

ONLINE FIRST

Failure to Engage Hospitalized Elderly Patients and Their Families in Advance Care Planning

Daren K. Heyland, MD, MSc, FRCPC; Doris Barwich, MD, CCFP; Deb Pichora, RN, MSc; Peter Dodek, MD, MHSc; Francois Lamontagne, MD, MSc, FRCPC; John J. You, MD, MSc; Carolyn Tayler, RN, BN, MSA, CON(C); Pat Porterfield, RN, MScN; Tasnim Sinuff, MD, PhD, FRCPC; Jessica Simon, MB, ChB, FRCPC; for the ACCEPT (Advance Care Planning Evaluation in Elderly Patients) Study Team and the Canadian Researchers at the End of Life Network (CARENET)

Importance: Advance care planning can improve patient-centered care and potentially reduce intensification of care at the end of life.

Objectives: To inquire about patients' advance care planning activities before hospitalization and preferences for care from the perspectives of patients and family members, as well as to measure real-time concordance between expressed preferences for care and documentation of those preferences in the medical record.

Design: Prospective study.

Setting: Twelve acute care hospitals in Canada.

Participants: Elderly patients who were at high risk of dying in the next 6 months and their family members.

Main Outcome Measures: Responses to an in-person administered questionnaire and concordance of expressed preferences and orders of care documented in the medical record.

Results: Of 513 patients and 366 family members approached, 278 patients (54.2%) and 225 family mem-

bers (61.5%) consented to participate. The mean ages of patients and family members were 80.0 and 60.8 years, respectively. Before hospitalization, most patients (76.3%) had thought about end-of-life (EOL) care, and only 11.9% preferred life-prolonging care; 47.9% of patients had completed an advance care plan, and 73.3% had formally named a surrogate decision maker for health care. Of patients who had discussed their wishes, only 30.3% had done so with the family physician and 55.3% with any member of the health care team. Agreement between patients' expressed preferences for EOL care and documentation in the medical record was 30.2%. Family members' perspectives were similar to those of patients.

Conclusions and Relevance: Many elderly patients at high risk of dying and their family members have expressed preferences for medical treatments at the EOL. However, communication with health care professionals and documentation of these preferences remains inadequate. Efforts to reduce this significant medical error of omission are warranted.

JAMA Intern Med.

Published online April 1, 2013.

doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2013.180

Author Affiliations are listed at the end of this article.

Group Information: A list of the ACCEPT Study Team is provided at the end of this article, and that of the CARENET investigators appears at www.thecarennet.ca.

THERE EXISTS A PROFOUND paradox in modern medicine at the end of life (EOL). Although most elderly patients prefer only comfort measures at the EOL, life-sustaining technologies are increasingly being used in the final stages of life. For example, most persons prefer to be cared for and die at home,¹⁻³ but in the Western world, the dying experience usually occurs in the hospital, and one-fifth of hospital deaths occur in an intensive care unit.⁴⁻⁶ Most older patients value quality of life over the unnecessary prolongation of life through the use of technology.⁷⁻¹⁰ However, life support measures are often provided to patients during the final months of life, even when the patient or

family prefers comfort care.¹¹

Advance care planning (ACP) is an ongoing process of reflection and communication in which a person who has decision-making capacity makes decisions regarding future health and/or personal care in the event that he or she becomes incapable of consenting to or refusing treatment or other care.¹² This process ideally involves discussions with health care providers, family members, and close friends regarding one's values and the health states one would find acceptable or unacceptable and establishing how much leeway the

See Invited Commentary
at end of article

surrogate is given to make future “in the moment” decisions about one’s care at the EOL.¹³ The ACP process may result in a verbal or written advance care plan, which may include instructions about medical treatments wanted or not wanted at the EOL, as well as the values that guide these significant decisions (ie, an advance directive). It may also result in someone being nominated as a surrogate decision maker to make decisions for the person if they become incapable. The process encourages dialogue between patients; their family, friends, and surrogate decision makers; and the health care team.

Although there may be limitations to the validity and clinical utility of documented advance directives,¹⁴ the conversations surrounding the ACP process are essential to providing patient-centered care. Moreover, ACP practices are associated with better quality of life for patients during the terminal phase of life, better outcomes for family caregivers, and less resource-intensive care at the EOL.¹⁵⁻²⁰ Accordingly, many practitioners around the world have begun to embed ACP into health care.²¹ A recent multi-institution evaluation of EOL care from the perspective of patients who had advanced illness showed that there are opportunities to improve timely provision of information about the patient’s condition and discussions with the physician regarding final location of care and use of technology at the EOL.²²

To our knowledge, there has been no rigorous audit or evaluation of ACP from the patient or family perspective using validated questionnaires that assess the frequency of engagement in key ACP activities. Based on the Knowledge-to-Action model for knowledge translation,²³ the next steps for implementing strategies to improve ACP should include identification of gaps between knowledge and current practice in the local context. Thus, the primary purpose of this study was to determine, from the perspectives of acutely ill patients and their family members, the prevalence of ACP and its components before the index hospitalization and the concordance between patients’ expressed preferences and prescribed levels of care as documented in the medical record. In addition, we assessed patients’ and family members’ overall satisfaction with EOL communication and decision making during the last 4 weeks.

METHODS

Between September 1, 2011, and March 15, 2012, we conducted a multicenter, prospective, study in 12 acute care hospitals in Canada. We administered a questionnaire during face-to-face interviews with patients and family members to assess the quantity and quality of ACP. We included a convenience sample of large hospitals in British Columbia, Alberta, Ontario, and Quebec. Hospitalized patients were enrolled if they had advanced pulmonary, cardiac, or liver disease or metastatic cancer (see eAppendix for details; <http://www.jamainternalmed.com>) or if they were aged 80 years or older and admitted to the hospital from the community for an acute medical or surgical condition. If none of these criteria were met, any patient whose death within the next 6 months would not surprise any member of his or her care team was also in-

cluded.²⁴ These criteria define a patient population at high risk of dying during the subsequent 6 months.^{9,11} To provide a representative sample of each site’s performance, we planned to enroll 30 patients and 30 family members per site.

Potentially eligible patients were identified by screening hospital records or by a referral from a member of the patient’s health care team. When research personnel were available, we approached consecutive eligible patients and their family members from participating hospital units for their consent to participate. Patients unable to communicate for cognitive reasons and non-English- and non-French-speaking individuals (assessed subjectively by staff) were excluded, but if family members were available, they were approached independent of the patient. Otherwise, enrolled study patients were asked to identify an adult family member who knew them best (inclusive of partners, significant others, and/or close friends) and who had visited the patient at least once during the current hospitalization. These same criteria applied to family members of eligible but nonparticipating patients. We timed our initial approach to be 48 to 120 hours after admission of the patient to allow for abatement of symptoms present at admission so that the patient and family could participate in an interview.

After obtaining written informed consent, the research assistant conducted separate face-to-face interviews with patients and family members. The details of questionnaire development and validation are described elsewhere.²⁵ Questions addressed their engagement in ACP both before and during the current hospitalization. We assessed the extent to which patients had completed elements of ACP, including thinking about the kinds of life-sustaining treatments they would or would not want, what their current preferences were, whether they had shared these preferences with anyone (and if so, with whom), and whether a physician had discussed their prognosis with them. We also sought to determine whether the patients believed that they had formally documented these wishes in a written advance care plan or directive, whether they had formally documented their choice of surrogate decision maker, and whether they had been asked about these *prior* discussions or written documents on admission to the hospital. We asked family members about their wishes for the patient, not a proxy assessment of the patient’s wishes. To measure the quality of these decisions made near or at the EOL, we used a validated instrument to assess satisfaction with EOL communication and decision making, the Canadian Health Care Evaluation Project (CANHELP) Questionnaire.²⁶ We administered questions related to the domains that were relevant to communication and decision making (relationship with physicians, communication, decision making, and role of family). This questionnaire asked about level of satisfaction with specific aspects of care during the last 4 weeks (regardless of location of care). Demographic characteristics of the patients and family members (detailed in the eAppendix) were determined from direct interview of the patient and/or family or abstraction from the medical record.

Immediately after completion of the interview, the study nurse reviewed the medical record to determine whether there were any prescribed orders to withhold, limit, or withdraw life-sustaining therapies, the presence or absence of a standardized way to identify and store ACP documents, and any other documentation in the medical record of a discussion between health care providers and the patient and family regarding these issues. The documented treatment goals were abstracted in the same way they were elicited from the patient or family. When patients or families preferred “mixed” levels of care, this was considered concordant provided there was a mix of aggressive




Figure 1. Flow diagram of patients and families involved in this study.

and comfort measures in the record.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The overall prevalence of key components of ACP is reported for patients and family members as percentages of respondents and 95% CIs. The confidence limits were calculated by the Wald approach, using standard errors estimated by Taylor series linearization to account for the design effect of having the hospitals as the primary sampling unit. These estimates were calculated by the SURVEYFREQ procedure of SAS software (version 9.3; SAS Institute, Inc).²⁷ Crude agreement between stated preferences and prescribed levels of care was calculated as the percentage of patients whose stated preference matched their documented orders in their record. Patients who had missing preference data or missing documented orders were excluded from this analysis. For the CANHELP questionnaire, response options were as follows: 1, not at all satisfied; 2, not very satisfied; 3, somewhat satisfied; 4, very satisfied; and 5, completely satisfied. The “overall” satisfaction score is the unweighted average for all answered questions. The domain scores are the average of nonmissing questions specific to each domain. All scores were rescaled to range between 0 (worst possible value) and 100 (best possible value).

This study was approved by the research ethics board of each participating institution.

RESULTS

We approached 513 eligible patients and 366 potentially eligible family members during the study period;

278 patients and 225 family members consented, yielding an enrollment rate of 54.2% and 61.5%, respectively (Figure 1). For 95 of the 225 participating family members (42.2%), the corresponding patient participated as well. For 130 family members (57.8%), the patient did not participate, usually because he or she was too ill. On average, interviews occurred 3 days (interquartile range, 2.0-4.0 days) after admission. The mean age of the patients was 80 years, and 37.1% lived alone (Table 1). The mean age of the family members was 60.8 years; most were children of the patient (56.3%) (Table 2). Most patients and family members were white and spoke either English or French. There were significant differences in baseline demographics between participating and nonparticipating patients (Table 1).

Before hospitalization, most of the participating patients and family members (76.3% and 81.7%, respectively) had thought about future care for themselves or their loved one. Of those who had, 88.7% of patients and 88.1% of family members had discussed these wishes with someone (Table 3). Most of these discussions were with another family member. Only 17.0% of patients and 18.2% of family members had discussed their preferences with a specialist physician, and only 30.3% of patients and 22.6% of family members had discussed their preferences with a family physician (Table 3). Of those patients and family members who responded that they had discussed these wishes for care with someone before hospitalization, 55.3% of patients and 62.7% of fam-

Table 1. Patient Demographics^a

Demographic Characteristic	278 Participants	130 Nonparticipants	P Value ^b
Age, mean (SD) [range], y	80.0 (9.3) [55.0-99.0]	84.1 (8.7) [57.0-103.0]	<.001
Sex			
Male	131 (47.1)	51 (39.2)	.12
Female	147 (52.9)	78 (60.0)	
Charlson comorbidity index, mean (SD) [range] ^c	2.3 (2.8) [0.0-12.0]	NA	
Marital status			
Married or living as married	99 (35.6)	60 (46.2)	.02
Widowed	124 (44.6)	57 (43.8)	
Never married	18 (6.5)	1 (0.8)	
Divorced or separated; not remarried	37 (13.3)	12 (9.2)	
Residence in last month (if in the hospital, then month before hospitalization)			
Home (or other private dwelling) alone	103 (37.1)	30 (23.1)	.003
Home (or other private dwelling) with spouse or significant other	89 (32.0)	41 (31.5)	
Home (or other private dwelling) with children or other family members	34 (12.2)	24 (18.5)	
Retirement residence	36 (12.9)	14 (10.8)	
Long-term care or nursing home	14 (5.0)	20 (15.4)	
Rehabilitation facility	1 (0.4)	0	
Other (specify)	1 (0.4)	1 (0.8)	
Location of last residence noted above			
Rural	32 (11.6)	8 (6.2)	.11
Urban	244 (87.8)	120 (92.3)	
Missing	1 (0.4)	2 (1.5)	
Health literacy (REALM-R) score, mean (SD) [range] ^d	7.3 (1.6) [0.0-8.0]	NA	
Education (highest level achieved)			
Elementary school or less	39 (14.0)	33 (25.4)	.006
Some high school	70 (25.2)	28 (21.5)	
High school graduate	58 (20.9)	30 (23.1)	
Some college (including CEGEP) or trade school	31 (11.2)	6 (4.6)	
College diploma (including DEC) or trade school	27 (9.7)	11 (8.5)	
Some university	12 (4.3)	4 (3.1)	
University degree	24 (8.6)	11 (8.5)	
Postgraduate degree	17 (6.1)	3 (2.3)	
Declined to respond	0	2 (1.5)	
Identification with formal religious group or practice			
None	82 (29.5)	35 (26.9)	.09
Protestant (Anglican, Baptist, or United Methodist)	105 (37.8)	34 (26.2)	
Catholic	63 (22.7)	37 (28.5)	
Jewish	4 (1.4)	2 (1.5)	
Muslim	1 (0.4)	1 (0.8)	
Sikh	1 (0.4)	2 (1.5)	
Other (specify)	22 (7.9)	19 (14.6)	
Race and language			
White	263 (94.6)	103 (79.2)	<.001
White; speaking a language other than English or French on a daily basis	48 (17.3)	38 (29.2)	.006
Nonwhite; speaking a language other than English or French on a daily basis	9/278 (3.2)	24/130 (18.5)	<.001
Patient's current fitness or frailty			
Very fit (category 1)	16 (5.8)	3 (2.3)	<.001
Well (category 2)	33 (11.9)	5 (3.8)	
Managing well (category 3)	54 (19.4)	16 (12.3)	
Vulnerable (category 4)	79 (28.4)	27 (20.8)	
Mildly frail (category 5)	52 (18.7)	26 (20.0)	
Moderately frail (category 6)	35 (12.6)	29 (22.3)	
Severely frail (category 7)	7 (2.5)	18 (13.8)	
Very severely frail (category 8)	2 (0.7)	6 (4.6)	
Inclusion criteria			
Age ≥55 y with chronic obstructive lung disease, congestive heart failure, cirrhosis, cancer, and/or end-stage dementia	113 (40.6)	33 (25.4)	.003
Age ≥80 y and admitted to hospital from community for acute medical or surgical condition	165 (59.4)	97 (74.6)	
Care team assessment ^e	0	0	

(continued)

Table 1. Patient Demographics^a (continued)

Demographic Characteristic	278 Participants	130 Nonparticipants	P Value ^b
Diagnosis			
Chronic obstructive lung disease	39 (14.0)	5 (3.8)	.002
Congestive heart failure	27 (9.7)	10 (7.7)	.51
Cirrhosis	3 (1.1)	0	.24
Cancer	54 (19.4)	18 (13.8)	.17
End-stage dementia	0	3 (2.3)	.01
Hospital length of stay, mean (SD) [range], d	14.5 (28.0) [2.0-377.0]	18.5 (39.0) [2.0-386.0]	.35
Death in hospital	9 (3.2)	14 (10.8)	.002

Abbreviations: CEGEP, Collège d'enseignement général et professionnel; DEC, diplôme d'études collégiales; NA, not applicable; REALM-R, rapid estimate of adult literacy in medicine—revised.

^aData are given as number (percentage) of patients unless otherwise indicated. Values may not sum to total owing to missing data.

^bBoldface P values indicate significant differences ($P < .05$).

^cHigher scores reflect more comorbid conditions.

^dThose with a REALM-R score of ≤ 6 (of a total of 8) should be considered at risk for poor health literacy (see eAppendix).

^eAny patient whose death within the next 6 months would not surprise any member of his or her care team was also included.

ily members said that they had discussed them with at least 1 member of the health care team that was caring for the patient during the index hospitalization (physician, nurse, social worker, or spiritual care worker). Before hospitalization, only 20.1% of patients and 33.2% of family members reported participating in a discussion about the patient's prognosis with a physician.

Of participating patients, 47.9% reported having completed a written advance care plan, and 73.3% had been through a formally documented process of naming a surrogate decision maker (Table 3). When family members were asked, 52.2% reported the patient had an advance care plan, and 72.1% reported that the patient had nominated a surrogate decision maker. On admission to the hospital, only 24.8% of patients and 31.7% of family members reported that they had been asked about these prior discussions or written documents.

Most patients preferred comfort care (30.6%) or a mix of comfort and full medical care that does not include resuscitation (30.6%), whereas only 11.9% preferred life-prolonging medical care, including resuscitation, in the event of a deterioration in their health (Table 3). Similarly, family members more commonly preferred comfort care for the patient (34.8%) or a mix of comfort and full medical care that does not include resuscitation (27.7%); only 14.7% preferred aggressive medical care, including resuscitation (Table 3).

Of the 276 patients who had expressed a preference for care, 77 (27.9%) did not have a written order in the record stating the goal of care. Of these, only 12 (15.6%) preferred aggressive medical management, including resuscitation. Of the 224 family members who had expressed a preference of care for the patient, 71 patients (31.7%) did not have a written order in the record stating the goal of care. Of these, 12 (16.9%) preferred aggressive management, including resuscitation. For the 199 patients and 153 family members who had expressed a preference for care and for whom a written goals-of-care order was present in the patient's record, crude agreement between patients' and family members' expressed preferences and the documented goals-of-care order in the medical record was 30.2% and 31.4%, respectively

(see eTables 1 and 2). The area of greatest discordance was that 28.1% of patients (56 of 199) preferred comfort measures only, but this preference was documented in only 4.5% (9 of 199) of stated goals (Figure 2A). Among family members, 34.6% (53 of 153) preferred that the patient receive comfort measures only, but this was documented in only 17.0% (26 of 153) (Figure 2B).

The mean (SD) satisfaction score from the CANHELP surveys for patients was 69.1 (17.0) (eFigure 1) and for family members it was 61.0 (20.6) (eFigure 2). The lowest levels of satisfaction for patients related to discussion about future location of EOL care and what to expect at the end stages of illness. For family members, the lowest levels of satisfaction related to discussions about the future location of EOL care and the use of life-sustaining technologies.

COMMENT

In this multicenter audit of ACP practices in 12 hospitals in Canada, we used a validated questionnaire to interview patients and families shortly after hospital admission to determine their engagement in key ACP process steps and preferences for EOL care. We then determined whether their preferences were accurately documented in the medical record. We found that the majority of patients and family members had considered and discussed the use or nonuse of life-sustaining technologies near the EOL and could clearly express their preferences for EOL care. However, there was very little effective communication about ACP between the patient or family and members of the health care team before hospitalization. Moreover, less than one-third of patients and families reported that they had been asked about their advance care plans on admission to the hospital. Of patients and families who reported a preference for the use of life-sustaining treatments, nearly 30% did not have any documentation of a preference in the medical record. When preferences were documented, in more than two-thirds of cases the documented preferences were discordant with the patient's or family's expressed prefer-

Table 2. Family Member Demographics^a

Demographic Characteristic	Findings in 225 Family Members
Age, mean (SD) [range], y	60.8 (13.7) [20.0-92.0]
Sex	
Male	54 (24.1)
Female	170 (75.9)
Relationship to patient	
Spouse or partner	77 (34.4)
Parent	3 (1.3)
Parent-in-law	3 (1.3)
Daughter or son	126 (56.3)
Sister or brother	2 (0.9)
Other (specify)	13 (5.8)
Education (highest level achieved)	
Elementary school or less	7 (3.1)
Some high school	26 (11.6)
High school graduate	41 (18.3)
Some college (including CEGEP) or trade school	29 (12.9)
College diploma (including DEC) or trade school	41 (18.3)
Some university	12 (5.4)
University degree	47 (21.0)
Postgraduate degree	19 (8.5)
Declined to respond	2 (0.9)
Health Literacy (REALM-R) score, mean (SD) [range] ^b	7.8 (0.9) [1.0-8.0]
Identification with formal religious group or practice	
None	68 (30.4)
Protestant (Anglican, Baptist, United Methodist)	60 (26.8)
Catholic	65 (29.0)
Jewish	4 (1.8)
Muslim	1 (0.4)
Sikh	2 (0.9)
Other (specify)	22 (9.8)
Declined to respond	2 (0.9)
Respondent is the surrogate decision maker (n = 224)	191 (85.3)
Race and language	
White (n = 221)	191 (86.4)
White; speaking a language other than English or French on a daily basis (n = 221)	47 (21.3)
Nonwhite; speaking a language other than English or French on a daily basis (n = 221)	21 (9.5)
Patient is a study participant (n = 224)	95 (42.4)
Reason for patient nonparticipation ^c	
Too tired, sick, or weak	64 (44.4)
Emotionally overwhelmed or stressed	10 (6.9)
Hearing or speech problems	13 (9.0)
Literacy, reading, or language difficulties	28 (19.4)
Refusal to participate	10 (6.9)
Cognitive impairment	19 (13.2)

Abbreviations: CEGEP, Collège d'enseignement général et professionnel; DEC, diplôme d'études collégiales; REALM-R, rapid estimate of adult literacy in medicine—revised.

^aData are given as number (percentage) of family members unless otherwise indicated. Values may not sum to total owing to missing data.

^bThose with a REALM-R score of ≤ 6 (of a total of 8) should be considered at risk for poor health literacy (see eAppendix).

^cn=130 patients, but there can be more than 1 response for a given patient, or a patient can have more than 1 reason to be excluded.

ences. This level of discordance is remarkable given that documentation of preferences and the reports of patients and families occurred at nearly the same time.

Our results show high levels of patient and family engagement in core ACP activities, consistent with findings of other published studies.²⁸ The situation is markedly improved from 20 years ago when a survey of outpatients attending a general medical clinic found that very few patients had thought about EOL treatment preferences or communicated them to even a family member, and none had written down their plans.²⁹ However, there is still room for improvement. Barriers to engaging in ACP are emerging from qualitative studies and in-

clude personal barriers to discussing ACP, such as a fear of “tempting fate,” a perception that the health care professional did not have time for the conversation, and fear of upsetting the patient.³⁰⁻³³ Reducing these barriers and encouraging patients and their family members to reflect on their preferences, communicate them, and record them in appropriate documents should be a high priority for health care systems. Resources to assist with this effort can be found on several websites.³⁴⁻³⁸

Our results show that even when patients and families have thought about and expressed preferences for EOL care before hospitalization, members of the health care team that is caring for the patient during the index hos-

Table 3. Prevalence of Key Components of Advance Care Planning

Questions About Advanced Care Planning Before Hospitalization	% (95% CI) ^a	
	278 Patients	224 Family Members
Have you ever considered or thought about what kinds of life-sustaining treatments you would want, or not want, for yourself (or for your loved one) in the event your (their) physical health deteriorated?	76.3 (68.1-84.4)	81.7 (76.7-86.6)
As it relates to your overall plan of care, if the situation were to arise in which there was a deterioration of your (or your loved one's) health, which option, at this point in time, would you prefer for your/their care?		
Unsure	7.9 (2.9-12.9)	7.6 (2.5-12.7)
Aggressive use of heroic measures and artificial life-sustaining treatments, including CPR, to keep me/my loved one alive at all costs	11.9 (5.2-18.5)	14.7 (8.1-21.4)
Full medical care, but in the event my/my loved one's heart or breathing stops, no CPR	18.3 (13.5-23.2)	15.2 (9.9-20.5)
Physicians will be focused on my/my loved one's comfort by alleviating suffering and not on keeping me/my loved one alive by artificial means or heroic measures, such as trying to prolong my/my loved one's life with CPR and other life-sustaining technologies	30.6 (22.3-38.8)	34.8 (29.0-40.6)
A mix of above (eg, try to fix problems but if not getting better, switch to focusing only on my/my loved one's comfort, even if it hastens death)	30.6 (19.4-41.8)	27.7 (20.3-35.0)
Declined to respond	0.7 (0.0-2.2)	...
If yes, ^b did you discuss these wishes with anyone? ^c	88.7 (83.6-93.8)	88.1 (81.5-94.4)
Physician		
Family	30.3 (26.1-34.5)	22.6 (13.5-31.7)
Specialist	17.0 (6.7-27.3)	18.2 (9.7-26.8)
Other	17.0 (3.0-31.0)	23.3 (8.8-37.7)
Nurse	8.0 (1.8-14.1)	10.1 (5.2-14.9)
Social worker	5.3 (0.7-9.9)	5.7 (1.5-9.8)
Spiritual care provider	6.4 (0.8-12.0)	1.9 (0.0-4.9)
Family member(s)	92.0 (86.9-97.1)	83.0 (73.1-93.0)
Surrogate decision maker	56.4 (33.3-79.5)	...
Other family	...	74.2 (65.9-82.5)
Lawyer	29.8 (13.5-46.1)	27.0 (11.6-42.4)
Other	2.1 (0.0-4.9)	6.9 (0.4-13.4)
Prior to hospitalization, did the physician ever talk to you about a poor prognosis or indicated in some way that you/your loved one had a limited time left to live?	20.1 (13.4-26.9)	33.2 (24.1-42.0)
Do you/does your loved one have an advance directive or living will or some other written document describing the medical treatments you/they would want (or not want) in the event you/they are unable to communicate for yourself/themselves as a result of a life-threatening health problem?	47.9 (35.3-60.6)	52.2 (39.6-64.7)
Have you/your loved one formally designated someone, in writing, whom you/they trust to represent your/their wishes concerning medical treatment decisions in the event you/they are not able to do so?	73.3 (69.4-77.1)	72.1 (62.1-82.0)
On admission to the hospital, were you/your loved one asked whether you/they had prior discussions or written documents about the use of life-sustaining treatments?	24.8 (16.9-32.7)	31.7 (19.6-43.8)

Abbreviation: CPR, cardiopulmonary resuscitation.

^aWhere not otherwise specified, percentages representing proportion responding yes. Values may not sum to total owing to missing data.

^bOf the 212 patients and 183 family members who responded yes to the prior question.

^cOf the 188 patients and 159 family members who responded to this question.

pitalization are not discussing them with the patient or family members and these preferences are not documented in the medical record. Most commonly, patients and family members preferred less aggressive care than what was prescribed. In most settings, this may partially be due to the policy that "for resuscitation" or full code is the default position so that, in the absence of conversations early in the hospital stay, patients are prescribed treatments incongruent with their preferences. Aggressive treatment at the EOL has been shown to result in poorer quality of life for patients and family members, poorer quality of death, negative long-term consequences for the family, and wasted health care

resources.^{17,20} Efforts to provide more patient-centered EOL care that is consistent with patients' preferences need urgent attention. Asking patients and family members about existing documents or past conversations seems like a simple starting point. Finally, documentation forms and strategies, such as Physician Orders for Life-Sustaining Treatment (or similar), may help improve the clarity of documented goals of care³⁹ and may facilitate the communication of preferences across time and locations of care.

Despite the presence of advance directive legislation in most provinces in Canada,⁴⁰ our findings suggest that there are large gaps in communication, decision mak-




Figure 2. Relationship between expressed preferences for use (or nonuse) of life-sustaining treatments and documented goals of care in the medical record. A, Patients' preferences for care and documented goals of care. Two patients with missing preference data and 77 with missing documentation were excluded; 199 of 278 enrolled patients (71.6%) were included in the analysis. The preferences were described and categorized as follows: (1) aggressive use of heroic measures and artificial life-sustaining treatments, including CPR (cardiopulmonary resuscitation), to keep me alive at all costs; (2) full medical care, but in the event my heart or breathing stops, no CPR; (3) physicians will be focused on my comfort by alleviating suffering and not on keeping me alive by artificial means or heroic measures, such as trying to prolong my life with CPR and other life-sustaining technologies; (4) a mix of the above options (eg, try to fix problems, but if I am not getting better, switch to focusing only on my comfort, even if it hastens death); (5) unsure; and (6) other. B, Family members' preferences for patient care and documented goals of care, with categories as listed for panel A. One family member with missing data and 71 with missing documentation were excluded; 153 of 225 enrolled family members (68.0%) were included in this analysis.

ing, and documentation if our goal is truly to achieve patient-centered care. Patients' ratings of satisfaction with EOL care offer some suggestions for prioritizing our quality improvement efforts. Patients and families were least satisfied with the discussions they had with physicians and other members of the health care team regarding what to expect at the EOL, the location of terminal care, and the use of life-sustaining measures.

Although communication with physicians in the hospital about patient or family preferences occurred in only one-third of cases, communication with other health care professionals was strikingly low; less than 10% of patients and family members communicated their preferences for use of life-sustaining measures to nurses, social workers, and spiritual care workers (Table 3). Given that the largest unmet needs of this population are emotional, psychological, spiritual, and informational,²¹ expanding the time, availability, and engagement of allied health care professionals may be more effective and efficient than relying on conventional physician-led initiatives. Others have shown that trained nonphysician facilitators in collaboration with treating physicians can help significantly in engaging patients and families in ACP.³⁸ Moving these conversations from the acute care sector to community settings or primary care also seems sensible. However, these conversations do not commonly occur with family physicians either (Table 3). If systems are not put in place to ensure the communication of previously stated preferences across the health care system, increasing primary care sector involvement in ACP may not be effective. Understanding the perspectives of health care professionals on ACP is clearly important in closing the communication gaps and is the subject of another multicenter study by our group (the DECIDE Study).⁴¹

To our knowledge, our study is the first large-scale evaluation of ACP from a patient and family perspective in the acute care setting. Previously published audits of ACP practice have relied on abstractions from medical record.^{9,42} The strengths of this study include the use of validated instruments to elicit patient and family member perspectives, including satisfaction with EOL care in a large, clinically heterogeneous, multicenter sample and real-time, prospective measurement of concordance between patient preferences and prescriptions about level of care at the EOL, which increases the value and generalizability of our findings. The limitation of this work is that our sample is largely a white, English-speaking population sampled at a single time point in the hospital. We do not address communications, clarifications of goals of care, and actual care that may have been provided later in the hospital stay. Recruiting patients 48 to 120 hours after hospital admission may have resulted in a select sample by excluding patients who had died or been discharged before that time period. Furthermore, our data may not be generalizable to a broader community-dwelling elderly patient population because we sampled a select population of persons who were admitted to the hospital.

CONCLUSIONS

Our study of patients at high risk for dying and their family members has identified several gaps in communication and documentation in the care of these sick, elderly patients. For the most part, these patients and their family members have considered their wishes for medical treatments at the EOL, but there has been very little communication with health care professionals (either be-

fore or during hospitalization) and inadequate documentation of these wishes. As a consequence, there is a disconnect between patients' and family members' wishes for less aggressive medical management at the EOL and documentation in the patient record. More concerted efforts from all health care professionals and decision makers are warranted to narrow these gaps and improve EOL care. Investing in ACP is perhaps the single most important thing we can do as a society and as stewards of our health care system to improve the quality of care from the perspectives of patients and family members and to reduce health care costs at the EOL.

Accepted for Publication: January 9, 2013.

Published Online: April 1, 2013. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2013.180

Author Affiliations: Clinical Evaluation Research Unit, Department of Medicine, Kingston General Hospital (Dr Heyland and Ms Pichora), and Department of Community Health and Epidemiology, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario (Dr Heyland); Division of Palliative Care, Department of Family Practice, and Vancouver Coastal Health and School of Nursing, University of British Columbia, Vancouver (Ms Porterfield); Fraser Health Authority, Surrey, British Columbia (Dr Barwich and Ms Tayler); Center for Health Evaluation and Outcome Sciences and Division of Critical Care Medicine, St Paul's Hospital and University of British Columbia, Vancouver (Dr Dodek); Centre de Recherche Clinique Étienne-Le Bel, Université de Sherbrooke, Sherbrooke, Québec (Dr Lamontagne); Departments of Medicine and Clinical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario (Dr You); Department of Critical Care Medicine, Sunnybrook Hospital and Sunnybrook Research Institute, and Interdepartmental Division of Critical Care Medicine, Department of Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario (Dr Sinuff); and Division of Palliative Medicine, Departments of Oncology and Internal Medicine, University of Calgary, Alberta (Dr Simon).

Correspondence: Daren K. Heyland, MD, MSc, FRCPC, Clinical Evaluation Research Unit, Department of Medicine, Kingston General Hospital, Angada 4, Kingston, Ontario K7L 2V7, Canada (dkh2@queensu.ca).

Author Contributions: *Study concept and design:* Heyland, Barwich, Pichora, Dodek, Lamontagne, Tayler, Porterfield, Sinuff, and Simon. *Acquisition of data:* Heyland, Barwich, Pichora, Dodek, Lamontagne, You, Tayler, Porterfield, and Simon. *Analysis and interpretation of data:* Heyland, Barwich, Dodek, Lamontagne, and You. *Drafting of the manuscript:* Heyland, Pichora, Lamontagne, Tayler, Sinuff, and Simon. *Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content:* Heyland, Barwich, Pichora, Dodek, Lamontagne, You, Porterfield, Sinuff, and Simon. *Statistical analysis:* Heyland. *Obtained funding:* Heyland, Barwich, Lamontagne, You, Porterfield, Sinuff, and Simon. *Administrative, technical, and material support:* Heyland, Barwich, Pichora, Dodek, Tayler, and Porterfield. *Study supervision:* Heyland, Pichora, Dodek, Lamontagne, Tayler, and Porterfield.

ACCEPT Study Team: We thank the research coordinators at the following sites for their support of this study: Deb Pichora (Kingston General Hospital); Carol Mantle

(Hamilton General Hospital, Hamilton, Ontario); Pat Thompson (Royal Alexandra Hospital, Edmonton, Alberta); Bev Berg, Tracy Lynn Wityk Martin, Gail Gonyea, Sharon Holowachuk, Sue McAleenan, and Linda Lutz (Calgary Zone Hospitals, Alberta Health Services in Calgary); Nicole Wikjord, Kathy Warren, and Mary Jefford (Vancouver General Hospital, Vancouver, British Columbia); Janene Spring (Burnaby and Royal Columbian Hospitals, Burnaby and New Westminister, British Columbia, respectively); Betty Jean Ashley, Wallace Robinson, Helen Dunham, and Odette Bodman (St Paul's Hospital, Vancouver); Chantal Langevin and Dany Simard (Sherbrooke, Québec); and Sharon Nam Dobbs (University Health Network Hospitals, Toronto, Ontario). In addition, we are grateful to the support from staff at the Clinical Evaluation Research Unit at the Kingston General Hospital for their support in coordinating the study (Janet Overvelde) and analyzing the results (Xuran Jiang and Andrew Day). Finally, we acknowledge the contributions of the other members of the ACCEPT study team to the development of our study protocol or support with data collection: Bert Enns, Bev Berg, Tracy Lynn Wityk Martin, Jim Kustogiannis, James Downar, Roy Ilan, Nora Cummins, and Ana Johnson.

Conflict of Interest Disclosures: None reported.

Funding/Support: This study was supported by funding from the Canadian Institutes of Health Research, the Michael Smith Health Services Research Foundation in British Columbia, Alberta Innovates, and the Alternate Funding Plan Innovation Fund in Ontario.

Online-Only Material: The eAppendix, eTables, and eFigures are available at <http://www.archinternmed.com>.

REFERENCES

1. Charlton RC; Department of General Practice, Medical School, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand. Attitudes towards care of the dying: a questionnaire survey of general practice attenders. *Fam Pract*. 1991;8(4):356-359.
2. Townsend J, Frank AO, Fermon D, et al. Terminal cancer care and patients' preference for place of death: a prospective study. *BMJ*. 1990;301(6749):415-417.
3. Stajduhar KI, Allan DE, Cohen SR, Heyland DK. Preferences for location of death of seriously ill hospitalized patients: perspectives from Canadian patients and their family caregivers. *Palliat Med*. 2008;22(1):85-88.
4. Heyland DK, Lavery JV, Tranmer JE, Shortt SE, Taylor SJ. Dying in Canada: is it an institutionalized, technologically supported experience? *J Palliat Care*. 2000;16(suppl):S10-S16.
5. Cook D, Rocker G, Marshall J, et al; Level of Care Study Investigators and the Canadian Critical Care Trials Group. Withdrawal of mechanical ventilation in anticipation of death in the intensive care unit. *N Engl J Med*. 2003;349(12):1123-1132.
6. Gruneir A, Mor V, Weitzen S, Truchil R, Teno J, Roy J. Where people die: a multilevel approach to understanding influences on site of death in America. *Med Care Res Rev*. 2007;64(4):351-378.
7. Heyland DK, Dodek P, Rocker G, et al; Canadian Researchers at the End of Life Network (CARENET). What matters most in end-of-life care: perceptions of seriously ill patients and their family members. *CMAJ*. 2006;174(5):627-633.
8. Lloyd CB, Nietert PJ, Silvestri GA. Intensive care decision making in the seriously ill and elderly. *Crit Care Med*. 2004;32(3):649-654.
9. Lynn J, Teno JM, Phillips RS, et al. Perceptions by family members of the dying experience of older and seriously ill patients. *Ann Intern Med*. 1997;126(2):97-106.
10. Somogyi-Zalud E, Zhong Z, Hamel MB, Lynn J. The use of life-sustaining treatments in hospitalized persons aged 80 and older. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2002;50(5):930-934.
11. The SUPPORT Principal Investigators. A controlled trial to improve care for seriously ill hospitalized patients: the Study to Understand Prognoses and Prefer-

- ences for Outcomes and Risks of Treatments (SUPPORT). *JAMA*. 1995;274(20):1591-1598.
12. Advance care planning in Canada. A national framework. http://akeresourcecentre.org/files/ACP/ACP_National%20Framework_Full.pdf. Accessed July 31, 2012.
 13. Sudore RL, Fried TR. Redefining the "planning" in advance care planning: preparing for end-of-life decision making. *Ann Intern Med*. 2010;153(4):256-261.
 14. Winter L, Parks SM, Diamond JJ. Ask a different question, get a different answer: why living wills are poor guides to care preferences at the end of life. *J Palliat Med*. 2010;13(5):567-572.
 15. Harle I, Johnston J, Mackay J, Mayer C, Russell S, Zwaal C. Advance care planning with cancer patients: evidentiary base and guideline recommendations. Evidence-Based Series 19-1. Toronto: Program in Evidence-Based Care: A Cancer Care Ontario Program. 2008. <http://www.cancercare.on.ca/toolbox/qualityguidelines/clin-program/jointcollab-ebs/>. Accessed February 6, 2013.
 16. Silveira MJ, Kim SY, Langa KM. Advance directives and outcomes of surrogate decision making before death. *N Engl J Med*. 2010;362(13):1211-1218.
 17. Wright AA, Zhang B, Ray A, et al. Associations between end-of-life discussions, patient mental health, medical care near death, and caregiver bereavement adjustment. *JAMA*. 2008;300(14):1665-1673.
 18. Teno JM, Mitchell SL, Gozalo PL, et al. Hospital characteristics associated with feeding tube placement in nursing home residents with advanced cognitive impairment. *JAMA*. 2010;303(6):544-550.
 19. Detering KM, Hancock AD, Reade MC, Silvester W. The impact of advance care planning on end of life care in elderly patients: randomised controlled trial [published online March 23, 2010]. *BMJ*. 2010;340:c1345. doi:10.1136/bmj.c1345.
 20. Zhang B, Wright AA, Huskamp HA, et al. Health care costs in the last week of life: associations with end-of-life conversations. *Arch Intern Med*. 2009;169(5):480-488.
 21. Respecting patient choices. <http://www.respectingpatientchoices.org.au/>. Accessed February 6, 2013.
 22. Heyland DK, Cook DJ, Rocker GM, et al; Canadian Researchers at the End of Life Network (CARENET). Defining priorities for improving end-of-life care in Canada. *CMAJ*. 2010;182(16):E747-E752.
 23. Graham ID, Logan J, Harrison MB, et al. Lost in knowledge translation: time for a map? *J Contin Educ Health Prof*. 2006;26(1):13-24.
 24. Pattison M, Romer AL. Improving Care Through the End of Life: launching a primary care clinic-based program. *J Palliat Med*. 2001;4(2):249-254.
 25. Heyland DK, Pichora D, Dodek P, et al. The development and validation of a questionnaire to audit advance care planning. *J Palliat Care Med*. 2012;2:119. doi:10.4172/2165-7386.1000119.
 26. Heyland DK, Cook DJ, Rocker GM, et al; Canadian Researchers at the End of Life Network. The development and validation of a novel questionnaire to measure patient and family satisfaction with end-of-life care: the Canadian Health Care Evaluation Project (CANHELP) Questionnaire. *Palliat Med*. 2010;24(7):682-695.
 27. SAS Institute, Inc. *SAS/STAT 9.3 User's Guide*. Cary, NC: SAS Institute, Inc; 2011.
 28. Fried TR, Redding CA, Robbins ML, Paiva A, O'Leary JR, Iannone L. Stages of change for the component behaviors of advance care planning. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2010;58(12):2329-2336.
 29. Sam M, Singer PA. Canadian outpatients and advance directives: poor knowledge and little experience but positive attitudes. *CMAJ*. 1993;148(9):1497-1502.
 30. Slort W, Schweitzer BPM, Blankenstein AH, et al. Perceived barriers and facilitators for general practitioner-patient communication in palliative care: a systematic review. *Palliat Med*. 2011;25(6):613-629.
 31. Black K, Fauske J. Exploring influences on community-based case managers' advance care planning practices: facilitators or barriers? *Home Health Care Serv Q*. 2007;26(2):41-58.
 32. Glass AP, Nahapetyan L. Discussions by elders and adult children about end-of-life preparation and preferences. *Prev Chronic Dis*. 2008;5(1):A08.
 33. Simon J, Murray A, Raffin S. Facilitated advance care planning: what is the patient experience? *J Palliat Care*. 2008;24(4):256-264.
 34. Stewart F, Goddard C, Schiff R, Hall S. Advanced care planning in care homes for older people: a qualitative study of the views of care staff and families. *Age Ageing*. 2011;40(3):330-335.
 35. Advance care planning. <http://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/topic.page?id=E7A581A9BC0A467E916CFC5AD2D3B1E8>. Accessed February 6, 2013.
 36. Speak up campaign. www.advancecareplanning.ca. Accessed August 1, 2012.
 37. Advance Care Planning and End of Life Society. www.acpelsociety.com. Accessed August 1, 2012.
 38. Hammes BJ, Rooney BL, Gundrum JD. A comparative, retrospective, observational study of the prevalence, availability, and specificity of advance care plans in a county that implemented an advance care planning microsystem. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2010;58(7):1249-1255.
 39. Hickman SE, Nelson CA, Perrin NA, Moss AH, Hammes BJ, Tolle SW. A comparison of methods to communicate treatment preferences in nursing facilities: traditional practices versus the physician orders for life-sustaining treatment program. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2010;58(7):1241-1248.
 40. Zuckerberg J. End-of-life decisions: a view from Ontario and beyond. *Eur J Health Law*. 2009;16(2):139-164.
 41. The DECIDE Study. http://www.thecarenet.ca/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&layout=blog&id=47&Itemid=74. Accessed February 6, 2013.
 42. The Conversation Project <http://theconversationproject.org>. Accessed August 29, 2012.