

hard to understand why parents would advocate fiercely for any treatment that could benefit their child. At what point, though, should clinicians decline such requests based on lack of benefit or disproportionate burden? And what role should institutional policies and public opinion have in determining the proper response to such requests?

Using the 2015 ATS/AACN/ACCP/ESICM/SCCM consensus statement on NBT as a framework, this interactive case-based session will examine requests for potentially non-beneficial treatment from clinical, historical, legal, and personal perspectives. After tracing the trajectory of medical decision-making from paternalism to radical autonomy, recent attempts at defining and actualizing the concept of medical futility will be reviewed. Competing notions of burden and benefit will be explored, with specific reference to physicians' well-documented tendency to underestimate quality of life compared to patients and their families. A multi-disciplinary panel will aid in presenting various perspectives, including that of the parents and families. Clinicians' engagement with public opinion will be specifically addressed by a palliative care physician who weighed in about the Charlie Gard case, and will explore the degree to which we assume responsibility in presenting these issues to the public evenly and accurately, as well as the potential pitfalls of modern media. Practical steps—including recommendations for specific language, institutional policies, and mediating measures—will be presented.

“My Family Would Be Better Off Without Me”: Managing Suicidal Ideation and Risk in Palliative and Hospice Care (FR419)



David Gruenewald, MD FACP, VA Puget Sound Health Care System, Seattle, WA. Kathleen Bickel, MD MPhil MS, University of Colorado School of Medicine/Rocky Mountain Regional VAMC, Aurora, CO. Jaclyn Schneider, MD, VA WNY Healthcare System, Buffalo, NY. Christopher Parkinson, PhD, Southeast Louisiana Veterans Health Care System, New Orleans, LA. Sumathi Misra, MD MPH CMD FAAHPM, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, TN. Lynn Bushor, DNP APRN ACHPN, Veterans Health Administration, Mayfield, KY. Richard Stiles, MSN, Department of Veterans Affairs, New York, NY.

Objectives

- Recognize the high prevalence rate of suicidal ideation, attempts, and completed suicide in Veteran and non-Veteran patients receiving palliative care, and the widespread impact of suicide on survivors including family and professional caregivers.
- Describe validated assessment tools and evidence-based treatments to identify and manage patients at high risk of suicide in palliative care settings.

- Identify actionable strategies to integrate suicide risk assessment and management into clinical practice across various palliative care and hospice settings in Veteran and non-Veteran populations.

People facing serious medical illness often experience significant and debilitating psychological distress in addition to symptoms associated with the underlying disease. While many people are resilient, large epidemiologic studies suggest increased risk of suicide in serious medical illness. For example, in a study of suicide risk and precipitating circumstances in male Veterans >age 65 years, the adjusted odds ratio of suicide was 36-fold higher in those with physical health problems. Suicide in palliative care and hospice patients has not been widely studied, but known suicide risk factors include: older age, history of mental health problems, male gender, social isolation, recent medical hospitalization, poor physical functioning, and access to lethal means including opiates or firearms. Suicidal behavior is more lethal later in life, due to increased frailty, social isolation, greater resolve, and greater likelihood of firearm use.

Despite the high prevalence of these suicide risk factors in palliative care patients, few palliative or hospice programs have routine, standardized screening for suicide risk. Limited data guiding suicide assessment and prevention in palliative care are largely extrapolated from other patient populations. Multiple questions remain, including: should all palliative care and hospice patients be screened routinely for suicide risk? What assessment tools should be used? What warning signs signify especially high risk in this population? What words work best to evaluate risk without detracting from other goals of palliative care encounters? What interventions minimize suicide risk in palliative care patients?

In this concurrent session, our interdisciplinary panel will review current knowledge of suicide risk assessment and prevention across palliative care settings. We will present conceptual frameworks connecting suicidality, interpersonal risk factors, and biopsychosocial-spiritual domains. Then, based on evidence and clinical expertise, we will offer recommendations for assessing and stratifying suicide risk along with suicide risk-reduction strategies adaptable to palliative and hospice care settings.

Palliative Connect: Triggered Palliative Care Consultation Using an EHR Prediction Model (FR420A)



Kate Courtright, MD MS, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA. Corey Chivers, PhD, University of Pennsylvania Health System, Philadelphia, PA. Michael Becker, BS, Penn Medicine, Philadelphia, PA. Susan Regli, PhD, University of Pennsylvania Hospital System, Philadelphia, PA. Michael Draugelis, BS,

Penn Medicine, Philadelphia, PA. Nina O'Connor, MD FAAHPM, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA.

Objectives

- Describe the general process used to develop and implement an EHR-based mortality risk stratification model.
- Assess the impact and implications of implementation an EHR-based mortality risk stratification model on clinical, quality, and financial metrics.

Background. The frequency and timing of palliative care consultation is highly variable among inpatients with life-limiting illnesses despite evidence of its benefits.

Objectives. To develop an EHR-based risk stratification model and evaluate its impact as a trigger for inpatient palliative care consultation.

Methods. We performed a retrospective cohort study at three urban hospitals among 65,045 admissions in 2016. Using a randomly split sample and a machine learning approach, we developed and validated an EHR-based model (Palliative Connect) to predict risk of death within six months of admission. We then determined a risk threshold of $\geq 30\%$ based on expert chart review and prospectively piloted Palliative Connect in a 4-month pre-post study of triggered palliative care consultation on a general medicine service at a large academic hospital. Primary clinicians could decline the consult. We performed an intention-to-treat analysis to evaluate impact on care delivery, quality metrics, and costs.

Results. The final prediction model had excellent discrimination (*c*-statistic 0.84, 95% CI 0.83-0.86). There were no differences in demographics between the pre- (*n*=142) and post-intervention (*n*=134) cohorts, with a mean age of 72 years (SD 12.9) and mean risk score of 0.50 (SD 0.16). One in three triggered consults were declined by the primary clinician. In the post-intervention period, there were increased consult orders (63.4% vs 16.2%, *p*<0.001) and advance care planning notes (26.9% vs 16.9%, *p*=0.04) in the EHR, and the pre-consult length of stay was lower (1.6 days vs. 2.8, *p*=0.04). Rates of ICU admission, hospital mortality, and 30-day readmission, and mean direct hospital costs were lower post-intervention, and hospice discharges increased, although not statistically significantly.

Conclusion. The Palliative Connect model accurately identifies inpatients with high risk of mortality who would not otherwise have received a palliative care consult and shows great promise as a trigger for consultation to improve outcomes.

Implications for Research, Policy, or Practice. Innovative predictive analytics may increase palliative care penetration and improve outcomes among patients most in need.

Specialty vs. Primary Palliative Care in Randomized Clinical Trials: A Systematic Review (FR420B)



Natalie Ernecoff, MPH, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC. Devon Check, PhD, Duke University, Durham, NC. Megan Bannon, BA, University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine, Pittsburgh, PA. Laura Hanson, MD MPH FAAHPM, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC. James Dionne-Odom, PhD RN ACHPN, University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, AL. Jennifer Corbelli, MD, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA. Michele Klein-Fedyschin, MSLS BSN RN, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA. Yael Schenker, MD, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA. Camilla Zimmermann, MD, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada. Robert Arnold, MD FACP FAAHPM, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA. Dio Kavalieratos, PhD, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA.

Objectives

- Describe the state of evidence for palliative care interventions broadly.
- Describe evidence for primary palliative care as one mechanism for potential palliative care delivery.

Background and Objective. Evidence shows specialty palliative care (SPC) improves quality of life and reduces symptom burden among seriously-ill patients, yet a shortage of SPC clinicians has prompted primary palliative care (PPC). We compared intervention content, delivery, and outcomes of SPC vs. PPC interventions tested in published RCTs.

Study Identification. We updated a 2016 systematic review of palliative care RCTs by reviewing MEDLINE, EMBASE, CINAHL, and Cochrane CENTRAL through December 2017 using National Consensus Project for Quality Palliative Care guidelines.

Data Extraction and Synthesis. Three authors classified interventions as SPC or PPC: SPC involved clinicians who were either palliative care board-certified or sub-specialty trained or had extensive clinical experience in palliative care. All other trials were considered PPC. We characterized elements of the interventions, delivery setting, and outcomes.

Results. Of 53 palliative care RCTs, 32 were SPC vs. 21 PPC. Most trials incorporated structural palliative care delivery and symptom management. A greater proportion of SPC interventions included ethical and decision-making aspects of care (13/32; 41%) compared to PPC (4/21; 19%). SPC interventions were delivered in inpatient (15/32; 47%) and/or outpatient settings (18/32; 56%) by specialty physicians (16/32; 50%) and nurses (16/32; 50%); PPC interventions were often delivered in the home (8/21; 38%) by nurses (16/21; 76%). In both SPC and PPC trials, most