)			
<i>Ambivalent</i>				N.C.
Simultaneously wanted the patient both to stay awake and to relieve the patient from suffering.	64 (155)	58,70	N.C.	
Simultaneously wanted the patient both to live longer and to die without suffering.	40 (97)	34,46	N.C.	
<i>Guilt and self-blame</i>				0.87
Could not understand what the patient wished for.	62 (149)	55,68	0.89	
Might not be able to realize the patient's unfulfilled wishes.	56 (135)	49,62	0.89	
Guilty, could not do enough for the patient.	52 (126)	46,58	0.88	
<i>Worry about staying with the patient</i>				0.77
Worried about caring the patient alone.	58 (140)	51,64	0.89	
Anxious about taking their eyes off the patient.	57 (139)	51,64	0.88	
<i>Burden about proxy judgment</i>				N.C.
Burden about having to make a decision on behalf of the patient.	39 (94)	33,45	0.86	
<i>Burden to others</i>				0.60
Distressed as the patient troubled others.	38 (91)	32,44	0.68	
Not wanting other members of the family to see the patient.	35 (84)	29,41	0.69	
Sad to see the patient having completely changed.	29 (71)	24,35	0.85	
<i>Acceptance</i>				N.C.
Just accepting the fact.	35 (84)	29,41	0.96	
<i>Helplessness</i>				0.78
Helplessness about what to do.	32 (78)	27,38	0.87	
Not sure about what was happening.	28 (68)	23,34	0.91	
<i>Relief</i>				0.81
Felt relieved.	3.3 (8)	2.0,6.0	0.89	
Felt happy.	2.5 (6)	1.0,5.0	0.91	

N.C. = not calculated.

for past events and was distressed as they noticed that they were talking strangely. About 20% of the family members reported a transcendent experience, that is, that the patient talked to or met people who had died (Table 3).

#### *Family-Perceived Meaning of Delirium and Interpretation of the Causes of Delirium*

About half of the respondents perceived delirium as a sign of approaching death, the patient trying to express what to say, or patient suffering. About one-fourth to one-third perceived delirium as a natural part of the dying process, dreaming, a transcendent phenomenon (entering the after-death world), or relief from actual suffering. Forty to 60% of the families interpreted the causes of delirium as pain/physical discomfort or medication effects (Table 4).

#### *Family-Reported Professional Care Practice for Delirium*

The families generally reported high adherence to the recommended care practice for

terminal delirium. Eighty percent or more families agreed that professionals treated patients the same as before, tried to understand what the patient wanted to say, were sufficiently compassionate to the family, explained the expected course along with daily changes, and respected the patient's subjective world (Table 5).

#### *Determinants of Family-Perceived Emotional Distress and Necessity of Improvement*

Compared with the family members with low-level distress, family members with high-level distress were more likely to experience agitated behavior, incoherent speech, the patient talking about uncompleted life tasks, the patient appearing incoherent but talking about actual past events, and being distressed by noticing that they were talking strangely; more likely to interpret the causes of delirium as pain/physical discomfort, medication effects, psychosis/"getting crazy," and mental weakness/death anxiety; less likely to report

Table 3  
Family-Reported Patient Behavior in the Delirium Episodes

	Occasionally	95% CI	Often	95% CI
	% (n)		% (n)	
<i>"Psychiatric symptoms"</i>				
Incoherent speech	53 (128)	47, 59	25 (60)	20, 31
Mentally clear in some situations within the day	36 (88)	31, 43	37 (89)	31, 43
Hallucinations	34 (83)	29, 41	17 (40)	12, 22
Agitated behavior	31 (75)	25, 37	15 (36)	11, 20
<i>Other than "psychiatric symptoms"</i>				
Expressed physiologic desires (excretion, thirst)	31 (76)	26, 38	40 (96)	34, 46
Seemed incoherent but talked about actual past events	41 (100)	35, 48	26 (62)	20, 32
Talked about uncompleted life tasks	32 (78)	27, 38	24 (57)	19, 29
Good mood	33 (80)	27, 39	7.4 (18)	5.0, 11
Apologized for past events	22 (53)	17, 28	6.6 (16)	4.0, 11
Distressed as the patient noticed him/herself talking strangely	21 (51)	16, 27	6.6 (16)	4.0, 11
Said that the patient talked to or met people who had died	18 (44)	14, 24	4.1 (10)	2.0, 7.0

the medical professionals as present with the family; and more likely to report the patient being physically restrained (Table 6).

Compared with the family members who perceived a low-level necessity of improvement, family members who perceived a high-level necessity of improvement were more likely to be young and male; more likely to interpret the causes of delirium as pain/physical discomfort and medication effects; less likely to report that the medical professionals were present with the family, respected the patient's subjective world, explained the expected course along with daily changes, tried to understand what the patient wanted to say, were sufficiently compassionate to the family, had facilitated communication before it became

Table 4  
Family-Perceived Meaning of Delirium and Interpretations About the Causes of Delirium

	Agree, or Strongly Agree	95% CI
	% (n)	
<i>Meaning of delirium</i>		
Sign of approaching death	59 (143)	53, 65
Trying to express what the patient wanted to do or say	52 (125)	45, 58
Suffering	45 (108)	38, 51
A natural part of the dying process	31 (74)	25, 37
Dream	25 (61)	20, 31
Entering after-death world	22 (54)	17, 28
Relief from actual suffering	22 (53)	17, 28
Happy and welcome experience	7.0 (17)	4.0, 11
<i>Interpretation about the causes of delirium</i>		
Pain or physical discomfort	60 (144)	53, 66
Medication effects	41 (99)	35, 47
Psychosis or "becoming crazy"	19 (46)	15, 24
Mental weakness or death anxiety	15 (37)	11, 20

difficult, and had confirmed the patient's wishes before communication became difficult; and reported a lower score of the family care subscale of the Care Evaluation Scale.

Multiple logistic regression analyses revealed that the independent determinants of high-level distress or high-level necessity of improvement were younger age; male gender; experience of agitation and incoherent speech; interpretation of the causes of delirium as pain/

Table 5  
Family-Reported Professional Care Practice for Delirium

	Practiced	95% CI
	% (n)	
Treated patients the same as before	94 (227)	90, 96
Tried to understand what the patient wanted to say	88 (214)	84, 92
Was sufficiently compassionate to the family	86 (208)	81, 90
Explained the expected course along with daily changes	86 (207)	80, 89
Respected the patient's subjective world without denying "incoherent things"	83 (202)	78, 88
Discussed with the family about how to deal with the issue	75 (181)	69, 80
Explained the pathology of delirium (not dementia or psychosis)	72 (175)	66, 78
Was present with the family	71 (173)	65, 77
Facilitated with family members in communicating and being with the patient before it became difficult	68 (164)	62, 73
Explained the universality of delirium	66 (159)	59, 71
Confirmed the patient's wishes before communication became difficult	54 (131)	48, 60
<i>Physical restraint</i>		
Before admission to palliative care units	3.3 (8)	2.0, 6.0
In palliative care units	2.5 (6)	1.0, 5.0



physical discomfort, medication effects, or mental weakness/death anxiety; and medical staff being present with the family, respecting the patient's subjective world, explaining the expected course along with daily changes, and relieving the family care burden.

### Discussion

This is, to our knowledge, the first systemic survey to investigate the potential correlations of the distress levels of families and the perceived necessity of improvement in care related to terminal delirium with family-reported professional care practice, family-reported patient behavior, and perception of the causes of delirium.

This survey revealed that, although a relatively small number of families (5.8%) reported that considerable or much improvement was necessary in the professional care they had received in certified palliative care units, about half of the families reported being very distressed or distressed about the experience of terminal delirium. This figure is relatively low compared with the previous two surveys,<sup>6,7</sup> but confirms that at least 50% of the families of patients with delirium experienced considerable emotional distress.

The most important finding of this study was the identification of factors associated with the distress levels of families and their perceived necessity of improvement. The chief factors included family experience of agitation, their interpretation of the causes of delirium, and their perception about the care they had received.

Consistent with previous surveys that identified agitation as a significant determinant of family distress,<sup>6,7</sup> family-reported agitation was an important determinant of family distress in this study. The control of agitation symptoms, therefore, is an important task for palliative care clinicians. This study revealed, however, that ambivalent wishes between symptom control and maintaining communication were the most common emotions of the families. Together with qualitative studies stressing the importance of ambivalent wishes in this situation,<sup>12,14</sup> clinicians should note that families want not only symptom palliation but also much broader elements of quality of life, such as maintaining cognitive control,

communicating with others, and living as long as possible.<sup>26,27</sup> That is, clinically, pharmacologically sedative therapy should not be routinely applied to control agitation symptoms without careful individualized considerations, and the depth or duration of sedation should be closely adjusted for each situation.<sup>28</sup>

Families often interpreted delirium as the consequences of pain/physical discomfort, medication effects, psychosis/"becoming crazy," or mental weakness/death anxiety, and these interpretations were significantly associated with both family distress and necessity of improvement. These findings confirm the great importance of information focusing on the cause and pathologies of delirium (i.e., terminal delirium is usually not an expression of pain, medication effects, "becoming crazy," or mental weakness), as stated in expert literature.<sup>10,14</sup>

The major care practices related to a family's emotional distress and necessity of improvement included being present with the family, respecting the patient's subjective world, explaining the expected course with daily changes, and relieving the family care burden.

Of special note, as this study suggests, respecting the patient's subjective world can be an important care strategy in terminal delirium. This care strategy was associated with the overall necessity of improvement, and the family members experienced various patient behaviors other than "psychiatric symptoms": the patient expressed physiologic desires, seemed incoherent but talked about actual past events, talked about uncompleted life tasks, and apologized for past events. Consistent with the recommendations of palliative care textbooks,<sup>8-11</sup> these findings suggest that the care strategy for terminal delirium may include exploring and fulfilling unmet physiological needs behind delirium symptoms, and trying to understand the "strange" behavior of delirious patients as a potentially meaningful experience to find a clue for important landmark events and achieve uncompleted life tasks for patients and families.

Among care strategies investigated in this study, only being with the patient was associated with families' emotional distress. This result indicates, as nonempirical literature stresses the importance of "being" for palliative care clinicians,<sup>8-11</sup> being with the families of delirious patients is an essential element of care.

Table 6  
Determinants of Family-Reported Emotional Distress and Necessity of Improvement

	Emotional Distress Level				Necessity of Improvement			
	Univariate Analyses		Multivariate Analysis <sup>a</sup>		Univariate Analyses		Multivariate Analysis <sup>b</sup>	
	High-Distress (n = 77)	Low-Distress (n = 165)	Odds Ratio [95% CI]	P	High Necessity (n = 89)	Low Necessity (n = 143)	Odds Ratio [95% CI]	P
<i>Background</i>								
Age (family)					55 ± 11	60 ± 14 <sup>c</sup>	0.96 [0.99-0.99]	0.016
Sex (family, female)					64% (n = 57)	79% (n = 113) <sup>c</sup>	0.22 [0.096-0.50]	0.001
Sex (patient, female)					45% (n = 40)	31% (n = 44) <sup>c</sup>		
<i>Family-reported patient behavior<sup>d</sup></i>								
Agitated behavior	0.85 ± 0.78	0.51 ± 0.69 <sup>c</sup>	1.5 [0.98-2.4]	0.063				
Incoherent speech	1.2 ± 0.72	0.97 ± 0.64 <sup>d</sup>	1.7 [1.0-2.9]	0.042				
Talked about uncompleted life tasks	1.0 ± 0.83	0.73 ± 0.77 <sup>d</sup>						
Seemed incoherent but talked about actual past events	1.2 ± 0.72	0.90 ± 0.76 <sup>c</sup>						
Distressed as the patient noticed	0.49 ± 0.73	0.30 ± 0.53 <sup>c</sup>						
<i>Interpretations of the causes<sup>e</sup></i>								
Pain or physical discomfort	3.0 ± 1.3	2.5 ± 1.2 <sup>d</sup>	1.3 [0.95-1.7]	0.099	2.9 ± 1.2	2.5 ± 1.2 <sup>c</sup>		
Medication effects	2.3 ± 1.2	2.0 ± 1.2 <sup>c</sup>						
Mental weakness or death anxiety	1.6 ± 1.3	1.3 ± 0.94 <sup>c</sup>	1.3 [0.97-1.8]	0.078	2.4 ± 1.1	1.9 ± 1.200 <sup>d</sup>	1.5 [1.1-2.1]	0.014
Psychosis or "getting crazy"	1.6 ± 1.3	1.3 ± 1.1 <sup>c</sup>						
<i>Family-reported professional care<sup>b</sup></i>								
Was present with the family	62% (n = 48)	76% (n = 125) <sup>c</sup>	0.49 [0.23-1.0]	0.068	58% (n = 52)	83% (n = 119) <sup>a</sup>	0.35 [0.12-1.0]	0.053
Respected the patient's subjective world					81% (n = 72)	88% (n = 126) <sup>c</sup>	0.16 [0.019-1.3]	0.088
Explained the expected course					79% (n = 70)	92% (n = 132) <sup>d</sup>	0.13 [0.028-0.64]	0.011
Tried to understand what the patient said					87% (n = 77)	93% (n = 133) <sup>c</sup>		
Was sufficiently compassionate to the family					76% (n = 68)	93% (n = 133) <sup>a</sup>		
Had confirmed the patient's wishes before communication became difficult					44% (n = 39)	64% (n = 91) <sup>a</sup>		

(Continued)

Table 6 (Continued)

	Emotional Distress Level			Necessity of Improvement		
	Univariate Analyses		Multivariate Analysis <sup>a</sup>	Univariate Analyses		Multivariate Analysis <sup>b</sup>
	High-Distress (n = 77)	Low-Distress (n = 165)	Odds Ratio [95% CI]	High Necessity (n = 89)	Low Necessity (n = 143)	Odds Ratio [95% CI]
Had facilitated communication before it became difficult				62% (n = 55)	73% (n = 105) <sup>f</sup>	
Relieved the family care burden <sup>g</sup>				6.4 ± 2.5	7.9 ± 2.5 <sup>e</sup>	0.84 [0.73–0.98]
Physical restraint	10% (n = 8)	3.6% (n = 6) <sup>c</sup>				0.025

<sup>a</sup> $\chi^2 = 0.15$ .<sup>b</sup> $R^2 = 0.37$ .<sup>c</sup> $P < 0.05$ .<sup>d</sup>Rated as 0 (none), 1 (occasionally), and 2 (often).<sup>e</sup> $P < 0.001$ .<sup>f</sup> $P < 0.01$ .<sup>g</sup>Rated as 0 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree).<sup>h</sup>Rated as practiced or not.<sup>i</sup>Rated on the family care subscale of the Care Evaluation Questionnaire. Lower score indicates a family-perceived higher necessity of care to relieve the family care burden.

The family-perceived necessity of improvement in care to relieve the family care burden was a significant determinant in the overall family-perceived necessity of improvement. As the family is an important target in palliative care, clinicians should make maximum efforts to relieve the family care burden, through reassuring the families that they can leave the patients' care to the staff, making the hospital environment comfortable for the families, and coordinating support from other members of the family.

Of interest was that this study highlighted some specific emotions evoked by the experience of terminal delirium. In this study sample, the three major emotions were ambivalent wishes, guilt and self-blame, and worry about staying with the patient. As only a few qualitative studies proposed a care strategy to relieve such specific distress,<sup>14</sup> more empirical studies are needed to understand in-depth family emotions related to terminal delirium and explore a specific care strategy.

Despite several strengths, including the success in obtaining a large sample with more than a 70% response rate, this study has some limitations. First, due to its retrospective nature, there might be a recall bias. Second, some families denied the episode of delirium despite a psychiatrically confirmed diagnosis, and might recall episodes other than delirium. Third, as all patients received specialized palliative care, adherence levels to recommended care practice were generally high and might result in low-sensitivity statistical analyses, and the findings could not be automatically generalized to other situations. Fourth, the cross-sectional design of this study cannot allow the causality of the associations identified. Fifth, we excluded 6.7% of the potential respondents with profound emotional distress due to ethical reasons. Finally, what is important for a good death, such as maintaining consciousness and dying during sleep, is different among cultural backgrounds,<sup>27,29</sup> and the results might not be automatically applied to different cultural settings.

In conclusion, a considerable number of family members experienced high levels of emotional distress and felt some need for improvement of the care for terminal delirium. Control of agitation symptoms with careful consideration of ambivalent family wishes,

information about the pathophysiology of delirium, being present with the family, respecting the patient's subjective world, explaining the expected course with daily changes, and relieving the family care burden can be useful care strategies. Intervention trials to determine the efficacy of these care strategies are needed.

## References

1. Bruera E, Miller J, McCallion J, et al. Cognitive failure in patients with terminal cancer: a prospective study. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 1992;7:192-195.
2. Lawlor PG, Ganon B, Mancini IL, et al. Occurrences, causes, and outcome of delirium in patients with advanced cancer. A prospective study. *Arch Intern Med* 2000;160:786-794.
3. Massie MJ, Holland J, Glass E. Delirium in terminally ill cancer patients. *Am J Psychiatry* 1983;140:1048-1050.
4. Morita T, Tei Y, Tsunoda J, et al. Underlying pathologies and their associations with clinical features in terminal delirium of cancer patients. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 2001;22:997-1006.
5. Pereira J, Hanson J, Bruera E. The frequency and clinical course of cognitive impairment in patients with terminal cancer. *Cancer* 1997;79:835-842.
6. Breitbart W, Gibson C, Tremblay A. The delirium experience: delirium recall and delirium-related distress in hospitalized patients with cancer, their spouse/caregivers, and their nurses. *Psychosomatics* 2002;43:183-194.
7. Morita T, Hirai K, Sakaguchi Y, Tsuneto S, Shima Y. Family-perceived distress from delirium-related symptoms of terminally ill cancer patients. *Psychosomatics* 2004;45(2):107-113.
8. Breitbart W, Jaramillo JR, Chochinov HM. Palliative and terminal care. In: Holland JC, Breitbart W, Jacobsen PB, Lederberg MS, eds. *Psycho-oncology*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998: 437-449.
9. Casarett DJ, Inouye SK. Diagnosis and management of delirium near the end of life. *Ann Intern Med* 2001;135:32-40.
10. Kuebler KK, English N, Heidrich DE. Delirium, confusion, agitation, and restlessness. In: Ferrell BR, Coyle N, eds. *Textbook of palliative nursing*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000: 290-308.
11. Shuster J. Delirium, confusion and agitation at the end-of-life. *J Palliat Med* 1998;1:177-185.
12. Susan B. The impact on the family of terminal restlessness and its management. *Palliat Med* 2003;17:454-460.
13. Pierre G, Cecile C, Pierre A, et al. Delirium in advanced cancer: a psychoeducational intervention for family caregivers. *J Palliat Care* 2002;18(4): 253-261.
14. Nanba M, Morita T, Imura C, et al. Terminal delirium: a family's live experience. *Palliat Med*. In press.
15. American Psychiatric Association. *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders*, 4th ed. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association.
16. Morita T, Ikenaga M, Adachi I, et al. Family experience with palliative sedation therapy for terminally ill cancer patients. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 2004;28:557-565.
17. Morita T, Akechi T, Ikenaga M, et al. Communication about the ending of anticancer treatment and transition to palliative care. *Ann Oncol* 2004;15:1551-1557.
18. Aneth G, Ingegerd BE, Dag L. Patients' experience of being critically ill or severely injured and cared for in an intensive care unit in relation to the ICU syndrome. *Intensive Crit Care Nurs* 1998;14:294-307.
19. Brigit R, Wendy C. Patients' dreams and unreal experiences following intensive care unit admission. *Nurs Crit Care* 2004;9(4):173-180.
20. Cynthia M, Sherill NC. Delirium: elders tell their stories and guide nursing practice. *Medsurg Nurs* 2003;12(5):318-323.
21. Edith MA, Ingalill RH, Astrid N, et al. The meaning of acute confusional state from the perspective of elderly patients. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry* 2002;17:652-663.
22. Fagerberg I, Jonhagen ME. Temporary confusion: a fearful experience. *J Psychiatr Ment Health Nurs* 2002;9:339-346.
23. Irene S. A small exploratory study of the reaction of older people to an episode of delirium. *J Adv Nurs* 1997;25:942-952.
24. Morita T, Hirai K, Sakaguchi Y, et al. Measuring the quality of structure and process in end-of-life care from the bereaved family perspectives. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 2004;27:492-501.
25. Matsuoka Y, Miyake Y, Arakaki H, et al. Clinical utility and validation of the Japanese version of Memorial Delirium Assessment Scale in a psychogeriatric inpatient setting. *Gen Hosp Psychiatry* 2001;23: 36-40.
26. Steinhauser KE, Christakis NA, Clipp EC, et al. Factors considered important at the end of life by patients, family, physicians, and other care providers. *JAMA* 2000;284:2476-2482.
27. Hirai K, Miyashita M, Morita T, et al. Good death in Japanese cancer care: a qualitative study. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 2006;31:140-147.
28. Morita T, Bito S, Kurihara Y, Uchitomi Y. Development of a clinical guideline for palliative sedation therapy using the Delphi method. *J Palliat Med* 2005;8:716-729.
29. Fainsinger RL, Nunez-Olarte JM, Demoissac DM. The cultural differences in perceived value of disclosure and cognition: Spain and Canada. *J Palliat Care* 2003;19:43-48.

# Physician and Nurse Attitudes Toward Artificial Hydration for Terminally Ill Cancer Patients in Japan: Results of 2 Nationwide Surveys

Mitsunori Miyashita, RN, PhD, Tatsuya Morita, MD,  
Yasuo Shima, MD, Rieko Kimura, RN, MHLthSci,  
Mikako Takahashi, RN, CNS, and Isamu Adachi, MD

This study investigated physician and nurse attitudes toward artificial hydration in terminally ill cancer patients and compared differences in attitudes between these 2 professions and among clinical settings in Japan. The response rate was 53% (584/1123) for physicians and 79% for nurses (3328/4210). More physicians answered that artificial hydration alleviates the sensation of thirst. More palliative care unit physicians and nurses answered that withholding artificial hydration alleviated several physical symptoms. Oncologists answered that artificial hydration alleviated the sensation of thirst and fatigue. Discussion among patient-centered

teams and individualized decision making are important. Because the differences identified here are attributable to differences in knowledge of artificial hydration for terminal cancer patients, oncologists should place greater emphasis on the opinion of palliative care specialists. Medical practitioners caring for terminal cancer patients should consider a broader range of views on hydration therapy, with a focus on effective hydration techniques and alternative interventions.

**Keywords:** palliative care; fluid therapy; attitude

**A**rtificial hydration for terminally ill cancer patients is controversial.<sup>1,2</sup> Arguments usually focus on symptom control, such as fluid retention symptoms,<sup>3</sup> delirium,<sup>4</sup> nausea,<sup>5</sup> sensation of thirst,<sup>6</sup> the urination burden,<sup>7</sup> and ethical problems.<sup>8-11</sup>

In Japan, Morita et al<sup>12</sup> identified 3 factors that significantly correlated with the decision to provide artificial hydration: decision-makers who were less involved in end-of-life care, the belief that artificial

hydration is effective for symptom palliation, and the belief that artificial hydration is a component of minimum standards of care. Despite reports of various negative effects, physicians who work in health centers other than palliative care units (PCUs) usually favor high-volume hydration.<sup>12</sup> In addition, a second article by Morita et al<sup>13</sup> on physician-reported and nurse-reported effects of artificial therapy on symptoms in terminally ill patients with cancer found that physicians and nurses in oncology and palliative care settings frequently observed that artificial hydration caused a deterioration in fluid retention symptoms, with limited benefit in alleviating symptoms of dehydration.<sup>13</sup>

The beliefs of physicians about artificial hydration significantly affect decision making by both patients and their families.<sup>14,15</sup> These findings highlight the importance of examining these beliefs in detail, yet attitudes toward artificial hydration have not been investigated in detail, especially for nurses.

The present report is based on 2 nationwide surveys conducted in Japan—the first in physicians<sup>13</sup> and

From the Department of Adult Nursing/Palliative Care Nursing, School of Health Sciences and Nursing, Graduate School of Medicine, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo (MM); Department of Palliative and Supportive Care, Palliative Care Team and Seirei Hospice, Seirei Mikatahara Hospital, Shizuoka (TM); Department of Palliative Medicine, Tsukuba Medical Center Hospital, Ibaraki (YS); Keio University, Tokyo (RK); St. Luke's International Hospital, Tokyo (MT); and Shizuoka Cancer Center, Shizuoka (IA), Japan.

Address correspondence to: Mitsunori Miyashita, RN, PhD, Department of Adult Nursing/Palliative Care Nursing, School of Health Sciences and Nursing, Graduate School of Medicine, The University of Tokyo, 7-3-1 Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan; e-mail: miyashita-tky@umin.net.

the second in nurses—to clarify respective attitudes toward symptom control and ethical issues in artificial hydration in terminally ill cancer patients. Differences in attitudes were compared between professions and among clinical settings. The 2 surveys were conducted separately, but the clinical settings of the respondents were similar and the questions were identical.

## Methods

### Participants

The first questionnaire was part of a previous survey on physician attitudes toward terminal hydration, reported in detail elsewhere.<sup>13</sup> Participants were recruited from 2 nationwide organizations, the Japanese Association of Clinical Cancer Centers and the Japanese Association of Hospice and Palliative Care Units. The former included 28 centers of excellence in clinical oncology, and the latter, a wider range of 80 hospitals with PCUs or inpatient hospices. Of these, 16 cancer centers and 73 hospitals participated in the present study. These were augmented by a further 4 general hospitals and a palliative care clinic belonging to the Japan Palliative Oncology Study Group.

Representatives of each institution were asked to identify for potential participation attending physicians who specialized in the care of terminally ill cancer patients. A total of 1123 physicians were recruited as a heterogeneous sample of physicians working at cancer centers, general hospitals, and PCUs.

The second questionnaire was part of a previous survey conducted in October 2002. Participants were recruited in the same manner as for the physician survey. The participating institutions included 24 cancer centers and 55 hospitals belonging to the above 2 organizations as well as 4 general hospitals. Representatives of each institution were asked to identify for potential participation attending nurses working in units for the care of terminally ill cancer patients. A total of 4210 nurses were recruited as a heterogeneous sample of nurses working at cancer centers, general hospitals, and PCUs.

In Japan, the Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare has strongly supported the expansion of specialized palliative care services. Coverage for PCUs under the National Medical Insurance began in 1991, and the number of PCUs has increased dramatically, from 5 that year to 135 in 2004. In contrast, the growth of home-based palliative care programs has been slow, and in fact, palliative care teams were not covered by National Medical Insurance

until 2002. The most common type of specialized palliative care service in Japan is the PCU. We selected medical practitioners belonging to general wards of cancer centers, general hospitals, and PCUs as study targets for this investigation.

### Questionnaire

The questionnaire (available from the authors) was developed by the Japan Palliative Oncology Study Group. Face validity of the questionnaire was confirmed by a pilot test with 11 physicians and 15 nurses from oncology and palliative care settings.

The respondents were first asked to report their backgrounds, including the number of years of clinical practice, practice setting, number of cancer deaths in their unit during the preceding year, and specialty (physicians only). The 2 questionnaires then made 15 identical statements developed after an extensive literature review of attitudes toward terminal artificial hydration, with a particular focus on symptom control and ethical issues.<sup>9-11,14-21</sup> The 15 statements were:

1. Artificial hydration alleviates sensations of thirst.
2. Artificial hydration alleviates fatigue.
3. Artificial hydration alleviates delirium.
4. Withholding artificial hydration alleviates the burden of urination.
5. Withholding artificial hydration alleviates nausea/vomiting.
6. Withholding artificial hydration alleviates cough/sputum/dyspnea.
7. Withholding artificial hydration leads to the loss of patient trust.
8. Withholding artificial hydration leads to the loss of family trust.
9. Withholding artificial hydration leads to undertreatment in compromised patients.
10. Withholding artificial hydration often shortens patient survival.
11. Withholding artificial hydration can be criticized by colleagues.
12. Artificial hydration is essential for meeting minimum standards of care.
13. Determining the medical indications for artificial hydration is difficult.
14. Patients have the right to refuse artificial hydration.
15. Maintaining a venous route is a burden on the patient.

Respondents were asked to evaluate each statement and respond using a 6-point Likert scale (strongly agree to strongly disagree).

## Statistical Analyses

Before statistical analysis, an explanatory factor analysis with promax rotation was conducted to order the questions and help with their interpretation. These results were used to order the questions and word them as listed.

To compare attitudes between the 2 respondent groups, overall percentages of "strongly agree," "agree," and "slightly agree" answers were calculated and compared using the  $\chi^2$  test. Given the marked differences in responses depending on clinical setting,<sup>13</sup> responses were also compared by clinical setting by using the  $\chi^2$  test.

Data for physicians and nurses affiliated with cancer centers and general hospitals as oncologists and oncology nurses were aggregated and compared with those for physicians and nursing staffs of PCUs. For statistical tests, 2-tailed *P* values were calculated, with values of *P* < .05 considered statistically significant. Owing to the large sample size, we considered an absolute 20% difference in responses as clinically significant. All analyses were performed using the statistical package SAS 9.1 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC).

## Results

### Characteristics of Participants

Questionnaires were mailed to 1123 physicians, and responses were received from 595. Eleven did not meet the eligibility criteria and were excluded, leaving 584 responses for the final analysis (validated response rate, 53%). Questionnaires were mailed to 4210 nurses, and responses were received from 3515. A total of 187 were excluded because of missing values, leaving 3328 for final analysis (validated response rate, 79%). Participant characteristics are summarized in Table 1. General hospital settings accounted for a higher proportion of physicians (physicians, 46%; nurses, 35%), and cancer centers accounted for more nurses (physicians, 38%; nurses, 47%). The proportion of PCU settings was about the same (physicians, 15%; nurses, 18%).

### Attitudes Toward Terminal Hydration

When responses of nurses and physicians were compared (Table 2), more than 70% of physicians and nurses agreed with the statements "determining the medical indications for artificial hydration is difficult" and "patients have the right to refuse artificial

Table 1. Participant Characteristics

Characteristic <sup>a</sup>	Physicians (n = 584)	Nurses (n = 3328)
Age	42 (43 ± 8.5)	31 (33 ± 8.7)
Sex		
Female (%)	6.0	99
Years of clinical experience	16 (17 ± 8.3)	9 (11 ± 8.6)
Clinical setting		
General hospital	46	35
Cancer center	38	47
Palliative care unit	15	18
Specialty (%) <sup>b</sup>		
Surgery	36	
Gastroenterology	16	
Internal medicine, hematology, medical oncology	15	
Palliative medicine	10	
Respiratory medicine	8	
Radiology	2.9	
Gynecology	2.7	
Urology	2.4	
Otolaryngology	1.9	
Orthopedics	1.7	
Anesthesiology	1.2	
Neurosurgery	0.3	
Dermatology	0.3	
Patient deaths during the past year (n)	10 (22 ± 35)	22 (40 ± 42)

a. Continuous data are presented as median ± SD.

b. Physicians only.

hydration." In contrast, less than 30% agreed with the statements "artificial hydration alleviates delirium," "withholding artificial hydration leads to loss of patient trust," "withholding artificial hydration leads to loss of family trust," "withholding artificial hydration leads to undertreatment in compromised patients," "withholding artificial hydration shortens patient survival," and "withholding artificial hydration may be criticized by colleagues." Responses to the other statements differed between physicians and nurses, although with a clinically significant difference for 1 statement only, "artificial hydration alleviates the sensation of thirst" (difference, 23%; *P* < .0001). In addition, although not clinically significant, physicians tended to agree with the statement "artificial hydration is a component of minimum standards of care" (difference, 18%; *P* < .0001).

When responses from physicians were compared among clinical settings (Table 3), oncologists agreed to a clinically significant degree with the statements "artificial hydration alleviates the sensation of thirst"

**Table 2.** Attitudes Toward Artificial Hydration Therapy for Terminally Ill Cancer Patients Between Physicians and Nurses

	Physicians (Phy) (n = 584)	Nurses (N) (n = 3328)	Difference (Phy-N)	P
Belief that artificial hydration alleviates physical symptoms				
Artificial hydration alleviates the sensation of thirst	43	20	23	<.0001
Artificial hydration alleviates fatigue	34	19	14	<.0001
Artificial hydration alleviates delirium	20	11	10	<.0001
Belief that withholding artificial hydration alleviates physical symptoms				
Withholding artificial hydration alleviates the burden of urination	51	57	-7	0.002
Withholding artificial hydration alleviates nausea/vomiting	46	35	11	<.0001
Withholding artificial hydration alleviates cough/sputum/dyspnea	52	48	4	0.08
Perception of loss of trust by withholding artificial hydration				
Withholding artificial hydration leads to loss of patient trust	23	19	4	0.034
Withholding artificial hydration leads to loss of family trust	26	21	5	0.010
Perception of guilt with withholding artificial hydration				
Withholding artificial hydration leads to undertreatment in compromised patients	8	5	4	0.001
Withholding artificial hydration shortens patient survival	29	23	6	0.002
Withholding artificial hydration may be criticized by colleagues	10	5	5	<.0001
Belief that artificial hydration is a component of minimum care				
Artificial hydration is a component of minimum standards of care	40	22	18	<.0001
Perception of difficulty concerning decision making for artificial hydration				
Determining the medical indications for artificial hydration is difficult	72	72	0	0.81
Patients have the right to refuse artificial hydration	96	95	1	0.18
Belief that maintaining a venous route is a burden				
Maintaining a venous route is a burden on the patient	65	71	-6	0.003

NOTE: Values denote the proportion of summed "strongly agree," "agree," and "slightly agree" responses.

(difference, 26%;  $P < .0001$ ), "artificial hydration alleviates fatigue" (difference, 24%;  $P < .0001$ ), "withholding artificial hydration shortens patient survival" (difference, 23%;  $P < .0001$ ), and "artificial hydration is a component of minimum standards of care" (difference, 30%;  $P < .0001$ ). In addition, PCU physicians agreed to a clinically significant degree with the statements "withholding artificial hydration alleviates the burden of urination" (difference, -38%;  $P < .0001$ ), "withholding artificial hydration alleviates nausea/vomiting" (difference, -50%;  $P < .0001$ ), and "withholding artificial hydration alleviates cough/sputum/dyspnea" (difference, -46%;  $P < .0001$ ).

For nurses, PCU nurses agreed to a clinically significant degree with the statements "withholding artificial hydration alleviates nausea/vomiting" (difference, -34%;  $P < .0001$ ) and "withholding artificial hydration alleviates cough/sputum/dyspnea" (difference, -43%;  $P < .0001$ ).

## Discussion

This study details the broad range of attitudes toward artificial hydration for terminally ill cancer patients obtained by using an identical questionnaire sent to physicians and nurses working in a variety of clinical settings. Several responses differed significantly between professions and among clinical settings.

A higher percentage of physicians than nurses answered that artificial hydration alleviates the sensation of thirst. Given that several studies have shown that the sensation of thirst is not improved by hydration therapy,<sup>6,22</sup> this result indicates a misconception on this point among Japanese physicians, particularly oncologists. The reason for the nurses' low agreement might be due to clinical experience that mouth care or sips of liquids are an effective intervention.<sup>1</sup> It is important to educate physicians that mouth care is more effective than artificial hydration in alleviating the sensation of thirst.



**Table 3.** Attitudes Toward Artificial Hydration Therapy for Terminally Ill Cancer Patients (Comparison Among Clinical Settings)

	Physicians, Oncologist (O) and PCU				Nurses, Oncology (O) and PCU			
	Onc (n = 493)	PCU (n = 90)	Diff (O-PCU)	P	O (n = 2735)	PCU (n = 593)	Diff (O-PCU)	P
Belief that artificial hydration alleviates physical symptoms								
Artificial hydration alleviates the sensation of thirst	47	21	26	<.0001	21	17	4	.028
Artificial hydration alleviates fatigue	37	13	24	<.0001	21	13	8	<.0001
Artificial hydration alleviates delirium	21	18	3	0.52	11	9	2	.15
Belief that withholding artificial hydration alleviates physical symptoms								
Withholding artificial hydration alleviates the burden of urination	45	82	-38	<.0001	55	66	-11	<.0001
Withholding artificial hydration alleviates nausea/vomiting	39	89	-50	<.0001	29	63	-34	<.0001
Withholding artificial hydration alleviates cough/sputum/dyspnea	45	91	-46	<.0001	41	83	-43	<.0001
Perception of loss of trust by withholding artificial hydration								
Withholding artificial hydration leads to loss of patient trust	25	11	14	0.004	21	11	10	<.0001
Withholding artificial hydration leads to loss of family trust	28	17	11	0.025	23	16	7	.001
Perception of guilt with withholding artificial hydration								
Withholding artificial hydration leads to undertreatment in compromised patients	9	3	6	0.06	5	4	1	.18
Withholding artificial hydration shortens patient survival	33	10	23	<.0001	25	15	10	<.0001
Withholding artificial hydration may be criticized by colleagues	9	17	-8	0.025	5	3	2	.09
Belief that artificial hydration is a component of minimum care								
Artificial hydration is a component of minimum standards of care	45	14	30	<.0001	24	12	12	<.0001
Perception of difficulty concerning decision making for artificial hydration								
Determining the medical indications for artificial hydration is difficult	74	66	8	0.11	72	70	2	.24
Patients have the right to refuse artificial hydration	96	98	-2	0.40	95	95	0	.70
Belief that maintaining a venous route is a burden								
Maintaining a venous route is a burden on the patient	63	78	-15	0.007	73	66	7	.001

NOTE: PCU = palliative care unit.

Physicians tended to answer that artificial hydration represented a minimum standard of care.<sup>23</sup> Physicians often consider that hydration therapy has a symbolic role as a personal intervention by the medical expert for the terminally ill patient.<sup>8,24</sup> In contrast, nurses would more likely attempt other nursing interventions

to alleviate the burden of artificial hydration. These differences of view might arise from a difference in attitudes toward minimum standards of care. Results for several of the statements show a lack of concordance among physicians and nurses.<sup>25</sup> These differences of belief would result in differences in the

conduct of artificial hydration.<sup>12,13</sup> Effective hydration therapy thus requires discussion among patient-centered teams and an emphasis on individualized decision making.<sup>15,19,26</sup>

Among physicians, responses to several statements differed between oncologists and PCU physicians. The PCU physicians more clearly recognized that withholding artificial hydration palliates physical symptoms such as cough/sputum/dyspnea and nausea/vomiting, likely because of their greater first-hand experience with the effectiveness of withholding hydration therapy for terminally ill patients. The PCU physicians also disagreed that hydration therapy represents a minimum standard of care. The PCU physicians would similarly be more skilled in other medical or nonmedical treatments for patients than oncologists. Japanese oncologists might not only prescribe medications and fluid but might also have views on caring for patients that would in turn allow them to realize again their own role for terminally ill patients through the provision of alternative methods of hydration, alternative care, and in-depth communication as holistic care. In addition, data on artificial hydration is still insufficient, and further evidence from randomized clinical trials or well-designed observational studies is required.<sup>3</sup>

Among nurses, PCU nurses had greater recognition that withholding artificial hydration palliated physical symptoms such as cough/sputum/dyspnea and nausea/vomiting. Similar to physicians, oncology nurses require greater understanding of the effectiveness of withholding artificial hydration. In contrast to physicians, however, oncology and PCU nurses showed only small differences in their understanding of the clinical effectiveness of hydration therapy, likely because of their greater personal contact with patients.

The present study has several limitations. The response rate for physicians was relatively low. Nevertheless, this figure is common in Japanese opinion surveys of physicians. Further, questions concerning general attitudes may be confounded by answers that depend on individual scenarios, including the care of patients with complications such as bowel obstruction, ascites, and pleural effusion.

## Conclusion

Our results show that attitudes toward several statements on artificial hydration differ between physicians and nurses and among clinical settings. They

further emphasize the importance of discussion among patient-centered teams and of individualized decision making. As the differences are attributable to knowledge of artificial hydration for terminal cancer patients, oncologists should place greater emphasis on the opinions of palliative care specialists. Overall, medical practitioners caring for terminal and palliative care patients should consider not simply the providing or withholding of hydration therapy, but rather a broader range of views on hydration therapy, with a focus on effective alternative interventions.

## Acknowledgments

We are grateful to the physicians and nurses of the Japanese Association of Clinical Cancer Centers, the Japanese Association of Hospice and Palliative Care Units, and the Japan Palliative Oncology Study Group who took the time to respond to the questionnaires. This work was supported in part by a Grant-in-Aid for Cancer Research (11-2) from the Ministry of Health and Welfare, Japan.

## References

1. McCann RM, Hall WJ, Groth-Juncker A. Comfort care for terminally ill patients. The appropriate use of nutrition and hydration. *JAMA*. 1994;272:1263-1266.
2. Viola RA, Wells GA, Peterson J. The effects of fluid status and fluid therapy on the dying: a systematic review. *J Palliat Care*. 1997;13:41-52.
3. Morita T, Hyodo I, Yoshimi T, et al. Association between hydration volume and symptoms in terminally ill cancer patients with abdominal malignancies. *Ann Oncol*. 2005; 16:640-647.
4. Fainsinger RL, Bruera E. When to treat dehydration in a terminally ill patient? *Support Care Cancer*. 1997;5: 205-211.
5. Ripamonti C, Twycross R, Baines M, et al. Clinical-practice recommendations for the management of bowel obstruction in patients with end-stage cancer. *Support Care Cancer*. 2001;9:223-233.
6. Musgrave CF, Bartal N, Opstad J. The sensation of thirst in dying patients receiving i.v. hydration. *J Palliat Care*. 1995;11:17-21.
7. Zerwekh JV. The dehydration question. *Nursing*. 1983; 13:47-51.
8. Burge FI. Dehydration symptoms of palliative care cancer patients. *J Pain Symptom Manage*. 1993;8:454-464.
9. Craig GM. On withholding artificial hydration and nutrition from terminally ill sedated patients. The debate continues. *J Med Ethics*. 1996;22:147-153.

10. De Ridder D, Gastmans C. Dehydration among terminally ill patients: an integrated ethical and practical approach for caregivers. *Nurs Ethics*. 1996;3:305-316.
11. Chiu TY, Hu WY, Cheng SY, Chen CY. Ethical dilemmas in palliative care: a study in Taiwan. *J Med Ethics*. 2000;26:353-357.
12. Morita T, Shima Y, Adachi I; Japan Palliative Oncology Study Group. Attitudes of Japanese physicians toward terminal dehydration: a nationwide survey. *J Clin Oncol*. 2002;20:4699-4704.
13. Morita T, Shima Y, Miyashita M, Kimura R, Adachi I, Japan Palliative Oncology Study Group. Physician- and nurse-reported effects of artificial hydration therapy on symptoms of terminally ill patients with cancer. *J Palliat Med*. 2004;7:683-693.
14. Parkash R, Burge F. The family's perspective on issues of hydration in terminal care. *J Palliat Care*. 1997;13:23-27.
15. Morita T, Tsunoda J, Inoue S, Chihara S. Perceptions and decision-making on rehydration of terminally ill cancer patients and family members. *Am J Hosp Palliat Care*. 1999;16:509-516.
16. Micetich KC, Steinecker PH, Thomasma DC. Are intravenous fluids morally required for a dying patient? *Arch Intern Med*. 1983;143:975-978.
17. Marin PP, Bayer AJ, Tomlinson A, Pathy MS. Attitudes of hospital doctors in Wales to use of intravenous fluids and antibiotics in the terminally ill. *Postgrad Med J*. 1989;65:650-652.
18. Collaud T, Rapin CH. Dehydration in dying patients: study with physicians in French-speaking Switzerland. *J Pain Symptom Manage*. 1991;6:230-240.
19. Bozzetti F, Amadori D, Bruera E, et al. Guidelines on artificial nutrition versus hydration in terminal cancer patients. European Association for Palliative Care. *Nutrition*. 1996;12:163-167.
20. Musgrave CF, Bartal N, Opstad J. Intravenous hydration for terminal patients: what are the attitudes of Israeli terminal patients, their families, and their health professionals? *J Pain Symptom Manage*. 1996;12:47-51.
21. Meares CJ. Primary caregiver perceptions of intake cessation in patients who are terminally ill. *Oncol Nurs Forum*. 1997;24:1751-1757.
22. Cerchietti L, Navigante A, Sauri A, Palazzo F. Hypodermoclysis for control of dehydration in terminal-stage cancer. *Int J Palliat Nurs*. 2000;6:370-374.
23. Anonymous. Terminal dehydration. *Lancet*. 1986;1:306.
24. Wanzer SH, Federman DD, Adelstein SJ, et al. The physician's responsibility toward hopelessly ill patients. A second look. *N Engl J Med*. 1989;320:844-849.
25. Meares CJ. Terminal dehydration: a review. *Am J Hosp Palliat Care*. 1994;11:10-14.
26. Steiner N, Bruera E. Methods of hydration in palliative care patients. *J Palliat Care*. 1998;14:6-13.

# Nurse Views of the Adequacy of Decision Making and Nurse Distress Regarding Artificial Hydration for Terminally Ill Cancer Patients: A Nationwide Survey

Mitsunori Miyashita, RN, PhD, Tatsuya Morita, MD, Yasuo Shima, MD, Rieko Kimura RN, MHLthSci, Mikako Takahashi, RN, CNS, and Isamu Adachi, MD

We evaluated nurse views on the adequacy of decision-making discussion among nurses and physicians regarding artificial hydration for terminally ill cancer patients and nurse distress arising from artificial hydration issues, as well as factors related to this distress. A self-administered questionnaire consisting of 4 questions about nurse views of discussions regarding artificial hydration and 6 questions about nurse distress arising from artificial hydration issues was distributed in participating institutions in October 2002 and returned by mail. A total of 3328 responses (79%) were analyzed. Almost half of the nurses felt that discussion of terminal hydration issues was insufficient. Among responses, 39% of oncology nurses and 78% of palliative care unit (PCU) nurses agreed that patients and medical practitioners discuss the issue of artificial hydration adequately, and 49% and 79%, respectively, agreed that medical practitioners discuss the issue of artificial hydration with other physicians adequately.

As for distress on behalf of patients and families who refuse artificial hydration, 44% of oncology nurses and 57% of PCU nurses experienced such distress for patients, and 19% and 28% did so for families, respectively. Furthermore, 48% of oncology nurses and 47% of PCU nurses experienced distress arising from disagreements among medical practitioners about withholding artificial hydration, whereas 44% and 43% experienced distress about medical practitioners refusing artificial hydration, respectively. Discussion among care providers regarding artificial hydration is insufficient, particularly in general wards. Medical practitioners caring for terminally ill cancer patients should engage in greater discussion among patient-centered teams and facilitate individualized decision making.

**Keywords:** palliative care; attitude; fluid therapy; nurses; decision making; questionnaires

From the Department of Adult Nursing/Palliative Care Nursing, School of Health Sciences and Nursing, Graduate School of Medicine, The University of Tokyo, Japan (MM); the Department of Palliative and Supportive Care, Palliative Care Team and Seirei Hospice, Seirei Mikatahara Hospital, Shizuoka, Japan (TM); the Department of Palliative Medicine, Tsukuba Medical Center Hospital, Ibaraki, Japan (YS); Keio University, Tokyo, Japan (RK); St. Luke's International Hospital, Tokyo, Japan (MT); and Shizuoka Cancer Center, Shizuoka, Japan (IA).

The views expressed in this article are those of the authors alone.

Address correspondence to: Mitsunori Miyashita, RN, PhD, Department of Adult Nursing/Palliative Care Nursing, School of Health Sciences and Nursing, Graduate School of Medicine, The University of Tokyo, 7-3-1 Hongo Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan; e-mail: [miyasita-tyk@umin.net](mailto:miyasita-tyk@umin.net).

Nurses encounter many difficulties in the care of terminally ill patients.<sup>1-4</sup> In Japan, Sasahara et al reported that 92% of nurses were distressed by insufficient opportunities to discuss care with physicians. Morita et al investigated the emotional burden faced by nurses in palliative sedation therapy and emphasized the importance of a team approach to resolving conflicting opinions, especially between physicians and nurses.<sup>5</sup> Regarding the team approach to care, Maeyama et al reported that perceptions of the practice of team care differ between physicians and nurses and that nurses regarded team care as insufficient in Japan.<sup>6</sup> Together, these