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ABSTRACT

Introduction Increasing numbers of patients are surviving critical illness, leading to growing concern about the potential impact of the long-term consequences of intensive care on patients, families and society as a whole. These long-term effects are together known as postintensive care syndrome and their presence can be evaluated at intensive care unit (ICU) follow-up consultations. However, the services provided by these consultations vary across hospitals and units, in part because there is no validated standard model to evaluate patients and their quality of life after ICU discharge. We describe a protocol for a scoping review focusing on models of ICU follow-up and the impact of such strategies on improving patient quality of life.

Methods and analysis In this scoping review, we will search the literature systematically using electronic databases (MEDLINE - from database inception to June 15th 2020) and a grey literature search. We will involve stakeholders as recommended by the Joanna Briggs Institute approach developed by Peters et al. The research will be conducted in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses Extension for Scoping Reviews guidelines.

Ethics and dissemination This study does not require ethics approval, because data will be obtained through a review of published primary studies. The results of our evaluation will be published in a peer-reviewed journal and will also be disseminated through presentations at national and international conferences.

INTRODUCTION

Better understanding of disease pathophysiology, improvements in medical technology, and greater attention to the process of care have helped improve survival rates for intensive care unit (ICU) patients. However, ICU survivors can experience lifelong consequences of their critical illness, with survival just the start of a long challenging path of rehabilitation. After discharge, patients may have to cope with weakness, cognitive impairment, and psychological distress and the secondary effects of these sequelae, including burn-out, dependency and unemployment.

In 2012, a task force from the Society of Critical Care Medicine acknowledged and gathered those disabilities into a new entity called postintensive care syndrome (PICS). PICS is defined as worsening mental, cognitive and physical status that persists beyond the acute hospitalisation and impacts a patient’s quality of life. The prevalence of post-ICU disabilities varies across studies largely because of the heterogeneity of the tools used to assess patients. However, more than 50% of survivors will present one or more disabilities during the first year after ICU discharge. Cognitive impairments, including of global cognition and executive function, can affect up to 70% of ICU survivors. Psychological distress includes depression, anxiety and post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). Up to 50% of patients have anxiety after ICU discharge and up to 58% depression.

Because of the high risk that intensive care may compromise quality of life for survivors, PICS is a major concern for healthcare providers. Different models of ICU follow-up clinics have been established around the world aiming to address the problems associated with long-term disabilities of ICU survivors. However, the effectiveness of these clinics remains uncertain. Currently, there is no standard approach that has been shown to effectively address the problems associated with PICS. Three systematic reviews of ICU survivor follow-up have recently been published: one analysed the critical care transition programme, another exercise rehabilitation programmes after ICU discharge, and the third investigated the impact of ICU follow-up consultations in...
ICU survivors compared with standard care and showed that ICU follow-up could decrease PTSD symptoms. The published systematic reviews pooled highly heterogeneous data. A scoping review published by Lasiter et al on critical care follow-up clinics had several limitations, including that only studies in English speaking populations were included, patients enrolled from burn units were excluded and other types of follow-up, such as phone calls, home visits and mailed questionnaires, were not assessed. One integrative review, also published in 2016, only analysed aspects of nurse-led follow-up.

To gain better knowledge about ICU follow-up, we, therefore, decided to conduct a new scoping review with broad eligibility criteria to identify features, advantages and disadvantages of all types of ICU follow-up. Given the methodological differences in the available studies on this subject, a scoping review will help better understand current practice and provide a basis for targeted research questions.

OBJECTIVES
The objectives of this review are to characterise the concept of an ICU follow-up service from a broad perspective, to clarify the implications of such a service for patient quality of life, to identify research gaps and to make methodological recommendations for future research.

METHODS
Protocol
The study will be conducted according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses extension (PRISMA) for Scoping Reviews guidelines. The protocol was registered in the Open Science Framework on 30 January 2020. Important protocol amendments will be registered on that webpage.

Study design
A scoping review was considered the most appropriate method for the aims of this study. In developing this protocol, we applied the approach developed by Peters et al, based on the framework proposed by Arksey and O’Malley, already improved by Levac et al and the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI). The five stages proposed by this approach are:
1. Identification of the review question(s).
2. Identification of relevant studies.
3. Study selection.
4. Charting the data.
5. Collating, summarising and reporting the results.

Review questions
We used the population, concept and context approach suggested by Munn et al to guide our question development. Our review targets the following research questions:

Main questions:
1. What types of ICU follow-up were reported?
2. What was the impact of the ICU follow-up on patient quality of life?

Secondary questions:
1. For whom was the ICU follow-up suggested?
2. Was the effectiveness of the ICU follow-up assessed and, if so, how?

Search strategy and eligibility criteria
The search will use two sources: (1) electronic bibliographic database and (2) grey literature.

The electronic bibliographic database that will be searched is the Medical Literature Analysis and Retrieval System Online (MEDLINE). The proposed search strategy for MEDLINE via PubMed is detailed in table 1. No date limits will be applied to this review. The search string will include as filters human species, adult patients and language. We will include studies published in English, French, Italian, Portuguese or Spanish. Articles related to any type of patient follow-up after discharge from an ICU, including burn units, will be considered. There will be no limitations for the duration of ICU follow-up or outcome measures. Primary research studies, letters, abstracts and guidelines will all be included, but reviews and meta-analyses will be excluded. The reference lists of all included articles will be checked to identify additional eligible documents.

The grey literature search will include general and targeted website searching. General website searching will use Google as the search engine and the following search terms: ICU follow-up; after intensive care; rehabilitation after ICU. All the results from each of the Google searches will be examined. The targeted websites will include the Society of Critical Care Medicine and the European Society of Intensive Medicine homepages and subpages.

Study selection
We will screen all documents in two phases. Two authors will independently evaluate the titles and abstracts of documents identified in the search, followed by full-text screening of potentially eligible articles for final inclusion. Any disagreements on study eligibility will be resolved through debate or by discussion with a third author. The citation management software used to manage the selection process will be EndNote X9 (Clarivate Analytics, Pennsylvania, USA). The reference lists of eligible documents will be imported into the JBI’s System for the Unified Management, Assessment and Review of Information (JBI SUMARI; The JBI, Adelaide, Australia). The results of each step of the planned search, including reasons for exclusion, will be given in detail in the final report and presented in a PRISMA flow diagram.

Data charting
Using the JBI Data Extraction Form for Experimental/Observational Studies, data will be extracted independently by two authors, because additional unforeseen
data may be usefully identified in this manner. The results will be cross-checked. Any disagreements on data extraction will be resolved by a third reviewer. The following information will be extracted for each study: title, year of publication, first author, the country where the study was conducted, type of study, underlying diseases and any outcomes that fit into the conceptual framework of the study. Authors of the primary studies screened will be contacted in case of missing relevant data. The data extraction process will be referred to as ‘charting the results’. The authors will keep careful records to enable identification of each study.

Collating, summarising and reporting the results

We will summarise quantitative results as frequency counts for concepts, populations and outcomes. Table 2 reports a descriptive and logical summary of the results that will be reported. An assessment of the quality of the included studies will not be performed. For qualitative studies, we will perform a descriptive qualitative content analysis, using NVivo software.38

DATA STATEMENT

The datasets generated during the current study and the analytical methods (including preprocessing and eventually the analysis code) will be available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

PATIENT AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Involvement of patients and the public has been planned as proposed by the original framework of Arksey and O’Malley.34 We will contact critical stakeholders to identify...
supplementary references for inclusion. The stakeholders chosen are members of the European Society of Intensive Care Medicine, the Belgian Society of Intensive Care and the Society of Critical Care Medicine.

ETICS AND DISSEMINATION

This paper does not require ethics approval, as data will be obtained through a review of published primary studies. The results of our evaluation will be published in a peer-reviewed journal and will also be disseminated through presentations at national and international conferences. Patients’ associations, such as THRIVE ICU, Patients Like Me and Patient Opinion, will be contacted to disseminate the results through online material. Finally, team members will use their networks to ensure broad dissemination of the results.

CONCLUSION

This scoping review will identify existing literature related to all types of ICU follow-up services. With its broad eligibility criteria, our results will help better understand the advantages and disadvantages of ICU follow-up, and guide future research and practice.
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