

Journal of Medical Ethics

Revisiting the equity debate in COVID-19: ICU is no panacea

Journal:	<i>Journal of Medical Ethics</i>
Manuscript ID	medethics-2020-106460
Article Type:	Current controversy
Keywords:	Living Wills/Advance Directives, Clinical Ethics, End of Life Care, Distributive Justice, Palliative Care

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

1
2
3 1 **Revisiting the equity debate in COVID-19: ICU is no panacea**
4
5
6 2

7
8 3 **Abstract**
9

10 4 Throughout March and April 2020, debate raged about how best to allocate limited intensive
11 care unit resources in the face of a growing COVID-19 pandemic. The debate was
12 dominated by utility-based arguments for saving the most lives or life-years. These
13 arguments were tempered by equity-based concerns that triage based solely on prognosis
14 would exacerbate existing health inequities, leaving disadvantaged patients worse off.
15 Central to this debate was the assumption that ICU admission is a valuable but scarce
16 resource in the pandemic context.
17
18 10

19 11 In this paper, we argue that the concern about achieving equity in ICU triage is problematic
20 for two reasons. First, ICU can be futile and prolong or exacerbate suffering rather than
21 ameliorate it. This may be especially true in COVID-19 patients with emerging data showing
22 that most who receive access to a ventilator will still die. There is no value in admitting
23 patients with poor prognostic indicators to ICU to meet an equity target when intensive
24 critical care is contrary to their best interests. Second, the focus on ICU admission shifts
25 focus away from important aspects of COVID-19 care where there is greater opportunity for
26 mitigating suffering and enhancing equitable care.
27
28 18

29 19 We propose that the focus on equity concerns during the pandemic should broaden to
30 include providing all people who need it with access to the highest possible standard of end
31 of life care. This requires attention to culturally safe care in the following interlinked areas:
32 palliative care, communication and decision support and advanced care planning.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

24

Confidential: For Review Only

25 Introduction

26 As COVID-19 spread internationally, healthcare services in many countries became
27 overwhelmed. One of the main manifestations of this was a shortage of intensive care beds,
28 leading to urgent discussion about how to allocate these fairly. In the initial debates about
29 allocation of scarce ICU beds, there was optimism about the 'good' of intensive care unit
30 (ICU) access. However, rather than being a life-saving intervention, data began to emerge in
31 mid-April showing that most critical COVID-19 patients who receive access to a ventilator do
32 not survive to discharge. The minority who survive leave the ICU with significant morbidity
33 and a long and uncertain road to recovery. This reality remains under-recognised in the
34 bioethics literature on ICU triage. Throughout March and April 2020, debate raged about
35 how best to allocate limited intensive care unit resources in the face of the growing COVID-
36 19 pandemic. Central to this debate were two assumptions: first, that ICU admission was a
37 valuable but scarce resource in the pandemic context; and second, that both equity and
38 utility considerations were important in determining which patients should have access to
39 ICU. In this paper we explain how scarcity and value were conflated in the early ICU COVID
40 triage literature, leading to undue optimism about the 'good' of ICU access, which in turned
41 fuelled equity-based arguments for ICU access. In the process, ethical issues arising
42 regarding equitable access to end of life care more broadly were neglected.

43
44 Equity requires the prevention of avoidable or remediable differences among social,
45 economic, demographic, or geographic groups.⁽¹⁾ How best to apply an equity lens to
46 questions of distribution will depend on the nature of the resource in question. Equitable
47 distribution of ICU beds is significantly more complex than equitable distribution of other
48 goods that might be scarce in a pandemic, such as masks or vaccines if available. ICU

1
2
3
4 49 (especially that which involves intubation and ventilation i.e. mechanical ventilation) is a
5
6 50 burdensome treatment option that can lead to significant suffering – both short and long
7
8 51 term. The degree to which these burdens are justified depends on the *probability* of benefit,
9
10 52 and this depends on the clinical status of the patient. People are rightly concerned about the
11
12 53 equity implications of excluding patients from ICU on the grounds of pre-existing co-
13
14 54 morbidities that directly affect prognosis, especially when these align with and reflect social
15
16 55 disadvantage. But this does not mean that aged, frail or comorbid patients should be
17
18 56 admitted to ICU on the grounds of equity, when this may not be in their best interests.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 61 **ICU triage debate**

35
36 62 The COVID-19 pandemic has generated extraordinary demand for critical care and required
37
38 63 hard choices about who will receive presumed life-saving interventions such as ICU
39
40 64 admission. The debate has focused on whether or not a utilitarian approach aimed at
41
42 65 maximizing the number of lives (or life years) saved should be supplemented by equity
43
44 66 considerations that attempt to protect the rights and interests of members of marginalized
45
46 67 groups. The utilitarian approach uses criteria for access to ICU that focus on capacity to
47
48 68 benefit, understood as survival.(2) Supplementary equity considerations have been invoked
49
50
51 69 to relax the criteria in order to give a more diverse group of people a chance of entering
52
53
54
55 70 ICU.(3,4)
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 71 Equity-based critiques are grounded in the concern that a utilitarian approach aimed at
5
6 72 maximizing the number (or length) of lives saved may well exacerbate inequity in survival
7
8 73 rates between groups. This potential for discrimination is heightened if triage tools use age
9
10
11 74 as a proxy for capacity to benefit or are heavily reliant on QALYs (which will deprioritize
12
13 75 people with disabilities).(5,6) Even if these pitfalls are avoided, policies based on
14
15 76 maximizing lives saved entrench existing health inequalities because those most likely to
16
17
18 77 benefit from treatment will be people of privilege who come into the pandemic with better
19
20 78 health status than less advantaged people. Those from lower socioeconomic groups, and/or
21
22 79 some ethnic minorities have high rates of underlying comorbidities, some of which are
23
24
25 80 prognostically relevant in COVID-19 infection. Public health ethics requires that we
26
27
28 81 acknowledge how apparently neutral triage tools reflect and reinforce these disparities,
29
30 82 especially where the impact can be lethal.(7)

31
32
33 83 But the utility versus equity debate is more complex than it first appears. Both the utility and
34
35 84 equity approach to ICU triage start from the assumption that ICU is a valuable good – the
36
37
38 85 dispute is about how best to allocate it. Casting ICU admission as a scarce good subject to
39
40 86 rationing has the (presumably unintended) effect of making access to critical care look highly
41
42
43 87 appealing, triggering cognitive biases. Psychologists and marketers know that scarcity
44
45 88 sells.(8) People value a commodity more when it is difficult or impossible to obtain.(9) When
46
47
48 89 there is competition for scarce resources, people focus less on whether they really need or
49
50 90 want the resource. The priority becomes securing access to the resource.

51
52 91
53
54 92 Clinicians are not immune to scarcity-related cognitive bias. Clinicians treating COVID-19
55
56
57 93 patients are working under conditions of significant information overload but without the high
58
59 94 quality clinical research (generated from large data sets and rigorous methodology) usually
60

1
2
3
4 95 available for decision-making. The combination of overwhelming numbers of patients, high
5
6 96 acuity and uncertainty regarding best practice is highly anxiety provoking. In this context it is
7
8 97 unsurprising that, at least in the early stages of the pandemic, they may not have the
9
10 98 psychological bandwidth to challenge assumptions about the benefits of ICU admission for
11
12
13 99 patients with severe disease. Zagury-Orly and Schwartzstein have recently argued that the
14
15 100 health sector must accept that doctors' reasoning and decision-making are susceptible to
16
17
18 101 human anxieties and in the "...effort to "do good" for our patients, we may fall prey to
19
20 102 cognitive biases and therapeutic errors".(10)
21

22 103

24 104 We suggest the global publicity and panic regarding ICU triage distorted assessments of
25
26
27 105 best interests and decision-making about admittance to ICU and slanted ethical debate.
28

29 106 This has the potential to compromise important decisions with regard to patient care in
30
31 107 COVIDD-19 patients
32

33 108

34 109

38 110 **The emerging reality of ICU**

41 111 In general, the majority of patients who are ventilated for COVID-19 in ICU will die. Although
42
43
44 112 comparing data from different health systems is challenging due to variation in admission
45
46
47 113 criteria for ICU, clear trends are emerging with regard to those critically unwell and requiring
48
49 114 mechanical ventilation. Emerging data show case fatality rates (CFRs) of 50% - 88% for
50
51 115 ventilated COVID-19 patients. In China(11) and Italy about half of those with COVID-19 who
52
53
54 116 receive ventilator support have not survived.(12) In one small study in Wuhan the ICU
55
56 117 mortality rate among those who received invasive mechanical ventilation was 86%
57
58 118 (19/22).(13) Interestingly, the rate among those who received less intensive non-invasive
59
60

1
2
3
4 119 ventilation (NIV)¹ was still 79% (23/29).(13) Analysis of 5,700 patients in the New York City
5
6 120 area showed that the mortality for those receiving mechanical ventilation was 88%.(14) In
7
8 121 the UK, only 20% of those who have received mechanical ventilation in the UK have been
9
10 122 discharged alive.(15) Hence, the very real possibility of medical futility with regard to
11
12 123 ventilation in COVID-19 needs to be considered.

13
14
15
16 124 It is also important to consider the complications and side effects that occur in an ICU
17
18 125 context. These patients are vulnerable to hospital acquired infections such as ventilator
19
20 126 associated pneumonias (VAP) with high mortality rates in their own right (16), neuropathies,
21
22 127 myopathies (17) and skin damage. Significant long term morbidity (physical, mental and
23
24 128 emotional challenges) can also be experienced by people who survive prolonged ventilation
25
26 129 in ICU.(18,19) Under normal (non-emergency) circumstances, many patients experience
27
28 130 significant muscle atrophy and deconditioning, sleep disorders, severe fatigue (20), PTSD
29
30 131 (21), cognitive deficits (22), depression, anxiety, difficulty with daily activities and loss of
31
32 132 employment (23). Although it is too soon to have data on the long term outcomes of ICU
33
34 133 survivors in the specific context of COVID-19, the UK the Chartered Society of
35
36 134 Physiotherapy predicts a “tsunami of rehabilitation needs” as COVID patients begin to be
37
38 135 discharged.(24) The indirect effects of carer-burden should also not be underestimated as
39
40 136 research shows that caring for patients who have survived critical illness results in high
41
42 137 levels of depressive symptoms for the majority of caregivers.(25)

43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50 138 The emerging mortality data for COVID-19 patients admitted to ICU – in conjunction with
51
52 139 what is already know about the morbidity of ICU survivors – has significant implications for
53
54 140 the utility-equity debates about allocating the scarce resource of ICU beds. First, they

55
56
57
58
59 ¹ NIV does not require a general anaesthetic and intubation. Patients receive airway pressure support and
60 oxygen but they remain conscious.

1
2
3
4 141 undermine the utility argument as there seems to be little evidence that ICU admission leads
5
6 142 to better outcomes for patients, especially when the long term morbidity of extended ICU
7
8 143 admission is included in the balance of burdens and benefits. For some patients, perhaps
9
10 144 many, the burdens of ICU will not outweigh the limited potential benefits. Second, the poor
11
12
13 145 survival rates challenge the equity-based claim for preferential access to treatment for
14
15 146 members of disadvantaged groups. In particular, admitting frailer or comorbid patients to ICU
16
17
18 147 to fulfill equity goals is highly unlikely to achieve greater survival for these population groups,
19
20 148 but will increase their risk of complications and may ultimately prolong their suffering.
21
22

23 149

24
25 150 The high proportions of people who die despite ICU admission make it particularly important
26
27 151 to consider what might constitute better or worse experiences of dying with COVID-19, and
28
29
30 152 how ICU admission affects the likelihood of a “good” death. Critical care may compromise
31
32 153 the ability of patients to communicate and engage with their families during the terminal
33
34 154 phase of their lives – in the context of an intubated, ventilated patient this is unequivocal.
35
36

37 155 Given the high rates of medical futility with COVID-19 patients in ICU, the very significant
38
39
40 156 risks for further suffering in the short and long term and the compromise of important
41
42 157 psychosocial needs – such as communicating with our families – in the terminal phase of life,
43
44
45 158 our ethical scope must be wider than ICU triage. Ho and Tsai argue that “In considering
46
47 159 effective and efficient allocation of healthcare resources as well as physical and
48
49
50 160 psychological harm that can be incurred in prolonging the dying process, there is a critical
51
52 161 need to reframe end-of-life care planning in the ICU.”(26) We propose that the focus on
53
54 162 equity concerns during the pandemic should broaden to include providing all people who
55
56
57 163 need it with access to the highest possible standard of end of life care. This requires
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 164 attention to minimising barriers to accessing culturally safe care in the following interlinked
5
6 165 areas: palliative care, and communication and decision support and advanced care planning.
7

8 166

9
10 167 **1. Palliative care**

11
12
13 168

14
15 169 Scaling up palliative and hospice care is an essential component of the COVID-19 pandemic
16
17 response. Avoiding non-beneficial or unwanted high-intensity care is critical when the
18 170 capacity of the health system is stressed.(27) Palliative care focuses on symptom
19
20 171 management, quality of life and death, and holistic care of physical, psychological, social
21
22 172 and spiritual health.(28) Evidence from Italy has prompted recommendations that
23
24 173 “governments must urgently recognise the essential contribution of hospice and palliative
25
26 174 care to the COVID-19 pandemic, and ensure these services are integrated into the health
27
28 175 care system response.” (29) Rapid palliative care policy changes were implemented in
29
30 176 response to COVID-19 in Italy, including more support in community settings, change in
31
32 177 admission criteria, and daily telephone support for families.(29) To meet this increased
33
34 178 demand, hospice and palliative care staff should be included in PPE allocation and provided
35
36 179 with appropriate infection preventing and control (IPC) training when dealing with COVID-19
37
38 180 patients or high risk areas.
39
40 181
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 183 Attention must also be directed to maintaining supply lines for essential medications for pain,
50
51 184 distress and sedation. Patients may experience pain due to existing co-morbidities, but may
52
53 185 also develop pain as a result of excessive coughing or immobility from COVID-19. Such
54
55 186 symptoms should be addressed using existing approaches to pain management.(28) Supply
56
57 187 lines for essential medications for distress and pain management, including fentanyl and
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 188 midazolam are under threat in the United States and propofol – used in terminal sedation –
5
6 189 may also be in short supply.(30) The challenges are exacerbated when people who for
7
8 190 various reasons eschew or are unable to secure hospital admission decline rapidly at home
9
10 191 with COVID-19 (the time frame of recognition that someone is dying and then of the dying
11
12 192 process may be shorter than that through which hospice at home services usually support
13
14 193 people).There is growing debate about the fair allocation of novel drugs – sometimes
15
16 194 available as part of ongoing clinical trials –to treat COVID-19 with curative intent.(2,31) But
17
18 195 we must also pay attention to the fair allocation of drugs needed to ease suffering and dying.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

196

28 198 **2. Communication and end of life decision-making support**

199

200 End of life planning can be especially challenging because patients, family members and
201 health care providers often differ in what they consider most important near the end of
202 life.(32) Less than half of ICU physicians — 40.6 % in high income countries and 46.3 % in
203 low-middle income countries — feel comfortable holding end-of-life discussions with patients'
204 families.(26) With ICUs bursting and health providers under extraordinary pressure, their
205 capacity to effectively support end of life decisions and to ease dying will be reduced.

206 This suggests a need for specialist COVID-19 communication support teams, analogous to
207 the idea of specialist ICU triage teams to ensure consistency of decision making about ICU
208 admissions/discharges, and to reduce the moral and psychological distress of health
209 providers during the pandemic.(33) These support teams could provide up to date
210 information templates for patients and families, support decision-making, the development of
211 advance care plans (ACPs), and act as a liaison between families (prevented from being in

1
2
3 212 the hospital), the patient and the clinical team. Some people with disabilities may require
4
5
6 213 additional communication support to ensure the patients' needs are communicated to all
7
8 214 health providers, for example using whiteboards to display critical medical
9
10 215 documentation.(34) This will be especially important if carers and visitors are not able to be
11
12
13 216 present.

14
15
16 217 To provide effective and appropriate support in an equitable way, communication teams will
17
18 218 need to include those with the appropriate skills for caring for diverse populations including:
19
20 219 interpreters, specialist social workers, disability advocates, and cultural support liaison
21
22 220 officers for ethnic and religious minorities. Patient groups that already have comparatively
23
24 221 poor health outcomes require dedicated resources. These support resources are essential if
25
26 222 we wish if we wish to truly mitigate equity concerns that arise in the acute setting. See Box 1:
27
28 223 *Supporting communication and compassionate care during pandemic* for examples of
29
30 224 specific communication and care strategies to support patients.
31
32
33
34
35

36 225

38 226 **3. Advance care planning**

40 227

42 228

44
45 229 Advance care plans (ACPs) aim to honour decisions made by autonomous patients if and
46
47 230 when they lose capacity. However, talking to patients and their loved ones about clinical
48
49 231 prognosis, ceilings of treatment and potential end of life care is challenging even in normal
50
51 232 times. During COVID-19 the challenges are exacerbated by uncertainty and urgency, the
52
53 233 absence of family support (due to visitor restrictions), and the wearing of PPE by clinicians
54
55 234 and carers. Protective equipment can create a formidable barrier between the patient and
56
57 235 the provider, often adding to the patient's sense of isolation and fear. An Australian palliative
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 236 care researcher with experience working in disaster zones, argues that the “PPE may
5
6 237 disguise countenance, restrict normal human touch, and create an unfamiliar gulf between
7
8 238 you and your patient.”(35) The physical and psychological barriers of PPE coupled with the
9
10 239 pressure of high clinical loads do not seem conducive to compassionate discussions about
11
12 240 patients’ end of life preferences. Indeed, a study in Singapore during the 2004 SARS
13
14 241 epidemic demonstrated the barrier posed by PPE to compassionate end of life care.(36)
15
16 242
17
18 243 Clinicians may struggle to interpret existing ACPs in the context of COVID-19, given the
19
20 244 unprecedented nature and scale of the pandemic and emerging clinical knowledge about the
21
22 245 aetiology of the disease and (perhaps especially) about prognosis. This suggests the need
23
24 246 for COVID-19-specific ACPs. Where possible, proactive ACPs should occur with high-risk
25
26 247 patients, the frail, those in residential care and those with significant underlying morbidities.
27
28 248 Ideally, ACP conversations should take place prior to illness, involve known health providers
29
30 249 and carers, not be hampered by PPE or subject to time constraints imposed by acute care
31
32 250 contexts. Of note here, a systematic review found that patients who received advance care
33
34 251 planning or palliative care interventions consistently showed a pattern toward decreased ICU
35
36 252 admissions and reduced ICU length of stay.(37)
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

254 Conclusion

51 256 How best to address equity concerns in relation to ICU and end of life care for COVID-19
52
53 257 patients is challenging and complex. Attempts to broaden clinical criteria to give patients
54
55 258 with poorer prognoses access to ICU on equity grounds may result in fewer lives saved
56
57 259 overall – this may well be justified if access to ICU confers benefit to these “equity” patients.
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 260 But we must avoid tokenistic gestures to equity – admitting patients with poor prognostic
5
6 261 indicators to ICU to meet an equity target when intensive critical care is contrary to their best
7
8 262 interests. ICU admission may exacerbate and prolong suffering rather than ameliorate it,
9
10 263 especially for frailer patients; and prolonging life at all costs may ultimately lead to a worse
11
12 264 death. The capacity for harm not just the capacity for benefit should be emphasized in any
13
14 265 triage tools and related literature. Equity can be addressed more robustly if pandemic
15
16 266 responses scale up investment in palliative care services, communication and decision-
17
18 267 support services and advanced care planning to meet the needs of all COVID-19 patients.
19
20 268 Ultimately, however, equity considerations will require us to move even further from a critical
21
22 269 care framework as the social and economic impact of the pandemic will disproportionately
23
24 270 impact those most vulnerable. Globally, we will need an approach that doesn't just stop an
25
26 271 exponential rise in infections but an exponential rise in inequality.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Box 1: Supporting communication and compassionate care during pandemics

Despite the sometimes overwhelming pressure of the pandemic, health providers continue to invest in communication, compassionate care, and end of life support. In some places, doctors have taken photos of their faces and taped these to the front of their PPE so that patients can “see” their face.(38) In Singapore, patients who test positive for coronavirus are quarantined in health facilities until they receive two consecutive negative tests. Patients may be isolated in hospital for several weeks. To help ease this burden on patients, health providers have dubbed themselves the “second family” and gone out of their way to provide care as well as treatment. [see comic below, we have permission to use this, to be discussed with JME editors] Elsewhere, medical, nursing and multi-disciplinary teams are utilising internet based devices to enable ‘virtual’ visits and contact between patients and their loved ones.(39) Some centres are providing staff with masks with a see-through window panel that shows the wearer’s mouth, to support effective communication with patient with hearing loss who rely on lip reading.(40)



*Usually 14 - 18 days. Or until there are 2 negative swabs.

view Only

REFERENCES

1. World Health Organization. Equity. <https://www.who.int/healthsystems/topics/equity/en/>
2. Emanuel EJ, Persad G, Upshur R. et al Fair Allocation of Scarce Medical Resources in the Time of Covid-19. *N Engl J Med*. 2020 Mar 23. doi: 10.1056/NEJMs2005114. [Epub ahead of print]
3. Ballantyne A. ICU triage: How many lives or whose lives? *Journal of Medical Ethics Blog*. 7 April 2020 <https://blogs.bmj.com/medical-ethics/2020/04/07/icu-triage-how-many-lives-or-whose-lives/>
4. Schmidt H. The Way We Ration Ventilators Is Biased. *The New York Times*. 15 April 2020 <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/04/15/opinion/covid-ventilator-rationing-blacks.html>
5. Stramondo J. COVID-19 Triage and Disability: What NOT To Do. *Bioethics.net blog*. 30 March 2020 <http://www.bioethics.net/2020/03/covid-19-triage-and-disability-what-not-to-do>
6. Leach Scully, J. Disablism In a Time of Pandemic: Some Things Don't Change. *IJFAB blog*. 1 April 2020. ijfab.org/blog/author/jackieleachscully/
7. The Hasting Centre. Structural Racism, White Fragility, and Ventilator Rationing Policies. *Bioethics.net blog*. 20 April 2020 <http://www.bioethics.net/2020/04/structural-racism-white-fragility-and-ventilator-rationing-policies/>
8. Gierl H, Plantsch M, Schweidler J. Scarcity effects on sales volume in retail. *International Review of Re-tail, Distribution and Consumer Research*, 2008: 18, 45–61
9. Brock TC. Implications of commodity theory for value change. In Anthony G. Greenwald, Timothy C. Brock, & Thomas M. Ostrom (Eds.), *Psychological foundations of attitudes* 1968. (pp. 243–275). New York: Academic Press.
10. Zagury-Orly I, Schwartzstein RM. Covid-19 - A Reminder to Reason. *N Engl J Med*. 2020 Apr 28. doi: 10.1056/NEJMp2009405. [Epub ahead of print]
11. Wu Z, McGoogan JM. Characteristics of and Important Lessons From the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Outbreak in China: Summary of a Report of 72 314 Cases From the Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention. *JAMA*. 2020;323(13):1239–1242. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.2648
12. Johnson CY, Cha AE. The dark side of ventilators: Those hooked up for long periods face difficult recoveries. *The Washington Post*. 7 April 2020 <https://www.washingtonpost.com/health/2020/04/03/coronavirus-survivors-recovery/>
13. Yang X, Yu Y, Xu J et al. Clinical course and outcomes of critically ill patients with SARS-CoV-2 pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a single-centered, retrospective, observational study. *Lancet Respir Med*. 2020; 8(5):475-481. doi: 10.1016/S2213-2600(20)30079-5. Epub 2020 Feb 24.

- 1
2
3 14. Richardson S, Hirsch JS, Narasimhan M, et al. Presenting Characteristics, Comorbidities, and
4 Outcomes Among 5700 Patients Hospitalized With COVID-19 in the New York City Area.
5 JAMA. April 22, 2020. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.6775
6
7
- 8 15. Wise J. A third of covid-19 patients admitted to UK hospitals die. BMJ2020;369: m1794.
9 doi:10.1136/bmj.m1794 pmid:32354787
10
- 11 16. Kalanuria, A. A., Ziai, W., & Mirski, M. (2014). Ventilator-associated pneumonia in the ICU.
12 Critical care (London, England), 18(2), 208. <https://doi.org/10.1186/cc13775>
13
- 14 17. Shepherd S, Batra A, Lerner DP. Review of Critical Illness Myopathy and Neuropathy.
15 Neurohospitalist. 2017;7(1):41-48. doi:10.1177/1941874416663279
16
- 17 18. Johnson CY, Cha AE. The dark side of ventilators: Those hooked up for long periods face
18 difficult recoveries. The Washington Post. 7 April 2020
19
20 <https://www.washingtonpost.com/health/2020/04/03/coronavirus-survivors-recovery/>
21
- 22 19. Hashem MD, Nallagangula A, Nalamalapu S. et al. Patient outcomes after critical illness: a
23 systematic review of qualitative studies following hospital discharge. Crit Care. 2016 Oct
24 26;20(1):345.
25
- 26 20. Parker A, Sricharoenchai T, Needham DM. Early rehabilitation in the intensive care unit:
27 preventing physical and mental health impairments. Curr Phys Med Rehabil Rep 2013;1:
28 307-14. doi:10.1007/s40141-013-0027-9 pmid:24436844
29
- 30 21. Parker AM, Sricharoenchai T, Raparla S, Schneck KW, Bienvenu OJ, Needham
31 DM. Posttraumatic stress disorder in critical illness survivors: a metaanalysis. Crit Care Med.
32 2015 ;43(5):1121-9. doi: 10.1097/CCM.0000000000000882.
33
- 34 22. Pandharipande PP, Girard TD, Jackson JC, et al. Long-term cognitive impairment after critical
35 illness. N Engl J Med. 2013;369(14):1306–1316. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1301372
36
- 37 23. Kamdar BB, Huang M, Dinglas VD et al. Joblessness and Lost Earnings after Acute Respiratory
38 Distress Syndrome in a 1-Year National Multicenter Study. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2017;
39 15;196(8):1012-1020. doi: 10.1164/rccm.201611-2327OC.
40
- 41 24. Thornton J. Covid-19: the challenge of patient rehabilitation after intensive care BMJ 2020;
42 369 :m1787
43
- 44 25. Cameron JI, Chu LM, Matte A. One-Year Outcomes in Caregivers of Critically Ill Patients. N
45 Engl J Med. 2016 May 12;374(19):1831-41. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1511160.
46
- 47 26. Ho A, Tsai DF. Making good death more accessible: end-of-life care in the intensive care unit.
48 Intensive Care Med 2016; 42, 1258–1260. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-016-4396-2>
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 27. Curtis JR, Kross EK, Stapleton RD. The Importance of Addressing Advance Care Planning and
4 Decisions About Do-Not-Resuscitate Orders During Novel Coronavirus 2019 (COVID-19).
5 JAMA. Published online March 27, 2020. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.4894
6
7
8 28. Lawrie I, Murphy F. COVID-19 and Palliative, End of Life and Bereavement Care in Secondary
9 Care. 22 March 2020. [https://apmonline.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/COVID-19-and-
10 Palliative-End-of-Life-and-Bereavement-Care-22-March-2020.pdf](https://apmonline.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/COVID-19-and-Palliative-End-of-Life-and-Bereavement-Care-22-March-2020.pdf)
11
12 29. Costantini, Massimo & Sleeman, Katherine & Peruselli, Carlo & Higginson, Irene. (2020).
13 Response and role of palliative care during the COVID-19 pandemic: a national telephone
14 survey of hospices in Italy. 10.1101/2020.03.18.20038448.
15
16 30. Sheikh, K. Essential Drug Supplies for Virus Patients Are Running Low. The New York Times. 2
17 April 2020. <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/04/02/health/coronavirus-drug-shortages.html>
18
19 31. Kolata G. Haphazard Rollout of Coronavirus Drug Frustrates Doctors. New York Times 8 May
20 2020. [nytimes.com/2020/05/08/health/coronavirus-remdesivir-hospitals.html](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/05/08/health/coronavirus-remdesivir-hospitals.html)
21
22 32. Meier, Emily A. et al. Defining a Good Death (Successful Dying): Literature Review and a Call
23 for Research and Public Dialogue. The American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry, Volume 24,
24 Issue 4, 261 - 271
25
26 33. Truog, R. Mitchell, C. Daley, GQ. The Toughest Triage — Allocating Ventilators in a
27 Pandemic. NEJM, March 2020,
28 <https://www.nejm.org/doi/pdf/10.1056/NEJMp2005689?articleTools=true>
29
30 34. Guirdy-Grimes, L et al 2020. Disability Rights as a Necessary Framework for Crisis Standards
31 of Care and Future Health Care Delivery. Hastings Centre Report Special Issue (Under Review
32 – will update reference prior to publication.)
33
34 35. Coghlan R. COVID-19: projecting compassion through the barrier of PPE. Insight. 6 April
35 2020. [https://insightplus.mja.com.au/2020/13/covid-19-projecting-compassion-through-
36 the-barrier-of-personal-protective-
37 equipment/?utm_source=InSight%2B&utm_campaign=e820900a94-
38 EMAIL_CAMPAIGN_2020_04_03_05_06&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_7346f35e23-
39 e820900a94-43650729](https://insightplus.mja.com.au/2020/13/covid-19-projecting-compassion-through-the-barrier-of-personal-protective-equipment/?utm_source=InSight%2B&utm_campaign=e820900a94-EMAIL_CAMPAIGN_2020_04_03_05_06&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_7346f35e23-e820900a94-43650729)
40
41 36. Leong IY, Lee AO, Ng TW, The challenge of providing holistic care in a viral epidemic:
42 opportunities for palliative care. Palliat Med. 2004 Jan;18(1):12-8.
43
44 37. Khandelwal N, Kross EK, Engelberg RA, et al. Estimating the effect of palliative care
45 interventions and advance care planning on ICU utilization: a systematic review. Crit Care
46 Med. 2015 May;43(5):1102-11. doi: 10.1097/CCM.0000000000000852.
47
48 38. <https://twitter.com/HananyaNaftali/status/1246799853675520000/photo/1>
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 39. Martieau P. iPads Are Crucial Health Care Tools in Combating Covid-19. 8 April 2020. Wired.
4 <https://www.wired.com/story/ipads-crucial-health-tools-combating-covid-19/>
5
6 40. Trecca EMC, Gelardi M, Cassano M. COVID-19 and hearing difficulties [published online
7 ahead of print, 2020 Apr 19]. Am J Otolaryngol. 2020;102496.
8
9 doi:10.1016/j.amjoto.2020.102496
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Confidential: For Review Only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



Compassionate care during COVID-19. With thanks to the NUS Medicine Covid-19 Chronicles strips.

117x176mm (150 x 150 DPI)