EEG and clinical assessment in delirium and acute encephalopathy

Studies on delirium detection tools usually have a delirium expert as a reference rater. However, experts appear to frequently disagree on the diagnosis of delirium, even if considering exactly the same clinical and cognitive information.1 Acute encephalopathy is a rapidly developing (over less than 4 weeks, but usually within hours to days) pathobiological process in the brain which can lead to a clinical presentation of (sub)syndromal delirium,2 and can be detected with electroencephalography (EEG) as slow wave activity in theta and delta ranges.3–7 Because of its objective character, EEG seems to be a promising method to detect delirium.7,8 To the best of our knowledge, there are no previous reports on the extent to which clinical signs of delirium concur with signs of encephalopathy in EEG. The aim of this study was to investigate the overlap between the clinical and EEG classifications of delirium and acute encephalopathy, and to explore whether EEG may provide additional information to the classification of delirium by clinical experts.

In this study (details: Appendix S1), 2 minutes of 321 postoperative one-channel (Fp2 – Pz) EEG recordings of 145 awake elderly surgical patients were assessed by three EEG experts with at least 15 years of clinical EEG experience, independently of each other and unaware of clinical information. Four criteria were assessed to determine the presence of acute encephalopathy: (i) slow wave activity should lie between 0.5 and 5 Hz; (ii) polymorphic delta waves should have higher amplitudes than alpha waves; (iii) runs of at least two consecutive polymorphic delta waves should be present; and (iv) runs of polymorphic delta activity should be present at least three times per minute. The clinical diagnosis of delirium was based on video-recorded standardized cognitive assessments, administered directly after the EEG recording. This included the Delirium Rating Scale-Revised-98 (DRS-R-98) to assess delirium severity,9 and notes from the electronic patient file on the 24 h before the EEG recording. Different pairs of two clinical experts with at least 5 years of expertise in delirium diagnosis classified each patient independently of each other and unaware of the EEG classification. In case of discordance, a third expert was consulted. Final classifications were based on a majority vote of each expert panel.

Study population characteristics and extended results are found in Appendix S1, Table S1–S5. We found that EEG experts classified 119 of 321 recordings (37.1%) as ‘acute encephalopathy’ (AE+), whereas clinical experts classified ‘delirium’ (D+) in 73/321 assessments (22.7%). A total of 233 assessments (72.6%) showed overlap between the clinical and EEG classifications of the presence/absence of delirium and acute encephalopathy. A positive diagnosis by both expert panels (AE + D+) was associated with the highest DRS-R-98 score (mean 12.4, Standard Deviation (SD) 5.6). Mean DRS-R-98 scores gradually decreased along with the level of consensus between expert panels (see Table 1; AE = D + 7.9, SD 3.0; AE + D = 3.8, SD 1.9; AE – D = 2.8, SD 1.7; test for trend P < 0.001).

This study shows that identification of acute encephalopathy by EEG experts and a diagnosis of delirium by clinical experts largely overlap, using one-channel EEG in which eye artifacts should be distinguished from slow wave activity. Interestingly, if ‘acute encephalopathy’ was present without clinical delirium, a significantly higher severity of delirium score (DRS-R-98) was observed, compared to a negative classification by both expert panels. Similarly, a significantly lower delirium severity score was found for cases classified as ‘no acute encephalopathy’ but ‘delirium’, compared to a positive classification by both expert panels.

As delirium severity appears to differ in these subgroups in an intuitive way, we may speculate that EEG could be more sensitive to changes in cognitive dysfunction. In some cases these changes may have been too subtle for experts to diagnose these as ‘delirium’, or potentially, the cognitive reserve of a patient may have obscured dysfunction. These findings are consistent with a prior study that showed a correlation between slow wave EEG activity and delirium severity, where patients with subsyndromal delirium – not fulfilling all clinical criteria for delirium - had intermediate rates of EEG slowing compared to patients who met all criteria for delirium.10

In conclusion, acute encephalopathy in EEG largely overlaps with a clinical diagnosis of delirium. EEG may be sensitive to brain state changes that may not be classified as clinically apparent delirium. The use of an EEG classification of acute encephalopathy in combination with a clinical classification of delirium may be an interesting approach as a reference standard in future studies on delirium detection tools, especially when EEG-based classification can be automated to eliminate challenges in the interpretation of one-channel EEG.

| Classification by clinical experts | Classification by EEG experts | N     | Mean DRS-R-98 score | SD  | Range       |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------|---------------------|-----|-------------|
| Delirium                          | Acute encephalopathy         | 52    | 12.4                | 5.6 | 5.0–29.0    |
| Delirium                          | No acute encephalopathy      | 21    | 7.9                 | 3.0 | 4.3–16.3    |
| No delirium                       | Acute encephalopathy         | 67    | 3.8                 | 1.9 | 0.5–10.0    |
| No delirium                       | No acute encephalopathy      | 181   | 2.8                 | 1.7 | 0.0–8.7     |
| Total                             |                               | 321   | 4.9                 | 4.5 | 0.0–29.0    |

1 Delirium Rating Scale Revision 1998 (DRS-R-98) scores (mean, standard deviation (SD) and observed range of minimum and maximum values) for each classification category where clinical experts agree or did not agree. A significant linear relationship was found between the classification categories and the DRS-R-98 scores (R² = 0.581, test for trend P < 0.001).
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Antidepressants are the first-line treatment for patients with major depressive disorder (MDD), although they might have potential troublesome adverse effects in clinical practice.1 Vortioxetine is a 5-HT3, 5-HT1D, and 5-HT7 antagonist; a 5-HT1A agonist; a 5-HT1B partial agonist; and a serotonin reuptake inhibitor, with a chemical formula of 1-[2-(2,4-Dimethylphenylsulfanyl)-phenyl]-piperazine; and is approved for MDD in adults at a starting dose of 5 mg/d to 20 mg/d.1 It is one of the new serotonergic antidepressants launched in recent years, and the adverse effects are not well known. Bleeding tendency has been noted; however, no case of rapid onset of hemoptysis has been reported.

A 27-year-old single man had no previous mental or physical illness or history of use of illicit substances before his first visit to our clinic. He presented with a chief complaint of depression for a few months after experiencing a stressful occupational event at his job. Additionally, anxiety, negative thinking, poor attention, insomnia, and poor appetite had been found and he was unable to maintain his occupational performance as his usual self. No definite previous major depressive, manic, or hypomanic episode was identified, and an impression of MDD, single episode, was made after excluding organic brain lesion and substance-induced depression by history and physical examination. Vortioxetine of 5 mg/d was prescribed for treating his depression.

One day after initiating vortioxetine, the patient had left upper chest pain with a pain score of 4/5, radiating to his back while taking a deep breath. On the third day of using vortioxetine, he visited our thoracic physician for persistent chest pain. There was no trauma, local tenderness, abnormal breath sound, or dyspnea, and chest pain did not worsen on exertion. On the fifth day of using vortioxetine, he visited the thoracic physician again for hemoptysis and cough with blood-tinged sputum, when results from chest computed tomography (CT) showed focal consolidative opacity in the lingular lobe of the left upper lung. Bleeding caused by vortioxetine was highly suspected and vortioxetine was shifted to bupropion 150 mg/d and treatment with tranexamic acid 250 mg three times a day to prevent further blood loss.

Two days after aggressive management there was no hemoptysis, cough, or chest pain. Complete blood cell level, prothrombin time, partial thromboplastin time, and renal and liver function were normal. His depressive symptoms partially improved during the following 2 weeks on bupropion at the initial dosage.Combining treatment of bupropion and individual psychotherapy, the patient reached a syndrome-free state after a total duration of 6 weeks of treatment.

In our patient, rapid onset of abnormal bleeding soon after using vortioxetine was observed, and presented as left upper chest pain radiating to his back and subsequent hemoptysis, compatible with his chest CT report. There are numerous organic causes of chest pain and hemoptysis, such as arteriovenous malformation, granulomatosis with polyangiitis ( Wegener granulomatosis), lung cancer, parasitic infection pulmonary embolism, tuberculosis, pulmonary embolism, and pneumo nia. We clinically excluded potential chest causes by history taking, physical examination, laboratory data, and chest CT. Antidepressants that inhibit platelet reuptake of 5-HT may cause platelet 5-HT deple tion, leading to inhibition of 5-HT–induced platelet aggregation amplification.2 A mild preexisting platelet disorder or a modified platelet serotonergic response amplified by depletion of 5-HT has been suggested to be associated with this complication.2 Our patient had a normal platelet count, and there was a lack of information to confirm whether he had preexisting platelet disorder or a modified platelet

Supporting information

Additional Supporting Information may be found in the online version of this article at the publisher’s web-site:

Appendix S1 Supporting information.

Suzanne C.A. Hut, PhD,1,2 Sandra M.A. Dijkstra-Kersten, PhD,1 Tianne Numan, PhD,1 Nizare R.V.R. Henriquez, BSc,2 Nico W. Teunissen, BSc,2 Mark van den Boogaard, PhD,3 Franciscus S. Leijten, MD, PhD2 and Arjen J.C. Slooter, MD, PhD1,4

Departments of1Intensive Care Medicine and University Medical Center Utrecht Brain Center,2Neurology and Neurosurgery and University Medical Center Utrecht Brain Center, University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht University, Utrecht, 3Department of Intensive Care Medicine, Radboud Institute of Health Science, Radboud University Medical Center Nijmegen, Nijmegen, The Netherlands, and 4Department of Neurology, UZ Brussel, Brussels, Belgium

Email: s.c.a.hut@umcutrecht.nl

Received 28 December 2020; revised 23 April 2021; accepted 5 May 2021.

References

1. Numan T, van den Boogaard M, Kamper AM et al. Recognition of delirium in postoperative elderly patients: A multicenter study. J. Am. Geriatr. Soc. 2017; 65: 1932–1936.
2. Slooter AJC, Otte WM, Devlin JW et al. Updated nomenclature of delirium and acute encephalopathy: Statement of ten societies. Intensive Care Med. 2020; 46: 1020–1022.
3. Engel GL, Romano J. Delirium, a syndrome of cerebral insufficiency. J. Neuropsychiatry Clin. Neurosci. 2004; 16: 526–538.
4. Jacobson SA, Leuchter AF, Walter DO. Conventional and quantitative EEG in the diagnosis of delirium among the elderly. J. Neurol. Neurosurg. Psychiatry 1993; 56: 153–158.
5. Brenner RP. Utility of EEG in delirium: Past views and current practice. Int. Psychogeriatr. 1991; 3: 211–229.
6. Koponen H, Partanen J, Paakkönen A, Mattila E, Riekkinen PJ. EEG spectral analysis in delirium. J. Neurol. Neurosurg. Psychiatry 1989; 52: 980–985.
7. Numan T, van den Boogaard M, Kamper AM et al. Delirium detection using relative delta power based on 1-minute single-channel EEG: A multicentre study. Br. J. Anaesth. 2019; 122: 60–68.
8. Van Der Kooi AW, Zaal IJ, Klijn FA et al. Delirium detection using EEG: What and how to measure. Chest 2015; 147: 94–101.
9. Trezpac TF, Mittal D, Torres R, Kanary K, Norton J, Jimerson N. Vali dation of the delirium rating scale-revised-98: Comparison with the delirium rating scale and the cognitive test for delirium. J. Neuropsychiatry Clin. Neurosci. 2001; 13: 229–242.
10. Kimchi EY, Neelagiri A, Whitt W et al. EEG slowing correlates with delirium severity and predicts poor clinical outcomes. Neurology 2006; 93: e1260–e1271.

Acknowledgments

Grant support: EU Horizon 2020, grant number 820555.

Disclosure statement

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Ethical approval statement

The study protocol was reviewed by the Medical Ethical Committee of the University Medical Center Utrecht and registered at ClinicalTrials.gov under identifier NCT02404181. Study protocols corresponded to the provisions of the Declaration of Helsinki.

Informed consent statement

Written informed consent was obtained from each patient before elective surgery, and anonymity was preserved. All data were pseudonymized.

Supporting information

Additional Supporting Information may be found in the online version of this article at the publisher’s web-site:

Appendix S1 Supporting information.

Letters to the Editor

Psychiatry and Clinical Neurosciences 75: 265–270, 2021