

"This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: [Nursing in critical care, 2017, 22 (6), pp. 348 - 354]. which has been published in final form at [https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/nicc.12315]. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with [Wiley Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving](#)."



Repeated sleep quality assessment and use of sleep promoting interventions in ICU

Journal:	<i>Nursing in Critical Care</i>
Manuscript ID	NCR-2017-0833.R1
Manuscript Type:	Audit
Keywords:	Critical Care Nursing, Adult Intensive Care

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

View Only

1
2 ABSTRACT
3

4
5 Aims and objectives
6

7
8 To describe sleep quality using repeated subjective assessment and the on-going use of sleep
9 promoting interventions in intensive care.
10
11

12
13
14 Background
15

16
17 It is well known that the critically ill experience sleep disruption while in the intensive care unit
18 (ICU). Both the measurement and promotion of sleep is challenging in the complex environment of
19 ICU. Repeated subjective assessment of patients' sleep in the ICU and use of sleep promoting
20 interventions has not been widely reported.
21
22
23
24
25
26

27
28 Design
29

30
31 An observational study was conducted in a 58-bed adult ICU.
32
33

34
35 Methods
36

37
38 Sleep quality was assessed using the Richards-Campbell Sleep Questionnaire (RCSQ) each morning.
39 ICU audit sleep promoting intervention data were compared to data obtained prior to the
40 implementation of a sleep guideline. Patients answered open-ended questions about the
41 facilitators and deterrents of their sleep in ICU. Descriptive statistics were performed. Audit data
42 from the ICU Quality Database were examined. An independent sample t-test was performed to
43 compare self-reported sleep quality (RCSQ Total scores) from patients cared for prior to the time
44 the guideline was implemented and after the guideline was implemented. Content analysis was
45 used to explore responses to the open-ended questions on facilitators and deterrents of sleep.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56
57 Results
58
59
60

1
2 The sample (n = 50) was predominately male (76%) with a mean age: 62.6±16.9 years. Sleep
3
4 quality was assessed on 2 days or more for 21 patients. The majority of patients (98%) received
5
6 sleep promoting interventions. Sleep quality had not improved significantly since the guideline
7
8 was first implemented. The mean RCSQ score was 47.9±24.1 mm. The main sleep deterrents were
9
10 discomfort and noise. Frequently cited facilitators were nothing (i.e. nothing helped) and
11
12 analgesia.
13
14
15
16

17 Conclusions

18
19
20 The RCSQ was used on repeated occasions and sleep promoting interventions were used
21
22 extensively. There was no evidence of improvement in sleep quality since the implementation of a
23
24 sleep guideline.
25
26
27

28 Relevance to clinical practice

29
30
31 The use of the RCSQ for the subjective self-assessment of sleep quality in ICU patients and the
32
33 implementation of simple promoting interventions by ICU clinicians is both feasible and may be
34
35 the most practical way to assess sleep in the ICU context.
36
37
38

39 Key words: critical illness; critical care nursing; sleep
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

INTRODUCTION

Patients treated in the intensive care unit (ICU) are critically ill. The busy environment and the effects of critical illness are not conducive to sleep. (Aitken et al., 2016, Salandin et al., 2011, Li et al., 2011). Research has highlighted that patients treated in the ICU report poor sleep quality (Beecroft et al., 2008, Freedman et al., 2001). Investigations using polysomnography (PSG) have revealed sleep structure significantly different from that of healthy adults and typically described as disrupted (Watson et al., 2013, Elliott et al., 2013, Drouot et al., 2012). Sleep assessment in this population is challenging.

BACKGROUND

The function of sleep has yet to be completely elucidated; although it is acknowledged for its important role in wellbeing and restoration (Siegel, 2005). The difference in sleep structure and sleep stage progression displayed by ICU patients in comparison with healthy adults, indicates that patients may not experience the complete restorative benefits of sleep. Arguably critically ill patients are particularly in need of this. Many of the specific factors that disrupt sleep for ICU patients are not well understood. Factors specific to the ICU environment, such as non-circadian light and high sound levels and discomfort related to invasive monitoring have been reported as disruptive by patients (Aitken et al., 2016, Freedman et al., 2001). The role of factors related to the underlying illness such as systemic inflammatory response and treatment such as mechanical ventilation on sleep quality is less clear (Drouot and Quentin, 2016, Rittayamai et al., 2016, Pisani et al., 2015).

Sleep interventional research has focused either on modulation of one postulated sleep disruptive factor, such as mechanical ventilation mode (Rittayamai et al., 2016, Roussos et al., 2010) or on multiple factors, such as a sleep guideline or 'quiet time protocol' (Elliott and McKinley, 2014, Kamdar et al., 2013a). Sleep improvement has been reported in some investigations (Patel et al.,

2014, Li et al., 2011), while no significant improvements in sleep have been identified in others (Kamdar et al., 2013a), leading to difficulty generalising benefits.

When used as methods to assess sleep in ICU, nurse observation and PSG have significant limitations. Nurse observation has yet to be established as reliable (Beecroft et al., 2008, Ritmala-Castren et al., 2016) while PSG is intrusive, technically difficult and interpretation is uncertain using conventional scoring (Watson et al., 2013, Drouot et al., 2012). Therefore patient self-report, when possible, is recognised as a practical alternative for the assessment of sleep quality (Storti et al., 2015, Ritmala-Castren et al., 2013). The Richards-Campbell Sleep Questionnaire (RCSQ)(Richards et al., 2000) is a reliable self-report instrument that has evidence of validity against PSG.

Aims and objectives of the study

The aims of this study were to (i) assess the feasibility of the on-going repeated use of the RCSQ to assess ICU patients' sleep quality, (ii) contrast the use of sleep promoting strategies in a locally developed clinical practice guideline to usage previously reported [removed for blind peer review], (iii) assess any improvement in self-reported sleep quality since its implementation and outline self-reported sleep facilitators and deterrents.

DESIGN AND METHODS

Study design overview

We conducted a prospective observational study in which quantitative data from the RCSQ were compared with data from previous investigations in the same ICU [removed for blind peer review].

Some of the data in the current study were also analyzed for a larger previously published study [removed for blind peer review]. In this larger study the same study instruments and protocol was used in two study sites (including the study site described in this paper) but the uptake of sleep promoting interventions was not examined. Data were collected during May and June 2014.

Setting

This investigation was conducted in Sydney, Australia in a tertiary referral hospital providing statewide specialty services. The hospital had a 58 bed ICU, separated into four areas, two general ICUs, a cardiothoracic ICU and a neurological ICU. The registered nurse to patient ratio in the ICU was one to one for mechanically ventilated patients and one to two or three for high dependency patients. The ICU consisted of only single rooms, each with sliding glass doors to the outer and windows to adjoining rooms.

Participants

Participants were adult ICU patients (≥ 18 years) treated in the ICU for ≥ 24 hours and had demonstrated capacity to provide informed consent in English. Screening occurred between Monday to Friday; patients who met the eligibility criteria and had no exclusion criteria were invited to participate. Exclusion criteria included known or suspected preexisting sleep disorder, diagnosis or high suspicion of dementia and confirmed or high suspicion of excessive intake of alcohol or drug abuse. Patients were enrolled only once during the study period, even if readmitted to the ICU.

Instrumentation

The RCSQ is a brief self-report instrument specifically designed to assess the perception of critically ill patients' sleep (Richards et al., 2000). The RCSQ consists of five visual analogue scales (VAS); each scale represents a different sleep domain with scores ranging from 0 (poor quality) to 100 mm (excellent quality). Respondents were requested to place an 'X' along each VAS to indicate the quality of that sleep domain for the previous night. The distance from zero mm to the 'X' was measured and the mean distance of the five VAS was calculated to derive the RCSQ Total Score. The RCSQ Total Score is considered a global measure of sleep quality with higher scores indicating better sleep quality (Richards et al., 2000). It takes approximately two minutes to

1 complete the RCSQ (Hoey et al., 2014). Patients were also asked open-ended questions about
2
3 what had facilitated i.e. 'What strategies or interventions helped you get to sleep last night?' or
4
5 impeded (sleep deterrents) i.e. 'What activities woke you or kept you awake last night?' their
6
7 sleep on the previous night.
8
9

10 11 12 Data collection

13
14 Research personnel introduced themselves to eligible patients in the ICU when they were not
15
16 undergoing clinical activities (such as wound dressing changes) after first consulting with the
17
18 bedside nurse. Patients were required to be calm, cooperative, conscious (only lightly sedated)
19
20 and to have adequately corrected eye sight to read the study instrument. The patients' sedation
21
22 level was assessed using the Richmond Agitation Sedation Score (RASS) (Sessler et al., 2002). A
23
24 patient who was assessed to have a sedation level between -1 and 1 on the RASS was eligible to
25
26 participate (interactive and cooperative). After explanation, verbal agreement was sought and
27
28 written informed consent obtained later (retrospectively). The RCSQ was administered daily
29
30 (mostly in the morning) during the patients' entire ICU stay or up to three months for long stay
31
32 patients. The RCSQ was administered on an A4 sized sheet of paper. For participants who were
33
34 unable to write (e.g. in the case of quadriplegia), the researchers traced a pen along each VAS and
35
36 instructed the participant to provide a cue for where they wished to place the 'X'; the correct
37
38 placement was confirmed with the participant.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Clinical and demographic details were recorded on a case report form including date of birth,
47
48 gender and primary reason for admission, medications, ventilation and airway interventions and
49
50 APACHE II severity of illness score.
51
52

53
54 Participants were approached on subsequent days and asked to report their sleep quality for the
55
56 previous night. If participants declined RCSQ completion, they were asked to clarify whether they
57
58
59
60

1 were declining on that occasion only or declining further participation. Participants who declined
2
3 ongoing RCSQ self-reports were not approached again but were asked to consent to have the data
4
5 that they had already provided included in the analysis. Participant discharge dates for the ICU and
6
7 hospital were censored at three months.
8
9

10 The guideline evaluation (audit) data were part of the routine quality improvement data collection
11
12 in the study ICU and were obtained from the ICU Quality Database to identify the use of sleep
13
14 promoting strategies. The ICU quality database contained checklists with 'yes' and 'no' alternatives
15
16 for nurses to self-report on clinical activities at the point of care. The checklist included one item
17
18 for sleep containing: 'Usual sleep practices noted, patient settled before 2200hrs, ear plugs and
19
20 eye shades offered, care/treatment clustered to allow 1.5–2hrs rest' to which nurses entered 'yes'
21
22 or 'no'. The responses for the sleep item were obtained from the database for the investigation
23
24 period (5 May 2014 to 18 June 2014).
25
26
27
28
29

30 Ethical considerations

31
32 Ethics approval was provided by the health service and University Human Research Ethics
33
34 Committee (approval numbers: LNR/14/HAWKE/60 and 2014000199). Retrospective written
35
36 consent was obtained either at the conclusion of their ICU stay or in the hospital ward following
37
38 transfer from ICU. Where a patient was unable to sign, their proxy signed the consent form on the
39
40 patient's behalf. At each time point of being approached for RCSQ completion, consent was
41
42 obtained and patients were assured that they could decline further participation at any time
43
44 without affecting their future healthcare.
45
46
47
48

49 Data analysis

50
51 The distributions of data were examined. Descriptive statistics were performed, means and
52
53 standard deviations (e.g. age and RCSQ scores) and medians and interquartile ranges (e.g. ICU
54
55 length of stay) for continuous data and frequencies (e.g. gender) for categorical data. Audit data
56
57
58
59

1 from the ICU Quality Database were presented as frequencies. An independent sample t-test was
2 performed to compare self-reported sleep quality (RCSQ Total scores) at the time the guideline
3 was implemented and after the implementation of the guideline (during the current study). A p
4 value <0.05 was considered statistically significant. Microsoft Excel (Version: 14.0.7015.1000) and
5 IBM SPSS Statistics (Version 22) were used for statistical analyses. For the current study a
6 retrospective sample size calculation confirmed that a sample size of 50 provided 95% confidence
7 that the point estimate for the mean total RCSQ score represented the population mean. Content
8 analysis was used to explore responses to the open-ended questions on facilitators and deterrents
9 of sleep.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 RESULTS

24 Fifty patients participated. They were on average 60 years old, had a median length of ICU stay of
25 over 3 days and three-quarters were male. Two hundred and seventy-seven patients were
26 screened and 182 met the inclusion criteria, 145 were eligible but 74 were missed (Figure 1).
27 Seventy-one patients were approached and 50 were able to participate (only three declined). A
28 summary of selected demographic and clinical characteristics for the sample is provided in Table 1.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Feasibility of repeated assessment of sleep quality using the RCSQ

39 Forty-two percent of study participants completed more than one RCSQ. The reasons that
40 repeated data were not collected from 29 participants were; 17 completed the RCSQ on the day of
41 ICU discharge, 4 were recruited on Friday and discharged over the weekend (data collection was
42 not performed at the weekend), 5 were busy (e.g., having lunch or undergoing a radiological
43 investigation), and 3 discontinued from data collection. Almost all participants who were
44 approached on or after day four of their ICU stay completed a repeated RCSQ (13/14 participants).
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 more than one occasion had a greater median ICU length of stay (LOS) than those who had
2 completed the RCSQ only once (9 (5-25) verses 2 (2-3) days). The RCSQ repeated completion
3 percentage was 72% when adjusted to exclude those who did not complete because they were
4 discharged (Figure 1).
5
6
7
8
9

10 Use of sleep promoting strategies

11
12 Data from the ICU quality database for nurses' responses to the statement 'Usual sleep
13 practices' was examined. For the study period there were 1427 audits of sleep with 1409
14 indicating 'Yes' and 18 indicating 'No'. From the audit, 98.7% of nurses reported that sleep-
15 promoting strategies were in use in this ICU.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 Self-reported sleep quality

27
28 The RCSQ Total Scores from all participants in this investigation (n=50) were compared
29 with the RCSQ Total Scores from all participants in the previous investigation in the same
30 ICU (n=42) when the sleep promoting interventions had recently been implemented
31 [removed for blind peer review]. Scores were 47.9±24.4 mm and 51.3±24.4 mm
32 respectively (p = 0.50).
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Overall, sleep quality reported on the RCSQ was poor with sleep depth having the lowest score
42 and returning to sleep after awakening having the highest score (Table 1). Although a majority of
43 patients identified 'nothing' as facilitators or deterrents to their sleep the most common facilitator
44 was 'medications' with 'pain and discomfort' being the most common deterrent.
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 Discussion

52
53 This investigation was designed to explore the feasibility of assessing sleep quality of patients in an
54 adult ICU using the RCSQ on repeated occasions, to contrast the use of sleep promoting strategies
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2 in a locally developed clinical practice guideline to usage previously reported [removed for blind
3
4 peer review] and to assess any improvement in self-reported sleep quality since its
5
6 implementation.
7

8
9
10 The repeated completion rate of 72% indicated that collection of sleep quality data using the RCSQ
11
12 repeatedly was feasible. Sleep interventions were reported by bedside nurses to be in use for
13
14 almost all patients. Patient self-reported sleep quality did not show any improvement following
15
16 implementation of the locally developed guideline which had been in use for four years at the
17
18 time the current study was conducted. Patients in the ICU experienced poor sleep quality, with an
19
20 average score of less than 50/100mm. Perhaps tellingly many patients were unable to identify any
21
22 facilitators of their sleep and discomfort and care activities were frequently highlighted as sleep
23
24 deterrents.
25
26
27

28
29
30 We were encouraged by the ability of many patients to complete the RCSQ daily (only three
31
32 patients discontinued). We found the RCSQ to be non-burdensome and routine administration by
33
34 clinicians (rather than researchers) would probably have reduced the number of missed
35
36 opportunities to assess sleep (e.g. absent for radiological investigation). Given its ease of use it is
37
38 somewhat surprising that the use of the RCSQ for ongoing sleep assessment in the ICU is published
39
40 infrequently. Exceptions include two studies [removed for blind peer review] (Kamdar et al.,
41
42 2013a) that compared sleep assessments by patients' and nurses'. Fifty percent of participants
43
44 completed the RCSQ on two or more occasions in two studies; one conducted in Australia
45
46 [removed for blind peer review] and the other in North America (Kamdar et al., 2013a). In the
47
48 North American study the RCSQ was completed on 88% of available days by either the patients (or
49
50 by nurses if patients were unable to respond). Despite the scarcity of reports of the repeated use
51
52 of the RCSQ, these studies and our own repeated completion rate of 72% are evidence to support
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2 its feasibility for routine assessment of patients' sleep in the ICU, as well as for evaluating
3
4 interventions to improve sleep.
5

6
7 The audit of the ICU quality database indicated that nurses' self-reported adherence to strategies
8 presented in the 'Rest and Sleep guideline for ICU patients' was high. The finding of high self-
9 reported adherence indicated that the strategies either were used or considered for use, if they
10 were appropriate for the individual patient (e.g. non-delirious if ear plugs were offered). The
11 selected components of the guideline used for the audit were clustered hence the nurse could
12 only respond once (yes or no) to answer for all components. Consequently, identifying the
13 guideline components with the highest and lowest adherence rates could not be reported.
14
15

16
17 However, it appears that adherence has improved since the original audit of the guideline, which
18 suggested limited uptake of the strategies [removed for blind peer review]. The relocation of the
19 ICU to a new building before the current study and after the original audit and the length of time
20 for clinicians to be familiarised with the guideline may be contributing factors for the increased
21 adherence.
22
23

24
25 In a similar study that did report the use of individual components of a 'sleep bundle'
26 improvements were noted in creating sleep conducive environmental conditions that required
27 little time and effort from clinicians such as dimming night time lighting (Kamdar et al., 2013b) but
28 this did not result in improved sleep quality (Kamdar et al., 2013a). Likewise Patel et al.(2014)
29 reported that patients perceived less sleep disruption associated with noise and inappropriate
30 light levels after the implementation of a 'sleep bundle' and in this study the self-reported sleep
31 efficiency using the RCSQ improved significantly. Both pre-post evaluation studies assessed sleep
32 in a relatively short period (e.g. less than six months) after implementation of sleep promoting
33 strategies (Patel et al., 2014, Kamdar et al., 2013a). It is unclear whether any improvements in
34 practice or outcomes were maintained beyond the time in which the studies were conducted.
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 Similar problems with methodology were revealed in a recent Cochrane review that highlighted
2 the need for well-designed and conducted research to strengthen the evidence for the use of non-
3 pharmacological interventions for improving sleep in critically ill adults (Hu et al., 2015).

4
5
6
7
8
9 Mean RCSQ Total Scores representing poor sleep quality have been reported in previous
10 investigations in ICU patients including 47.18 mm in the same ICU, [removed for blind peer review]
11 and internationally 47.00mm (Krotsetis et al., 2017), 45.5 mm (Frisk and Nordstrom, 2003) and
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
51.42 mm (Nicolas et al., 2008) and was perhaps reflective of the many sleep deterrents identified
by patients. Self reports of the facilitators and deterrents of sleep by ICU patients appear to be
consistent between studies. Noise, in particular from staff conversations, is a universally reported
sleep deterrent [removed for blind peer review](Freedman et al., 1999, Stewart et al., 2016,
Krotsetis et al., 2017). In contrast in the current study noise was not the most commonly reported
deterrent to sleep and this may be a feature of the study ICU in which patients were exclusively
located in single rooms fitted with closing doors. The frequently mentioned deterrents 'pain and
discomfort' and 'care activities' were concerning. Likewise care activities were highlighted as
reasons for poor sleep by patients in a recent study to test the reliability of the German version of
the RCSQ (Krotsetis et al., 2017). In the current study 'analgesia' was frequently cited as a sleep
facilitator while a sense of relief/ fatigue was facilitative for patients in the Krotsetis et al. (2017)
study. Many patients were unable to identify anything specific ('nothing') which assisted or
deterred their sleep which is unsurprising given the multi-factorial effects of illness, the
environment and treatment on sleep. This response was reported among former ICU patients in a
phenomenological interview study about the experience of sleep deprivation; 'I don't sleep. I don't
know why'(Tembo et al., 2013).

Limitations of the study

1 Recruitment and data collection were limited to Monday to Friday (hence the number of missed
2 eligible patients). Convenience sampling is known to increase the risk of bias,(Williamson, 2003)
3
4
5
6 for example more patients with surgical diagnoses are admitted to ICU during weekdays than on
7
8 weekends. The sampling and data collection methods used in this investigation could have
9
10 impacted the representativeness of the sample and ability to generalize the findings.
11
12

13
14 The methods for audit data collection were different in the original audit and the current study. In
15
16 the original audit the researcher reviewed patient charts to identify adherence to components of
17
18 the Guideline and observed implementation of the usual rest period [removed for blind peer
19
20 review]. The components of the Guideline used for the audit in the current investigation were
21
22 clustered and allowed only one response (yes or no) for all components (so adherence for the
23
24 entire guideline may not have been 98%). Consequently, interpretation of the audit data is limited.
25
26
27

28
29 In addition a structured delirium assessment instrument was not routinely used in the study ICU at
30
31 the time of data collection. However the researchers sought the opinion of the nurse about
32
33 whether the patient was delirious and performed an informal assessment themselves before
34
35 performing the sleep assessment. The RCSQ was not administered to patients who were
36
37 considered to be delirious.
38
39

40
41
42 Implications and recommendations for research and practice
43

44
45 The RCSQ has not been validated in healthy populations; validation with PSG would be
46
47 useful in order to better interpret critically ill patients' RSCQ data. Importantly it would be
48
49 valuable to further validate the instrument in the critically ill populations. The original
50
51 validation was performed using PSG in 70 male cardiac patients, none of whom were
52
53 reported to have had sepsis, respiratory or other diagnoses or were mechanically
54
55 ventilated (Richards et al., 2000). This would further consolidate its usefulness for ongoing
56
57
58
59

1
2 sleep assessment at various time points of a patient's ICU stay and provide confidence in
3
4 its value as an adjunct to sleep research and quality activities designed to improve sleep in
5
6 this population.
7

8 9 CONCLUSION

10
11
12 Our study demonstrated that it is feasible to use the brief and non-burdensome RCSQ to assess
13
14 patients' sleep on multiple occasions while they are treated in the ICU. Few studies report
15
16 repeated measures of sleep quality using the RCSQ. Sleep quality varies with environmental and
17
18 internal conditions therefore arguably a 'one off' assessment is of limited use in the context of
19
20 critical illness when many patients experience prolonged treatment in ICU. The study provides
21
22 evidence of increased adherence to sleep strategies in the Rest and Sleep Guideline. Evidence of
23
24 guideline use contributes to the findings of a relatively small number of studies conducted on this
25
26 topic about sleep in ICU patients. The results from this investigation characterised patient sleep in
27
28 the ICU as poor quality and light. However, as has been reported in previous studies, apparently
29
30 good uptake of the guideline did not result in improved sleep quality for patients.
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

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

What is known about the subject

- The quality and quantity of patients' sleep in ICU is poor
- Assessment of ICU patients' sleep is challenging

What this paper contributes

- Repeated self-assessment using the Richards-Campbell Sleep Questionnaire of sleep quality by ICU patients is feasible
- Quality of ICU patients' sleep may not improve despite the use of a 'rest and sleep' guideline
- Sleep and rest interventions require further investigation to establish their efficacy in critically ill adults

Review Only

References

[Removed for Blind Peer review]

Beecroft JM, Ward M, Younes M, Crombach S, Smith O & Hanly PJ (2008). Sleep monitoring in the intensive care unit: comparison of nurse assessment, actigraphy and polysomnography. *Intensive Care Medicine*; **34**: 2076-83.

Drouot X & Quentin S (2016). Sleep Neurobiology and Critical Care Illness. *Sleep Med Clin*; **11**: 105-13. 10.1016/j.jsmc.2015.10.001.

Drouot X, Roche-Campo F, Thille AW, Cabello B, Galia F, Margarit L, d'Ortho MP & Brochard L (2012). A new classification for sleep analysis in critically ill patients. *Sleep Med*; **13**: 7-14. S1389-9457(11)00308-X [pii].

[Removed for Blind Peer review]

Freedman NS, Gazendam J, Levan L, Pack AI & Schwab RJ (2001). Abnormal sleep/wake cycles and the effect of environmental noise on sleep disruption in the intensive care unit. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*; **163**: 451-7.

Freedman NS, Kotzer N & Schwab RJ (1999). Patient perception of sleep quality and etiology of sleep disruption in the intensive care unit. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*; **159**: 1155-62.

Frisk U & Nordstrom G (2003). Patients' sleep in an intensive care unit--patients' and nurses' perception. *Intensive Crit Care Nurs*; **19**: 342-9. S0964339703000764 [pii].

Hoey LM, Fulbrook P & Douglas JA (2014). Sleep assessment of hospitalised patients: a literature review. *Int J Nurs Stud*; **51**: 1281-8. 10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2014.02.001.

Hu RF, Jiang XY, Chen J, Zeng Z, Chen XY, Li Y, Huining X & Evans DJ (2015). Non-pharmacological interventions for sleep promotion in the intensive care unit. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*: CD008808. 10.1002/14651858.CD008808.pub2.

Kamdar BB, King LM, Collop NA, Sakamuri S, Colantuoni E, Neufeld KJ, Bienvenu OJ, Rowden AM, Touradji P, Brower RG & Needham DM (2013a). The Effect of a Quality Improvement Intervention on Perceived Sleep Quality and Cognition in a Medical ICU. *Crit Care Med*. 10.1097/CCM.0b013e3182746442.

Kamdar BB, Yang J, King LM, Neufeld KJ, Bienvenu OJ, Rowden AM, Brower RG, Collop NA & Needham DM (2013b). Developing, Implementing, and Evaluating a Multifaceted Quality Improvement Intervention to Promote Sleep in an ICU. *Am J Med Qual*. 10.1177/1062860613509684.

Krotsetis S, Richards KC, Behncke A & Kopke S (2017). The reliability of the German version of the Richards Campbell Sleep Questionnaire. *Nurs Crit Care*. 10.1111/nicc.12275.

Li SY, Wang TJ, Vivienne Wu SF, Liang SY & Tung HH (2011). Efficacy of controlling night-time noise and activities to improve patients' sleep quality in a surgical intensive care unit. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*; **20**: 396-407. 10.1111/j.1365-2702.2010.03507.x.

Nicolas A, Aizpitarte E, Iruarizaga A, Vazquez M, Margall A & Asiain C (2008). Perception of night-time sleep by surgical patients in an intensive care unit. *Nurs Crit Care*; **13**: 25-33. NCR255 [pii].

Patel J, Baldwin J, Bunting P & Laha S (2014). The effect of a multicomponent multidisciplinary bundle of interventions on sleep and delirium in medical and surgical intensive care patients. *Anaesthesia*; **69**: 540-9. 10.1111/anae.12638.

Pisani MA, Friese RS, Gehlbach BK, Schwab RJ, Weinhouse GL & Jones SF (2015). Sleep in the Intensive Care Unit. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 10.1164/rccm.201411-2099CI.

Richards KC, O'Sullivan PS & Phillips RL (2000). Measurement of sleep in critically ill patients. *J Nurs Meas*; **8**: 131-44.

Ritkala-Castren M, Lakanmaa RL, Virtanen I & Leino-Kilpi H (2013). Evaluating adult patients' sleep: an integrative literature review in critical care. *Scand J Caring Sci*. 10.1111/scs.12072.

Ritkala-Castren M, Virtanen I, Vahlberg T, Leivo S, Kaukonen KM & Leino-Kilpi H (2016). Evaluation of patients' sleep by nurses in an ICU. *J Clin Nurs*. 10.1111/jocn.13148.

Rittayamai N, Wilcox E, Drouot X, Mehta S, Goffi A & Brochard L (2016). Positive and negative effects of mechanical ventilation on sleep in the ICU: a review with clinical recommendations. *Intensive Care Med*; **42**: 531-41. 10.1007/s00134-015-4179-1.

- 1
2 Roussos M, Parthasarathy S & Ayas NT (2010). Can we improve sleep quality by changing the
3 way we ventilate patients? *Lung*; **188**: 1-3. 10.1007/s00408-009-9189-8.
- 4 Salandin A, Arnold J & Kornadt O (2011). Noise in an intensive care unit. *J Acoust Soc Am*; **130**:
5 3754-60. 10.1121/1.3655884.
- 6 Sessler CN, Gosnell MS, Grap MJ, Brophy GM, O'Neal PV, Keane KA, Tesoro EP & Elswick RK
7 (2002). The Richmond Agitation-Sedation Scale: validity and reliability in adult intensive
8 care unit patients. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*; **166**: 1338-44. 10.1164/rccm.2107138.
- 9 Siegel JM (2005). Clues to the functions of mammalian sleep. *Nature*; **437**: 1264-1271.
- 10 Stewart JA, Green C, Stewart J & Tiruvoipati R (2016). Factors influencing quality of sleep among
11 non-mechanically ventilated patients in the Intensive Care Unit. *Aust Crit Care*.
12 10.1016/j.aucc.2016.02.002.
- 13 Storti LJ, Servantes DM, Borges M, Bittencourt L, Maroja FU, Poyares D, Burke PR, Santos VB,
14 Moreira RS, Mancuso FJ, de Paola AA, Tufik S, Carvalho AC & Cintra FD (2015).
15 Validation of a novel sleep-quality questionnaire to assess sleep in the coronary care unit: a
16 polysomnography study. *Sleep Med*; **16**: 971-5. 10.1016/j.sleep.2015.03.014.
- 17 Tembo AC, Parker V & Higgins I (2013). The experience of sleep deprivation in intensive care
18 patients: Findings from a larger hermeneutic phenomenological study. *Intensive Crit Care*
19 *Nurs*; **29**: 310-6. 10.1016/j.iccn.2013.05.003.
- 20 Watson PL, Pandharipande P, Gehlbach BK, Thompson JL, Shintani AK, Dittus BS, Bernard GR,
21 Malow BA & Ely EW (2013). Atypical Sleep in Ventilated Patients: Empirical
22 Electroencephalography Findings and the Path Toward Revised ICU Sleep Scoring
23 Criteria. *Crit Care Med*; **41**: 1958-1967. 10.1097/CCM.0b013e31828a3f75.
- 24 Williamson GR (2003). Misrepresenting random sampling? A systematic review of research papers
25 in the Journal of Advanced Nursing. *J Adv Nurs*; **44**: 278-88.
- 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

1
2 *Figure title and legend*

3 **Figure 1: Flow chart of patient screening, recruitment and participants' initial and**
4 **subsequent RCSQ completions**

5
6 *RCSQ = Richards-Campbell Sleep Questionnaire, †Data collection occurred Monday to Friday
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

For Review Only

Table 1: Selected sample characteristics and scores for RCSQ

Characteristic	Statistic
Age, years, Mean±SD*	62.6±16.9
Male gender, n (%)	38 (76)
Diagnosis, n (%)	
Non-operative	26 (52)
Operative	24 (48)
Main diagnostic categories, n (%)	
Cardiovascular operative	11 (22)
Neurological operative	5 (10)
Respiratory non-operative	5 (10)
Other	29 (58)
APACHE [†] II score, Mean±SD	12.5±6.3
Artificial airway, n (%)	6 (12)
Invasive or non-invasive ventilation, n (%)	7 (14)
Medication, n (%)	
Antipsychotic	4 (8) [‡]
Benzodiazepine	6 (12)
Opioid	24 (48) [§]
ICU length of stay, days, Median (IQR) [^]	3.4 (1.9–7.6)
Hospital length of stay, days, Median (IQR)	12.5 (7.2–29.5)
ICU day on which initial data collection occurred, Median (IQR)	2.0 (2.0–4.0)

RCSQ [#] Descriptors	Mean±SD [†] Score (mm)
My sleep last night was: Light... Deep	39.9±25.8
Last night, the first time I got to sleep, I: Just never could fall asleep... Fell asleep almost immediately	46.8±30.3
Last night I was: Awake all night long... Awake very little	46.0±27.6
Last night when I woke up or was awakened, I: Couldn't get back to sleep... Got back to sleep immediately	55.9±31.3
I would describe my sleep last night as: A bad night's sleep... A good night's sleep	50.7±31.6
Total RCSQ score	47.9±24.4

* SD = standard deviation, [†] APACHE = Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation, [‡] One patient received antipsychotic, benzodiazepine and opioid medications, [§] five patients received benzodiazepine and opioid medications, [^] IQR = interquartile range, [#]RCSQ = Richards-Campbell Sleep Questionnaire




Figure 1: Flow chart of patient screening, recruitment and participants' initial and subsequent RCSQ completions

*RCSQ = Richards-Campbell Sleep Questionnaire, [†]Data collection occurred Monday to Friday