Integrating Pupillometry into a Cardiovascular Intensive Care Unit: An Evidence- Based Quality Improvement Project

Morgan Scott, MSN, CCRN, ACNPC-AG

March 21, 2023





#### **DNP** Project Team

#### Advisor: Regina DeGennaro, DNP, CNS, RN, AOCN, CNL

Second Reviewer: Beth Hundt, PhD, NP-C, ACNS-BC

Practice Site Mentor: Lauren Huck, MSN, ACNP

Statistician: Ivy Hinton, PhD

Dataset Contacts: Judy Smith and Dustin Money

### Background and Significance

- Neurologic assessment, including pupillary assessment, is a standard of care in critically ill patients.
- Accurate neurologic assessment is essential (Olson et al., 2016; Phillips et al., 2019).
- Abnormalities of pupillary response are associated with neurological deterioration and correlate with poor neurological outcomes (Chen et al., 2011; Emilifeonwu et al., 2018).



# Background and Significance

- Manual pupillary assessment has been the standard of care.
  - Low inter- and intra- observer reliability among clinicians (Olson et al., 2016).
- Pupillometers standardize this crucial assessment.
- A pupillometer is an automated, objective, non-invasive, handheld device.
- Pupillometry is not widely adopted.





#### Literature Review

#### Major Conclusions:

- Literature supports the accuracy of pupillometry and its use in patient's post cardiac arrest.
- The most common neurologic consequence following cardiac arrest is hypoxic-ischemic brain injury.
- Hypoxic-ischemic brain injury is like neurologic complications following.



#### Literature Review

#### Major Conclusions (con't.):

- Pupillometry has been well documented as beneficial in neurological literature (Chen et al., 2011; El Ahmadieh et. al., 2021; Godau et al., 2021; Osman et al., 2019).
- Pupillometry is superior to manual pupillary assessment and should be the standard of care.

# Project Purpose

Since cardiovascular surgery patients are at increased risk for neurologic complications, integrating pupillometry will assist neurologic assessment and detection of neurologic complications. Doing this has been shown to improve the accuracy of neurologic assessments and will potentially improve patient outcomes.





# Project Design: Methods

Setting and Sample:

- Cardiovascular Intensive Care Unit (CVICU): 24-bed surgical ICU.
- This patient population is at an increased risk for neurologic complications.
- The patients at highest risk for neurologic complications are patients requiring mechanical circulatory support devices (MCSD).



# Project Design: Methods

Inclusion Criteria

• Adult patients admitted to the CVICU during the project window with MCSD.

**Exclusion** Criteria

• All other CVICU patients.



# Project Design: Measures

- Age (range).
- Gender.
- Admission diagnosis.
- Co-morbidities.
- Mechanical device type.

- Length of device use.
- Length of stay.
- Neurologic complication occurred (Yes or No).
- Mortality.



### Project Design: Measures

- Anticoagulation use (Yes or No).
- Anticoagulation type.
- Pupillometry data points documented.
- Nursing compliance to order (% pupillometry is documented).

- % Order for pupillometry is placed.
- Intervention/provider notification was documented because of abnormal pupillometry.



# Project Design: Procedures

- Institutional Review Board (IRB) determination (July).
- Background education for project (August):
  - Educational computer-based module on pupillometry.
  - Charge nurse education.
  - Discussion of project at staff meetings/unit huddles.
- Order for pupillometry placed in all mechanical circulatory support device order sets (September 1).
- Informational decision support tool posted (September 1).

**The UVA** school of NURSING

# Protection of Human Subjects Consideration

- IRB Application.
  - Determination of Human Subjects Research.
- Pupillometry was the standard of care, so consent was waived.

- Ethical considerations:
  - Confidentiality.
  - Justice.
  - Beneficence.
  - Non-maleficence.

| Data     |             |    |       |
|----------|-------------|----|-------|
| Data     | Variable    | Ν  | %     |
| Analysis | Age (years) |    |       |
|          | 18-39       | 3  | 18.75 |
|          | 40-59       | 4  | 25.0  |
|          | 60-79       | 8  | 50.0  |
|          | 80+         | 1  | 6.25  |
|          | Gender      |    |       |
|          | Male        | 13 | 81.25 |
|          | Female      | 3  | 18.75 |



| Data     |                         |   |       |
|----------|-------------------------|---|-------|
| Analysis | Variable                | Ν | %     |
| 1        | Device Type             |   |       |
|          | VV-ECMO                 | 6 | 37.5  |
|          | VA-ECMO                 | 3 | 18.75 |
|          | CENTRIMAG <sup>TM</sup> | 1 | 6.25  |
|          | IABP                    | 4 | 25.0  |
|          | LVAD                    | 1 | 6.25  |
|          | IMPELLATM               | 1 | 6.25  |



# Data Analysis

| Variable                       | IQR     | Median |
|--------------------------------|---------|--------|
| Length of Stay (days)          | 12-48.5 | 25.5   |
| Length of Device Use<br>(days) | 2-20    | 3.5    |



| Data     | Variable                | Ν  | %    |
|----------|-------------------------|----|------|
| Anolygia | Neurologic Complication |    |      |
| Analysis | Yes                     | 2  | 12.5 |
|          | No                      | 14 | 87.5 |
|          | Mortality               |    |      |
|          | Yes                     | 4  | 25.0 |
|          | No                      | 12 | 75.0 |
|          | Anticoagulation         |    |      |
|          | Yes                     | 12 | 75.0 |
|          | No                      | 4  | 25.0 |



| Data     | Variable   | Ν   | %     |
|----------|--|-----|-------|
| Analysis | Total Expected Documented Assessments<br>for All MCSD Patients | 747 |       |
|          | Total Expected Documented Assessments with Orders Place        | 735 | 100.0 |
|          | Total Completed Assessments<br>Documented                      | 551 | 75.0  |
|          | Total Assessments Not Documented                               |     |       |
|          | No Documentation   | 145 | 19.7  |
|          | Patient Refusal Documented                                     | 35  | 4.8   |
|          | Pupillometer Unavailable Documented                            | 4   | 0.5   |



# Data Analysis

| Variable   | Ν  | %     |
|--|----|-------|
| Abnormal Results Documented                      | 33 | 100.0 |
| Provider Notification/Intervention<br>Documented |    |       |
| Yes  | 5  | 15.0  |
| No   | 28 | 85.0  |





# Sustainability and Discussion

- An in-depth understanding of barriers is needed for sustainability.
- Further investigation into workflow and ease of documentation is needed.
  - Use of the Epic<sup>®</sup> Brain.
- There was a 75% improvement in pupillometry use as a result of this project.



# Sustainability and Discussion

- Requirement of and improvement in documentation of provider notification and intervention is necessary.
  - Documentation of provider notification/intervention was not required.
  - Many variables could account for lack of documentation.
  - Variables impacting lack of intervention.



# Strengths of the Project

- Uses a validated and reliable instrument among all ethnicities (pupillometer).
- Implementation of current evidence.
- Minimal adjustment to current clinical flow.
- No financial requirements.
- Promotes enhanced clinical assessment and potentially early recognition of neurologic complications.



## Nursing Practice Implications

- Improve neurologic assessment (Chen et al., 2011; El Ahmadieh et. al., 2021; Godau et al., 2021; Osman et al., 2019).
- Potential for earlier detection and intervention (Chen et al., 2011; El Ahmadieh et. al., 2021; Godau et al., 2021; Osman et al., 2019).
- Potential for improved patient outcomes (Chen et al., 2011; El Ahmadieh et. al., 2021; Godau et al., 2021; Osman et al., 2019).
- Potential reduction in healthcare costs for the patient and institution (Chen et al., 2011; El Ahmadieh et. al., 2021; Godau et al., 2021; Osman et al., 2019).
- Application in other populations.



#### **Disseminate Results**

- A manuscript ready for publication:
  - Final report of the DNP project in Libra.
  - Manuscript submission to Journal of Critical Care Nurse.
- Poster ready for presentation.
- Considerations for future scholarship:
  - Improve documentation workflow.
  - Research.
  - Broaden scope.



# Conclusion

- Neurologic assessment, including pupillary assessment, is a standard of care in critically ill patients.
- Pupillometry is reliable and reproducible (Nyholm et al., 2022).
- Pupillometry improves neurologic assessment (Chen et al., 2011; El Ahmadieh et al., 2021; Godau et al., 2021; Osman et al., 2019).



# Conclusion

- Early, accurate detection of neurologic deterioration has the potential to improve outcomes and save on healthcare costs (Chen et al., 2011; El Ahmadieh et al., 2021; Godau et al., 2021; Osman et al., 2019).
- It is feasible to perform routine pupillary examinations on MCSD patients.
- In-depth understanding is needed to sustain.

# Questions?



# **SCHOOL** of NURSING

#### References

American Hospital Association. (2021). Fast Facts on U.S. Hospitals, 2021.

https://www.aha.org/system/files/media/file/2021/01/Fast-Facts-2021-table-FY19-data-14jan21.pdf

Chen, J. W., Gombart, Z. J., Rogers, S., Gardiner, S. K., Cecil, S., & Bullock, R. M. (2011). Pupillary reactivity as an early indicator of increased intracranial pressure: the introduction of the Neurological Pupil index. *Surgical Neurology International*, *2*(82). https://doi.org/10.4103/2152-7806.82248

El Ahmadieh, T. Y., Bedros, N., Stutzman, S. E., Nyancho, D., Venkatachalam, A. M., MacAllister, M., Ban, S. B., Dahdealeh, N.S., Aiyargari, V., Figueroa, S., White, J.A., Batjer, H.H, Bagley, C.A., Olson, D.M., & Aoun, S. G. (2021). Automated pupillometry as a triage and assessment tool in patients with traumatic brain injury. *World Neurosurgery*, 145, e163-e169. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wneu.2020.09.152

Emelifeonwu, J. A., Reid, K., Rhodes, J. K., & Myles, L. (2018). Saved by the Pupillometer! –a role for pupillometry in the acute assessment of patients with traumatic brain injuries? *Brain Injury*, *32*(5), 675-677. https://doi.org/10/1080/026999052/2018/1429021



Godau, J., Bierwirth, C., Rösche, J., & Bösel, J. (2021). Quantitative infrared pupillometry in nonconvulsive status epilepticus. *Neurocritical Care*, 35(1), 113-120.

Lacerte, M., & Mesfin, F. B. (2019). Hypoxic brain injury.

Heimburger, D., Durand, M., Gaide-Chevronnay, L., Dessertaine, G., Moury, P.-H., Bouzat, P., Albaladejo, P., & Payen, J.-F. (2016). Quantitative pupillometry and transcranial doppler measurements in patients treated with hypothermia after cardiac arrest. *Resuscitation*, 103, 88–93. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resuscitation.2016.02.026 Hogue, C. W., Gottesman, R. F., & Stearns, J. (2008). Mechanisms of cerebral injury from cardiac surgery. *Critical* 

*Care Clinics*, 24(1), 83-98.

Iowa Model Collaborative. (2017). Iowa model of evidence-based practice: Revisions and validation. *Worldviews* on Evidence-Based Nursing, 14(3), 175-182. doi:10.1111/wvn.12223



Menozzi, M., Oddo, M., Peluso, L., Dessartaine, G., Sandroni, C., Citerio, G., Payen, J.-F., & Taccone, F. S. (2021). Early neurological pupil index assessment to predict outcome in cardiac arrest patients undergoing extracorporeal membrane oxygenation. *ASAIO Journal (American Society for Artificial Internal Organs: 1992)*. https://doi.org/10.1097/MAT.00000000001569

Miroz, J. P., Ben-Hamouda, N., Bernini, A., Romagnosi, F., Bongiovanni, F., Roumy, A., Roumy, A., Kirsch, M., Liaudet, L., Eckert, P., & Oddo, M. (2020). Neurological pupil index for early prognostication after venoarterial extracorporeal membrane oxygenation. *Chest*, 157(5), 1167-1174. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chest.2019.11.037

Morelli, P., Oddo, M., & Ben-Hamouda, N. (2019). Role of automated pupillometry in critically ill patients. *Minerva Anestesiologica*, 85(9), 995-1002. https://doi.org/10.23736/s0375-9393.19.13437-2

NeurOptics Inc. (2022). The NPi Pupillometer is reliable and eliminates subjectivity. https://neuroptics.com/pupillometry-clinical-overview/



Obling, L., Hassager, C., Illum, C., Grand, J., Wiberg, S., Lindholm, M. G., Winther-Jensen, M., Kondziella, D., & Kjaergaard, J. (2020). Prognostic value of automated pupillometry: An unselected cohort from a cardiac intensive care unit. European Heart Journal. *Acute Cardiovascular Care*, 9(7), 779–787. https://doi.org/10.1177/2048872619842004

Olson, D. M., Stutzman, S., Saju, C., Wilson, M., Zhao, W., & Aiyagari, V. (2016). Interrater reliability of pupillary assessments. *Neurocritical Care*, *24*(2), 251-257.

Osman, M., Stutzman, S. E., Atem, F., Olson, D., Hicks, A. D., Ortega-Perez, S., Aoun, S.G., Salem, A., & Aiyagari, V. (2019). Correlation of objective pupillometry to midline shift in acute stroke patients. *Journal of Stroke and Cerebrovascular Diseases*, 28(7), 1902-1910.

Phillips, S. S., Mueller, C. M., Nogueira, R. G., & Khalifa, Y. M. (2019). A systematic review assessing the current state of automated pupillometry in the NeuroICU. *Neurocritical Care*, *31*(1), 142-161



Sekhon, M. S., Ainslie, P. N., & Griesdale, D. E. (2017). Clinical pathophysiology of hypoxic ischemic brain injury after cardiac arrest: A "two-hit" model. *Critical Care*, 21(1), 1-10.

Suys, T., Bouzat, P., Marques-Vidal, P., Sala, N., Payen, J.-F., Rossetti, A. O., & Oddo, M. (2014). Automated quantitative pupillometry for the prognostication of coma after cardiac arrest. *Neurocritical Care*, 21(2), 300–308. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12028-014-9981-z



