

Ethical Issues in Palliative Care

Series Editors: Muriel Gillick, MD, and Gregg K. VandeKieft, MD, MA

Preemptive Use of Palliative Sedation and Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis

Jeffrey T. Berger, MD

Hospice and Palliative Medicine, Division of Geriatric Medicine, and Clinical Ethics, Department of Medicine, Winthrop University Hospital, Mineola, New York; and Department of Medicine, Stony Brook University School of Medicine, Stony Brook, New York, USA

Abstract

Patients in the advanced stages of amyotrophic lateral sclerosis often are faced with the dilemma of whether to use or continue to use mechanical ventilation. Patients who elect to terminate ventilatory support may be subject to significant and even extreme respiratory symptoms. Severe dyspnea and other symptoms are sometimes treated with palliative sedation, which is generally recommended as a last resort approach to refractory symptoms. However, the preemptive use of palliative sedation is sometimes appropriate. The preemptive use of palliative sedation is examined through a case-based analysis of a patient with advanced amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. J Pain Symptom Manage 2012;43:802–805. © 2012 U.S. Cancer Pain Relief Committee. Published by Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

Key Words

Ethics, palliative sedation, amyotrophic lateral sclerosis

Introduction

Patients who suffer from advanced amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS) often have particularly challenging palliative care needs. Compared with some other patients who are ventilator dependent, these patients generally are cognitively unimpaired. They are able to reflect on their condition and prognosis quite clearly and deliberate about their treatment options without the urgency or clinical instability coexistent with some other causes of respiratory failure such as pneumonia or sepsis. Such patients who elect to discontinue mechanical ventilation can anticipate their symptoms, their

process of dying, and their death well in advance of treatment withdrawal. Palliative sedation can be a powerful tool for these patients, who may request it preemptively. Yet, guidelines for this type of palliative sedation do not always account for the particular needs of ALS patients. The following case illustrates some of these challenges.

Case

L. R. is a 38-year-old man diagnosed with ALS four years before this final hospital admission. Eight months ago, he was hospitalized for treatment of pneumonia. Although L. R. had always intended to avoid mechanical ventilation, he agreed to be intubated because his pulmonologist, Dr. J., expected that respiratory independence would return once the pneumonia fully resolved. L. R. agreed to the placement of a tracheostomy and returned home with

Address correspondence to: Jeffrey T. Berger, MD, 222 Station Plaza North, Suite 518, Mineola, NY 11501, USA. E-mail: jberger@winthrop.org

Accepted for publication: November 1, 2011.

a mechanical ventilator to continue weaning trials. Unfortunately, he has remained ventilator dependent. Two months ago, after six months on the ventilator, L. R. began to contemplate its withdrawal. He was aware that he could live for months or longer on the ventilator and was aware that he would most likely die within minutes to hours after disconnection from the ventilator. L. R. also was mindful of his diminishing ability to communicate, which was now limited to eye blinking and facial expressions. L. R. involved his wife intimately in these deliberations and met numerous times with Dr. J., his pastor, and his attorney.

L. R. wanted to come off life support before he became totally locked in and thus unable to direct his care. He wished to be admitted to the hospital to die because he believed that dying at home would burden his wife and leave her surrounded with memories of his demise. Moreover, his greatest fears were to feel suffocation and to be aware of his dying. L. R. wanted Dr. J., his trusted physician, to manage his death—to sedate him to unconsciousness and to guarantee his comfort.

Dr. J. agreed to fully sedate L. R. before removing him from the ventilator to ensure total control of the anticipated dyspnea. Dr. J. consulted various guidelines on palliative sedation to better understand its use as a preemptive measure but found little direct guidance. Nevertheless, Dr. J. sedated L. R. with a lorazepam infusion and removed the ventilator. Surprisingly, 12 hours later, L. R. continued to breathe. At this juncture, Dr. J. thought L. R. could possibly survive up to several days, and having just read guidelines on palliative sedation, he believed that lightening L. R.'s sedation to the target symptom of dyspnea was required. The patient's family objected to this plan, stating that it would be cruel to wake up a person who thought he had died only to face death again. L. R. remained sedated and died several hours later.

Discussion

Palliative sedation is the pharmacological sedation of patients for the purpose of symptom relief. Guidelines for palliative sedation require that the patient suffer from intolerable and refractory symptoms, that the degree of

sedation be proportionate to the target symptom (up to and including full sedation if necessary), and that palliative sedation be reserved as a treatment of last resort.^{1–6} Guidelines also require that patients have a terminal prognosis, but vary on how close to death patients must be for palliative sedation to be permissible, and range from hours or days to simply any terminal prognosis. Guidelines also differ on whether palliative sedation for existential distress is permissible.

With these considerations in mind, how did Dr. J.'s use of palliative sedation square with current guidelines? L. R. did not complain of pain or dyspnea, let alone any particular symptom that was demonstrably intolerable. Because he had not yet been treated for symptoms, a determination of symptom refractoriness could not be made. Finally, Dr. J. used palliative sedation as a first resort treatment, not as a last resort. Is assessing Dr. J.'s management of symptoms against guidelines for palliative sedation even appropriate because the case of L. R. is, in some ways, a simple case of withdrawing burdensome treatment? Certainly, the patient's well-informed and considered basis for doing so met established ethical requirements. However, guidelines for ventilator withdrawal recommend controlling symptoms before extubation and reserve medically induced unconsciousness for refractory situations.^{7–9} The preemptive use of full palliative sedation, whether for ventilator withdrawal or the termination of other treatments, presents a somewhat different clinical challenge. This case illustrates this issue and others pertaining to palliative sedation.

Perhaps, on the one hand, one could presume that L. R.'s symptoms would be severe, intolerable, and refractory, and if so, guidelines do not require first trialing less intensive measures that are expected to be inadequate. On the other hand, many patients who are terminally extubated do not require total sedation to achieve adequate symptom control. Regardless, once L. R. was fully sedated and the ventilator withdrawn, guidelines seemed to require that proportionate sedation be pursued. Should Dr. J. have attempted to down-titrate the lorazepam infusion to a minimal level of sedation necessary for symptom control? Was L. R.'s fear of being aware of his demise an appropriate target symptom for palliative sedation?

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/2730145>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/2730145>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)