

Questions Posed to the Consensus Working Group at the In-Person Meeting With Results:

Commas separate results from multiple vote iterations

1. Steroids should not be used as a routine therapy for the treatment of severe TBI
 - a) Agree – 100%
 - b) Disagree – 0%

2. Should we replace the statement shown below with individual statements?

Details of mannitol and HS dosing to be dealt with later

 - “Bolus treatment with IV Mannitol”
 - “Bolus treatment with IV Hypertonic Saline”
 - a) Yes – 61%
 - b) No – 39%

3. For Tier One Interventions for ICP-Only Algorithm, should we replace the statement shown below with individual statements?

Details of mannitol and HS dosing to be dealt with later

 - “Bolus treatment with IV Mannitol”
 - “Bolus treatment with IV Hypertonic Saline”
 - a) Separate – 94%
 - b) Group – 6%

4. For Tier One Interventions for ICP-Only Algorithm, should Tier 1 “ maintain normothermia”?
 - a) Yes – 97%
 - b) No – 3%

5. “Consider anti-seizure medications for 1 week only (85%)”

We will address EEG separately

Should we add this statement here at Tier 1 & 0

 - a) Yes – 94%
 - b) No – 4%

6. We added “Consider EEG monitoring (94%)”

Should we add this statement here at Tier 1
(and to Type B Tier 1)?

 - a) Yes, add this statement here at Tier 1 (and to Type B Tier 1) – 94%
 - b) No, this belongs at another Tier – 0%
 - c) No, this does not belong here or in Type B – 6%

7. For tier 1 should we include ‘CSF drainage (if EVD available)’?

- a) Yes – 97%
 - b) No – 3%
8. For tier 1 should we include 'Consider placement of an EVD to drain CSF'?
- a) Yes – 94%
 - b) No – 6%
9. Should we maintain CPP 60 – 70 as a Tier 1 parameter?
- a) Yes – 97%
 - b) No – 3%
10. Should we put an autoregulation - related CPP manipulation into Tier 2?
- a) Yes – 87.5%
 - b) No – 12.5%
11. Should the following language be added to Inter Tier
- Reexamine the patient and consider Repeat CT to reevaluate intracranial pathology
- a) Yes – 100%
 - b) No – 0%
12. Should the following language be added to Inter Tier: Reconsider surgical options for potentially surgical lesions
- a) Yes – 100%
 - b) No – 0%
13. Should the following language be added to Inter Tier: Consider extracranial causes of ICP elevation as an Inter-Tier recommendation
- a) Yes – 100%
 - b) No – 0%
14. Should "Neuromuscular paralysis in adequately sedated patients if trial is effective" be a Tier 2 option?
- Voted in at 91% at Tier 3 for ICP-Only algorithm
- A YES vote would be to move it to Tier 2
- a) Yes – moves it to Tier 2 – 81%
 - b) No – should be Tier 3 – 19%
 - c) No – should not be used – 0%
15. Mild hypocapnia
- a) Tier 2 – 56%
 - b) Tier 3 – 25%
 - c) No – Should not be used for ICP control – 19%

16. Mild hypocapnia

- a) Tier 2 – 76%, 88%
- b) Tier 3 – 24%, 12%

17. Mild hypocapnia definition

- a) 30-35 – 16.7%
- b) 32-35 – 60.0%
- c) 33-35 – 23.3%

18. Mild hypocapnia definition

- a) 32-35 – 84%
- b) 33-35 – 16%

19. Should “Adjust temperature to 35 - 37° C, using active cooling measures” be a Tier 2 option for ICP-Only patients?

Tier 2 in BOOST3 and NY Algorithm

Tier 3 for Type B in combined algorithm (84%)

- a) Tier 2 – 33%
- b) Tier 3 – 64%
- c) No – Should not be used for ICP Control – 3%

20. Should “Adjust temperature to 35 - 36° C, using active cooling measures” be a Tier 2 option for ICP-Only patients?

Tier 2 in BOOST3 and NY Algorithm

Tier 3 for Type B in combined algorithm (84%)

- a) Tier 2 – 18.2%
- b) Tier 3 – 81.2%

21. Temperatures below 35 should not be used routinely due to systemic complications

- a) Agree – 85%
- b) Disagree – 15%

22. Should “Some wording about a higher-dose mannitol treatment” be a Tier 2 option for ICP-Only patients?

Tier 2 NY Algorithm = High dose mannitol (> 1.0 g/kg bolus)

This wording at 68% for Type B Tier 2 in combined algo.

Tier 2 in BOOST3 = High dose Mannitol >1 g/kg, or higher frequency of standard dose mannitol

This wording at 66% for Type B Tier 2 in combined algo.

- a) Yes, we should figure out a higher-dose mannitol treatment, then assign it a role – 22%
- b) No – We should not divide mannitol into two dosing – 78%

23. Should “Some wording about a higher-dose mannitol treatment” be a Tier 2 option for ICP-Only patients?

Tier 2 NY Algorithm = High dose mannitol (> 1.0 g/kg bolus)

This wording at 68% for Type B Tier 2 in combined algo.

Tier 2 in BOOST3 = High dose Mannitol >1 g/kg, or higher frequency of standard dose mannitol

This wording at 66% for Type B Tier 2 in combined algo.

- a) Yes, we should figure out a higher-dose mannitol treatment, then assign it a role – 9%
- b) No – We should not divide mannitol into two dosing – 91%

24) For Manitol should we put a dosing range?

- a) Yes – 79%, 88%
- b) No – 21%, 12%

25) Dosing for Mannitol up to

- a) 1 – 85%
- b) 1.5 – 15%

26) Should “Some wording about a higher-dose hypertonic saline treatment” be a Tier 2 option for ICP-Only patients?

Tier 2 in BOOST3 = “Hypertonic saline bolus (i.e., 30 ml of 23.4%). May repeat if sNa levels are < 160 meq/l”

This wording at 66% for Type B Tier 2 in combined algo.

- a) Yes, we should figure out a higher-dose hypertonic saline treatment, then assign it a role – 6%
- b) No – We should not divide hypertonic saline into two dosing – 94%

27) The current recommendation for sedative-hypnotic “coma” for Tier 3 is “High-dose pentobarbital (“barb coma”)” voted in at 88%

The wording for similar treatment in the combined algorithm Tier 3 in Types B and D is “Pentobarbital or Thiopentone titrated to ICP control up to burst suppression, according to local protocol, if trial dose is effective. Avoid hypotension.”

- a) Yes – 91%
- b) No – 9%

28) High dose propofol as a Tier 3

- a) Yes – 12%
- b) No – 88%

29) ICP Only
All Tiers

- MAP Challenge / Trial
- a) Yes – 100%
 - b) No – 0%

30) 10mm MAP Challenge

- a) Yes – 94%
- b) No – 6%

31) Don't exceed CPP of 90mm of mercury

- a) Yes – 94%
- b) No – 6%

32) 20 minute duration

- a) Yes – 93%
- b) No – 7%

33) Adopt existing protocol for augmenting MAP

- a) Yes – 90%
- b) No – 10%

34) Should the following language be added to Tier 0 treatment under Expected?

- “Admission to ICU”
- a) Yes – 87.5%
 - b) No – 12.5%

35) Should the following language be added to Tier 0 treatment under Expected, Optimize venous return from the head

- “Keep the head midline”
- a) Yes – 84%
 - b) No – 16%

36) Should the following language be added to Tier 0 treatment under Expected, Optimise venous return from the head

- “Aim to optimize cerebral venous return by maneuvers like keeping the head midline and ensuring cervical collars are not too tight”

- a) Yes – 100%
 - b) No – 0%
- 37) For Tier 0 under Expected, what is the temperature above which you will treat?
- a) 38.5°C – 23%, 29%
 - b) 38.0°C – 45%, 39%
 - c) 37.5°C – 32%, 32%
 - d) Other – 0%, 0%
- 38) Expected to measure core temperature as a Tier 0 intervention?
- a) Yes – 100%
 - b) No – 0%
- 39) Should we specify at Tier 0 a treatment temperature for fever
- a) Yes – 61%, 87%
 - b) No – 39%, 13%
- 40) Would you treat temperature greater than 38.0?
- a) Yes – 87%
 - b) No – 13%
- 41) Would you treat temperature greater than 37.5 as Tier 0?
- a) Yes
 - b) No
- 42) Should we specify a temperature above which severe TBI patients in the absence of other indications should be warmed?
- a) Yes – 45%
 - b) No – 55%
- 43) Address rewarming?
- a) Yes – 41%
 - b) No – 59%
- 44) Patients with isolated severe TBI without any other indication for rewarming then active rewarming should be avoided
- a) Yes
 - b) No
- 45) Active rewarming should be avoided
- a) Yes
 - b) No

46) For Tier 0 under Expected what is the temperature at or below which TBI patients should be warmed?

- a) 35.6°C
- b) 36.0°C
- c) 35.5°C
- d) 35.0°C
- e) Other

47) For Tier 0 under Expected, what is the minimum oxygen saturation (SaO2) threshold range?

If you fancy a specific value, please pick the appropriate range:

- a) 98 - 100% – 6%
- b) 95 – 97% – 31%
- c) 92 - 94% – 50%
- d) 90 – 91% – 13%

48) What is the minimal acceptable SAO2 target in absence of contraindications?

- a) 95 – 97% – 36%
- b) 92 - 94% – 64%

49) What is the minimal acceptable SAO2 target?

- a) 92% – 7%
- b) 93% – 0%
- c) 94% – 59%
- d) 95% – 34%

50) What is the minimal acceptable SAO2 target?

- a) 94% – 71%
- b) 95% – 29%

51) Should we maintain a normal SPAO2 (94 – 100%)

- a) Yes – 100%
- b) No – 0%

52) For Tier 0 under Recommended, should we recommend the use of computerised pupillometry?

- a) Yes – 9.7%
- b) No – 90.3%

53) Patients should undergo serial evaluations of neurological status and pupillary reactivity.

- a) Yes – 100%
- b) No – 0%

54) Should we specify a minimum frequency?

- a) Yes – 66%, 41%
- b) No – 34%, 59%

55) For Tier 0 under Recommended, should we recommend to Consider early involvement of Rehabilitation Medicine?

- a) Yes – 47%
- b) No – 53%

56) Should we put any kind of statement about adding additional monitors?

- a) Yes – 48%
- b) No – 52%

57) Language for recommendations when advancing from Tier to Tier

Should “Review that basic physiologic parameters are in desired range (e.g. CPP, blood gas values)” be included in these fields?

- a) Yes – 91%
- b) No – 9%

58) Language for recommendations when advancing from Tier to Tier

Should “Consider patient transfer to specialist TBI centre” be included in these fields?

- a) Yes – 59%
- b) No – 41%

59) Language for recommendations when advancing from Tier to Tier

Should “Consider involving Rehabilitation Medicine” be included in these fields?

- a) Yes – 30%
- b) No – 70%

60) Language for recommendations when advancing from Tier to Tier

Should we include any language about palliative care consultation

- a) Yes – 30%, 11%
- b) No – 70%, 89%

61) Language for recommendations when advancing from Tier to Tier

Should “Consider consultation with specialist TBI centre”
be included in these fields?

- a) Yes – 77%
- b) No – 23%

62) Language for recommendations when advancing from Tier to Tier

Should “Consider consultation with higher level of care if applicable
for your health care system” be included in these fields?

- a) Yes – 83%
- b) No – 17%

63) Neuroworsening = the occurrence of one or more of the following objective criteria:

Spontaneous decrease in the GCS motor score of \geq xxx points (compared with the previous examination)

- a) Should use ≥ 2 points – 29%, 6%
- b) Should use ≥ 1 points – 71%, 94%
- c) Should not be part of the definition – 0%, 0%

64) Neuroworsening = the occurrence of one or more of the following objective criteria:

New decrease in pupillary reactivity

- a) Acceptable as is – 97%
- b) Needs modification – 3%
- c) Should not be part of the definition – 0%

65) Neuroworsening = the occurrence of one or more of the following objective criteria:

Pupillary asymmetry wording

- a) Interval development of pupillary asymmetry of ≥ 2 mm – 15%
- b) Interval development of pupillary asymmetry of ≥ 2 mm or bilateral mydriasis – 81%
- c) Should not be part of the definition – 4%

66) Neuroworsening = the occurrence of one or more of the following objective criteria:

Pupillary asymmetry wording

- a) New pupillary asymmetry – 6.5%
- b) New pupillary asymmetry or bilateral mydriasis – 90.3%
- c) Change the wording – 3.2%

67) Neuroworsening = the occurrence of one or more of the following objective criteria:

New focal motor deficit

- a) Acceptable as is – 100%
- b) Needs modification – 0%
- c) Should not be part of the definition – 0%

68) Neuroworsening = the occurrence of one or more of the following objective criteria:

Herniation syndrome (e.g. Cushing's triad)

- a) Acceptable as is – 84.4%
- b) Needs modification – 9.4%
- c) Should not be part of the definition – 6.3%

69) Neuroworsening = the occurrence of one or more of the following objective criteria:

Deterioration in neurological status sufficient to warrant immediate medical or surgical intervention

From original definition by Morris et al.

- a) Acceptable as is – 19%
- b) Needs modification – 3%
- c) Should not be part of the definition – 78%

70) Neuroworsening = the occurrence of one or more of the following objective criteria:

Deterioration in neurological status sufficient to warrant immediate medical or surgical intervention

From original definition by Morris et al.

- a) Acceptable as is – 16%
- b) Should not be part of the definition – 84%

71) Neuroworsening = the occurrence of one or more of the following objective criteria:

\downarrow ICP > 30?

- a) Acceptable as is – 9%
- b) Needs modification in terms of ICP value – 19%
- c) Should not be part of the definition – 72%

72) Neuroworsening = the occurrence of one or more of the following objective criteria:

\downarrow ICP > 30?

- a) Needs modification in terms of ICP value – 16%
- b) Should not be part of the definition – 84%

73) Emergent evaluation to identify possible cause (*) of neuroworsening

If herniation is suspected

- empiric treatment
- consider emergent imaging or other testing
- rapid escalation of treatment

- a) Yes – 84%
- b) No – 16%

74) For mannitol, Osmolality limits should be:

- a) 320 mOsm/L – 81%
- b) 360 mOsm/L – 13%
- c) Other – 6%

75) For mannitol, serum sodium limits should be:

- a) 150 mEq/L – 0%
- b) 155 mEq/L – 37.5%
- c) 160 mEq/L – 18.8%
- d) Don't need Na limits for mannitol – 43.8%
- e) Other – 0%

76) For HS, Osmolality limits should be:

- a) 320 mOsm/L – 88%
- b) 360 mOsm/L – 9%
- c) Other – 3%

77) For HS, Na limits should be:

- a) 150 mEq/L – 0%
- b) 155 mEq/L – 48.5%
- c) 160 mEq/L – 45.5%
- d) Other – 6.1%

78) Same limits for both

- a) Yes – 63%
- b) No – 37%

79) For both 155 and 320

- a) Yes – 76%
- b) No – 24%

80) Mannitol 320

- a) Yes – 100%
- b) No – 0%

81) Hypertonic

- a) 155 – 52%
- b) 160 – 48%

82) Hypertonic, Range of 155 – 160

- a) Yes – 88%
- b) No – 12%

83) For HS, Osmolality limits should be:

- a) 320 mOsm/L – 88%
- b) 360 mOsm/L – 9%
- c) Other – 3%

84) For HS, Na limits should be:

- a) 150 mEq/L – 0%
- b) 155 mEq/L – 48.5%
- c) 160 mEq/L – 45.5%
- d) Other – 6.1%

85) Limits for hypertonics

- a) 155 - 160 mEq/L Na Hypertonic Saline and 320 mOsm/L for mannitol – 28%, 16%
- b) 155 mEq/L Na and 320 mOsm/L for both – 72%, 84%

86) Should we add an intervention involving CPP elevation to Tier 1?

- BOOST3 has just added “Optimize CPP: May increase CPP up to a maximum of 70 mm Hg with fluid boluses or vasopressors as clinically appropriate
 - Notes: May assess autoregulation per local protocol to optimize MAP/CPP. “
- a) Yes, and wording is acceptable – 25%
 - b) Yes but need to consider changing wording – 50%
 - c) Should be Tier 2 – 25%
 - d) Should not be in ICP-only algorithm – 0%

87) Should we alter the intervention involving CPP elevation to Tier 2?

- “Optimize CPP: May increase CPP above 70 mm Hg with fluid boluses or vasopressors.”
- a) Yes, and wording is acceptable – 20%
 - b) Yes but need to consider changing wording – 31%
 - c) Should be Tier 3 – 26%
 - d) Should not be in ICP-only algorithm – 23%