

SOUNDING BOARD

Appropriate Use of Artificial Nutrition and Hydration — Fundamental Principles and Recommendations

David Casarett, M.D., Jennifer Kapo, M.D., and Arthur Caplan, Ph.D.

For two decades, clinicians have been guided by an agreement about the appropriate use of artificial nutrition and hydration (ANH). In general, ANH has been seen as a medical treatment that patients or their surrogates may accept or refuse on the basis of the same considerations that guide all other treatment decisions: the potential benefits, risks, and discomfort of the treatment and the religious and cultural beliefs of the patients or surrogates. Although this agreement has never been universal, it is well established among ethicists,¹ clinicians,²⁻⁵ and the courts. For instance, the 1990 Supreme Court decision in the well-known case of Nancy Cruzan specifically stated that the administration of ANH without consent is an intrusion on personal liberty.⁶⁻¹¹

However, this agreement has faced recent challenges to its legitimacy. For instance, even though the cases of Terri Schiavo¹² and Robert Wendland¹³ were complicated by disagreements among family members, the cases also involved public questioning of the premise that decisions about ANH should be made in the same way in which decisions about other treatments are made. Similarly, a recent papal statement that strongly discourages the withdrawal of ANH from patients in a permanent vegetative state will have a profound effect on decisions about ANH if it is accepted into Catholic doctrine.^{14,15} Several states have made the withdrawal of ANH more difficult than the withdrawal of other forms of life-sustaining treatment.¹⁶

Clinicians also face substantial obstacles that prevent them from applying sound, ethical reasoning when discussing ANH with patients and families. For instance, patients and families are often not fully informed of the relevant risks and potential benefits of ANH.¹⁷ In addition, financial incentives and regulatory concerns promote the use of ANH in a manner that may be inconsistent with medical evidence and with the preferences of patients and their families.^{18,19} Finally, preferences about ANH may not be honored

after a patient is moved from one care setting to another.²⁰

It is not possible to prevent all disagreements about the use of ANH. But it is possible, and indeed it is essential, to clarify the principles that should underlie decisions about ANH and to ensure that these principles guide decisions in clinical practice. Therefore, in this article we examine the ethical principles that have guided the appropriate use of ANH during the past 20 years and recommend steps to promote clinical practices that are more consistent with these principles.

CLINICAL DECISIONS AND MEDICAL EVIDENCE

ANH is usually administered enterally through a nasogastric tube or a gastrostomy or jejunostomy tube that is placed with fluoroscopic or endoscopic guidance. ANH may also be administered parenterally through peripheral or central venous access. Hydration alone can also be provided by subcutaneous infusion.

ANH may improve survival among patients who are in a permanent vegetative state. These patients may live for 10 years or more with ANH but will die within weeks without nutritional support.²¹ Parenteral ANH can also prolong the lives of patients with extreme short-bowel syndrome,²² and tube feeding can improve the survival and quality of life of patients with bulbar amyotrophic lateral sclerosis.^{23,24} Finally, ANH may improve the survival of patients in the acute phase of a stroke or head injury^{25,26} and among patients receiving short-term critical care,²⁷ and it may improve the nutritional status of patients with advanced cancer who are undergoing intensive radiation therapy^{28,29} or who have proximal obstruction of the bowel.³⁰

There is less evidence of benefit when ANH is used for other indications. For instance, some studies suggest that ANH improves the survival rate among patients receiving chemotherapy,³¹

but other studies do not support this finding.^{32,33} Studies of the effect of ANH on complication rates after cancer surgery have also produced conflicting results.^{34,35} The bulk of the available evidence suggests that ANH does not improve the survival rate among patients with dementia.^{19,36-39}

ANH is associated with considerable risks. For instance, patients with advanced dementia who receive ANH through a gastrostomy tube are likely to be physically restrained and are at increased risk of aspiration pneumonia, diarrhea, gastrointestinal discomfort, and problems associated with feeding-tube removal by the patient.^{36,40-42} In addition, when a patient's renal function declines in the last days of life, ANH may cause choking due to increased oral and pulmonary secretions, dyspnea due to pulmonary edema, and abdominal discomfort due to ascites.

ETHICAL PRINCIPLES FOR DECISION MAKING

Because ANH is associated with uncertain benefits and substantial risks, it is essential to ensure that decisions about its use are consistent with the patient's medical condition, prognosis, and goals for care. Therefore, decisions about ANH require careful consideration of its risks and potential benefits.

Decisions about the use of ANH should be made in the same way in which decisions about other medical treatment are made. Many people believe that nutrition must always be offered, just as pain management, shelter, and basic personal care must be. This view is deeply rooted in cultural and religious beliefs.⁴³ It is often expressed with the use of the word "starvation"^{14,43-45} to describe the condition of a patient who does not receive ANH. Patients, families, and physicians are entitled to hold these beliefs, which are not easily set aside. However, to help patients and families make decisions about ANH, physicians should present the contrary view by emphasizing three key points.

First, physicians should emphasize that ANH is not a basic intervention that can be administered by anyone, as food is. ANH is a medical therapy administered for a medical indication (e.g., dysphagia) with the use of devices that are placed by trained personnel using technical procedures. ANH therefore has more in common with other surgical and medical procedures that require technical expertise than with measures such as sim-

ple feeding. Second, physicians should explain that unlike the provision of food or other forms of comfort (such as warmth or shelter), the procedures required for ANH and the subsequent administration of ANH are associated with uncertain benefits and considerable risks and discomfort.^{35,36} These factors need to be considered carefully before ANH is initiated. Finally, physicians should clarify that the goal of ANH is not to increase the patient's comfort. In fact, during the administration of high-quality palliative care, symptoms of hunger or thirst generally resolve in a short time or can be managed effectively (e.g., mouth dryness can be alleviated with ice chips) without the provision of ANH.⁴⁶⁻⁴⁸ Throughout the comprehensive informed-consent process for patients and families, physicians should explain the potential benefits of ANH for a patient, as well as its risks and discomfort and all relevant alternatives, just as they would for other health care decisions.^{8,49}

After this discussion, patients and families may remain convinced that ANH differs from other treatments. Beliefs about food and the associations concerning food are deep-seated, and in some cohorts and communities they are linked to historical or personal experiences with starvation (e.g., during the Holocaust or the Great Depression). Patients and families may decide to accept or refuse ANH on the basis of these beliefs. When physicians have beliefs about ANH⁵⁰ that prevent them from supporting the decision-making process of a patient and his or her family in an unbiased way, they should consider transferring the patient's care to another physician. Hospitals and health care facilities should support physicians in doing so.

WITHHOLDING OR WITHDRAWAL OF TREATMENT

Many people believe it is more acceptable to withhold a treatment than to withdraw it,⁵¹⁻⁵³ and one cannot discount the emotional burden that families in particular may feel when they believe that the withdrawal of treatment will allow a patient to die. This distinction is not supported, however, by currently accepted ethical and legal reasoning.^{1,49,54-57} In fact, a more cogent argument can usually be made for the withdrawal of ANH after it has been administered for a trial period if it has proved to be ineffective or if experience has provided more information about its risks and discomfort.

EVIDENCE OF PATIENT PREFERENCE

When a patient lacks the capacity to make decisions, a single surrogate (usually defined in a state law according to a hierarchy) should make choices on that patient's behalf on the basis of available evidence of the patient's preferences and values.⁵⁸ These decisions may be based on previous statements (either oral or written) by the patient or on a surrogate's knowledge of the patient. This standard of surrogate decision making has been widely supported in the law^{7,57-59} and among ethicists.^{49,60} In some states, however, a patient's advance directive must include a statement that the patient would not want ANH.^{16,57} This higher standard of evidence is inappropriate for two reasons.

First, decisions about ANH should not be held to a higher standard of evidence, because the balance of risks and potential benefits is, in most situations, no different for ANH than for many other medical treatments. For many patients, such as those with dementia, the balance may favor other interventions over ANH. Therefore, it is illogical to require a higher level of evidence in order to withhold or withdraw ANH than would be required for other medical treatments or procedures that offer a similar risk-benefit balance.

Second, a higher standard that requires specific evidence of a patient's preferences regarding ANH is not realistic. Although in its decision in the Cruzan case, the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of requiring clear and convincing evidence of a patient's preferences,⁸ any higher standard has proved to be very difficult to satisfy. Despite moderate increases in the prevalence of advance directives as a result of the Patient Self-Determination Act, most adults have not executed a written advance directive,⁶¹⁻⁶³ and even those who have may not have specified their preferences about ANH. Therefore, a higher evidentiary standard makes it harder for surrogates to make decisions that reflect a patient's goals and preferences. Furthermore, a higher standard is illogical because it would permit certain restraints on liberty — the imposition of ANH without consent — whereas impositions of other treatments are prohibited.

LACK OF ADVANCE DIRECTIVE

Although surrogates should make decisions on the basis of a patient's preferences, sometimes an advance directive is not available. In this situation, the patient cannot be assumed to want ANH. Indeed, there are a variety of reasons why patients

do not complete advance directives, including cultural concerns, lack of information, and reluctance to initiate discussions about advance directives.⁶⁴⁻⁶⁶ When a patient's preferences are unknown, surrogates must consider how a reasonable person with a cultural background, life experience, and worldview similar to the patient's would weigh the risks and potential benefits of ANH. This "reasonable person" standard often may be easier to apply than the related "best interest" standard, which requires surrogates to consider the difficult philosophical question of whether a decision that could result in death is in a patient's best interest.

Although only a minority of states explicitly permit the reasonable-person standard,⁵⁷ reasonable people often choose to forgo life-sustaining treatment if its discomfort outweighs its benefits⁶⁷⁻⁶⁹ or if those people perceive a health condition to be worse than death.^{68,70} The balance of risks and potential benefits for ANH may be less favorable than the balance for other treatments that surrogates refuse on a patient's behalf. Therefore, states that allow surrogates to make other health care decisions on the basis of a reasonable-person standard also should permit this standard for decisions about ANH.

PROVISION OF PALLIATIVE CARE

Patients who forgo ANH may experience hunger or thirst. Although hunger typically resolves after several days, thirst may persist.⁴⁶ Other symptoms attributable to the withholding or withdrawal of ANH include dry mouth, confusion and delirium, and diminished alertness.⁴⁶ Some of these symptoms (in particular, altered mental status) are part of dying and may occur during any progressive illness.⁷¹

When ANH is withheld or withdrawn, physicians should reassure patients and families that most of the resulting discomfort can be managed effectively.^{2-4,72} Altered mental status can often be prevented by environmental modifications (such as reducing noise at night and placing orientation cues in patients' rooms), and delirium can be treated pharmacologically.⁷¹ Thirst and mouth dryness can be alleviated with ice chips, a mouth rinse, or moistened swabs.⁴⁶ Evidence suggests that these and other interventions can help ensure a comfortable death.⁴⁸ All patients who forgo ANH should be offered comprehensive palliative care, including hospice.^{3,73} A comprehensive palliative care or hospice plan should address physical and psychological symptoms and should

include emotional and spiritual support as well as bereavement support for the family after the patient's death.⁷²

OBSTACLES TO ETHICAL DECISION MAKING

Despite general agreement about these ethical principles, their application to decisions about ANH at the bedside may encounter numerous obstacles. We propose the following five recommendations to help ensure that patients and their families retain the right to make decisions about ANH and that these decisions are supported at the bedside by health care providers, by the law, and by the health care system.

First, given the inadequacies in the typical informed-consent process for ANH,¹⁷ all clinicians need to be better able to engage patients and families in meaningful discussions. Medical educators should better prepare clinicians to engage in these and other difficult end-of-life discussions by emphasizing both the ethical principles that underlie decisions about ANH and effective communication techniques. Reimbursement for physicians will also need to be increased proportionally, because effective, comprehensive discussions about ANH are time-consuming.¹⁷ It will be important to ensure that physicians and other clinicians have access to thorough nutritional assessments for the patient and to effective decision aids.⁷⁴

Second, decision making about ANH in nursing homes should be shielded from financial and regulatory pressures. Although the loss of the ability to eat is an expected part of dementia, one third of cognitively impaired nursing-home residents have a feeding tube.⁷⁵ Nursing homes should not be reimbursed at a higher rate for residents who are receiving ANH than for those not receiving ANH,⁷⁶ since providing ANH costs less than feeding by hand.^{18,77} In addition, staff and surveyors should be informed that nursing homes should not be cited when a patient loses weight after a decision to forgo ANH.⁷⁸ Finally, publicly reported data on weight loss, which are available on the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services Web site,⁷⁹ should exclude data for residents whose weight loss is the result of a choice to forgo ANH.

Third, state laws should allow the same standard of evidence of a patient's preferences for decisions about ANH as they do for other deci-

sions. These laws should allow families to make reasoned and caring decisions on the patient's behalf if they are based on knowledge of the patient's values and preferences. If a patient's preferences are unknown, surrogates should be allowed to make decisions, in close collaboration with the patient's health care providers, that are guided by thoughtful judgments about what a reasonable person would choose. The Uniform Health-Care Decisions Act achieves most of these aims in a clear and thoughtful way and should be adopted by state legislatures.⁸⁰

Fourth, attorneys, physicians, and other health care providers should encourage and help patients to complete advance directives and to include preferences about ANH. Because decisions about ANH are often complicated by disagreements among family members, advance directives should also identify a decision maker. More generally, state laws should specify a hierarchy of decision makers to reduce the possibility of ambiguity and conflict among family members.

Fifth, health care facilities should ensure that preferences are respected in all health care settings. Problems with information transfer between institutions can affect all patients and are particularly common when nursing-home residents are transferred to a short-term care setting.²⁰ Nursing homes and hospitals should develop effective documentation strategies, such as Physician Orders for Life-Sustaining Treatment forms, which ensure that a patient's preferences are clearly documented and readily available to guide the patient's care.^{81,82}

CONCLUSIONS

Patients and families should be allowed to make decisions about ANH in an informed-consent process that is guided by well-established principles. Moreover, the right of the patients and their families to make independent decisions about ANH and other medical treatment should be defended against legal, financial, and administrative challenges at the bedside. A variety of stakeholders — including organizations of medical professionals, legal associations, and other health care organizations — will be needed to ensure this defense. Through advocacy activities, disease-based organizations can also help guarantee that all patients who forgo ANH receive high-quality, compassionate care near the end of life.⁸³

But efforts by individual organizations will

not be enough. In order to ensure that patients' preferences are respected and that obstacles to high-quality care are removed, these organizations will need to work together closely. Moreover, they will need to form partnerships with legislators, payers, and regulatory agencies to promote the five recommendations. More generally, efforts to facilitate decisions about ANH that are compassionate, ethically sound, and clinically reasonable need to be part of a larger agenda to improve care for all patients with serious illness.

No potential conflict of interest relevant to this article was reported.

We are indebted to the Artificial Nutrition and Hydration Working Group for its contributions to this article.

From the Center for Health Equity Research and Promotion, Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Philadelphia (D.C.); and the Center for Bioethics and Institute on Aging (D.C., J.K., A.C.), the Division of Geriatric Medicine and Department of Medicine (D.C., J.K.), and the Leonard Davis Institute of Health Economics (D.C., A.C.), University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

1. Beauchamp TL, Childress JF. Principles of biomedical ethics. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, 2001.
2. American Nurses Association. Position statement on foregoing nutrition and fluid. ANA Nursing World, April 2, 1992. (Accessed November 28, 2005, at <http://www.nursingworld.org/readroom/position/ethics/etnutr.htm>.)
3. Hospice and Palliative Nurses Association. Position statement on artificial nutrition and hydration. (Accessed November 28, 2005, at http://www.hpna.org/position_ArtificialNutrition.asp.)
4. American Academy of Hospice and Palliative Medicine. Statement on the use of nutrition and hydration. (Accessed November 28, 2005, at <http://www.aahpm.org/positions/nutrition.html>.)
5. McCann RM, Hall WJ, Groth-Juncker A. Comfort care for terminally ill patients: the appropriate use of nutrition and hydration. JAMA 1994;272:1263-6.
6. Wenger NS, Kanouse DE, Collins RL, et al. End-of-life discussions and preferences among persons with HIV. JAMA 2001; 285:2880-7.
7. Brophy v. New England Sinai Hospital, Inc. 398 Mass. 417 497 N.E. 2d 626, 632 (1986).
8. Cruzan v. Director, Missouri Department of Health, 110 S. Ct. 2841 (1990).
9. Barber v. Superior Court, 147 Cal App. 3d 1006 195 Cal Rptr. 484 (1983).
10. Meisel A. The right to die. New York: John Wiley, 1995.
11. Rabeneck L, McCullough LB, Wray NP. Ethically justified, clinically comprehensive guidelines for percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy tube placement. Lancet 1997;349:496-8.
12. Dresser R. Schiavo: a hard case makes questionable law. Hastings Cent Rep 2004;34(3):8-9.
13. Lo B, Dornbrand L, Wolf LE, Groman M. The Wendland case — withdrawing life support from incompetent patients who are not terminally ill. N Engl J Med 2002;346:1489-93.
14. Pope John Paul II. Address on life-sustaining treatments and vegetative state. (Accessed November 28, 2005, at http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/speeches/2004/march/documents/hf_jp-ii_spe_20040320_congress-fiamc_en.html.)
15. Shannon TA, Walter JJ. Implications of the Papal allocution on feeding tubes. Hastings Cent Rep 2004;34(4):18-20.
16. Sieger CE, Arnold JF, Ahronheim JC. Refusing artificial nutrition and hydration: does statutory law send the wrong message? J Am Geriatr Soc 2002;50:544-50.
17. Brett AS, Rosenberg JC. The adequacy of informed consent for placement of gastrostomy tubes. Arch Intern Med 2001;161: 745-8.
18. Mitchell SL. Financial incentives for placing feeding tubes in nursing home residents with advanced dementia. J Am Geriatr Soc 2003;51:129-31.
19. Gillick MR. Rethinking the role of tube feeding in patients with advanced dementia. N Engl J Med 2000;342:206-10.
20. Morrison RS, Olson E, Mertz KR, Meier DE. The inaccessibility of advance directives on transfer from ambulatory to acute care settings. JAMA 1995;274:478-82.
21. The Multi-Society Task Force on PVS. Medical aspects of the persistent vegetative state (first of two parts). N Engl J Med 1994;330:1499-508.
22. Scolapio JS, Fleming CR, Kelly D, Wick DM, Zinsmeister AR. Survival of home parenteral nutrition-treated patients: 20 years of experience at the Mayo Clinic. Mayo Clin Proc 1999;74:217-22.
23. Mazzini L, Corra T, Zaccala M, Mora G, Del Piano M, Galante M. Percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy and enteral nutrition in amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. J Neurol 1995;242:695-8.
24. Miller RG. Examining the evidence about treatment in ALS/MND. Amyotroph Lateral Scler Other Motor Neuron Disord 2001;2:3-7.
25. Rapp RP, Young B, Twyman D, et al. The favorable effect of early parenteral feeding on survival in head-injured patients. J Neurosurg 1983;58:906-12.
26. Wanklyn P, Cox N, Belfield P. Outcome in patients who require a gastrostomy after stroke. Age Ageing 1995;24:510-4.
27. Martin CM, Doig GS, Heyland DK, Morrison T, Sibbald WJ. Multicentre, cluster-randomized clinical trial of algorithms for critical-care enteral and parenteral therapy (ACCEPT). CMAJ 2004;170:197-204.
28. Lee JH, Machtay M, Unger LD, et al. Prophylactic gastrostomy tubes in patients undergoing intensive irradiation for cancer of the head and neck. Arch Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg 1998; 124:871-5.
29. Daly JM, Hearne B, Dunaj J, et al. Nutritional rehabilitation in patients with advanced head and neck cancer receiving radiation therapy. Am J Surg 1984;148:514-20.
30. Senkal M, Zumtobel V, Bauer KH, et al. Outcome and cost-effectiveness of perioperative enteral immunonutrition in patients undergoing elective upper gastrointestinal tract surgery: a prospective randomized study. Arch Surg 1999;134:1309-16.
31. Yamada N, Koyama H, Hioki K, Yamada T, Yamamoto M. Effect of postoperative total parenteral nutrition (TPN) as an adjunct to gastrectomy for advanced gastric carcinoma. Br J Surg 1983;70:267-74.
32. Shamberger RC, Brennan MF, Goodgame JT Jr, et al. A prospective, randomized study of adjuvant parenteral nutrition in the treatment of sarcomas: results of metabolic and survival studies. Surgery 1984;96:1-13.
33. Popp MB, Fisher RI, Wesley R, Aamodt R, Brennan MF. A prospective randomized study of adjuvant parenteral nutrition in the treatment of advanced diffuse lymphoma: influence on survival. Surgery 1981;90:195-203.
34. Daly JM, Weintraub FN, Shou J, Rosato EF, Lucia M. Enteral nutrition during multimodality therapy in upper gastrointestinal cancer patients. Ann Surg 1995;221:327-38.
35. Brennan MF, Pisters PW, Posner M, Quesada O, Shike M. A prospective randomized trial of total parenteral nutrition after major pancreatic resection for malignancy. Ann Surg 1994;220: 436-41.
36. Finucane TE, Christmas C, Travis K. Tube feeding in patients with advanced dementia: a review of the evidence. JAMA 1999;282:1365-70.
37. Mitchell SL, Kiely DK, Lipsitz LA. Does artificial enteral nutrition prolong the survival of institutionalized elders with chewing and swallowing problems? J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci 1998;53:M207-M213.
38. Meier DE, Ahronheim JC, Morris J, Baskin-Lyons S, Morrison RS. High short-term mortality in hospitalized patients with advanced dementia: lack of benefit of tube feeding. Arch Intern Med 2001;161:594-9.

39. Post SG. Tube feeding and advanced progressive dementia. *Hastings Cent Rep* 2001;31(1):36-42.
40. Callahan CM, Haag KM, Weinberger M, et al. Outcomes of percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy among older adults in a community setting. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2000;48:1048-54.
41. Ciocon JO, Silverstone FA, Graver LM, Foley CJ. Tube feedings in elderly patients: indications, benefits, and complications. *Arch Intern Med* 1988;148:429-33.
42. Odom SR, Barone JE, Docimo S, Bull SM, Jorgensson D. Emergency department visits by demented patients with malfunctioning feeding tubes. *Surg Endosc* 2003;17:651-3.
43. Helman C. Culture, health, and illness. 4th ed. Oxford, England: Butterworth-Heinemann, 2000.
44. Callahan D. On feeding the dying. *Hastings Cent Rep* 1983;13(5):22.
45. Ahronheim JC, Gasner MR. The sloganism of starvation. *Lancet* 1990;335:278-9.
46. Viola RA, Wells GA, Peterson J. The effects of fluid status and fluid therapy on the dying: a systematic review. *J Palliat Care* 1997;13(4):41-52.
47. Pasma HR, Onwuteaka-Philipsen BD, Kriegsman DM, Ooms ME, Ribbe MW, van der Wal G. Discomfort in nursing home patients with severe dementia in whom artificial nutrition and hydration is forgone. *Arch Intern Med* 2005;165:1729-35.
48. Ganzini L, Goy ER, Miller LL, Harvath TA, Jackson A, Delorit MA. Nurses' experiences with hospice patients who refuse food and fluids to hasten death. *N Engl J Med* 2003;349:359-65.
49. President's Commission for the Study of Ethical Problems in Medicine and Biomedical and Behavioral Research. Making health care decisions: a report on the ethical and legal implications of informed consent in the patient-practitioner relationship. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1982.
50. Hodges MO, Tolle SW, Stocking C, Cassel CK. Tube feeding: internists' attitudes regarding ethical obligations. *Arch Intern Med* 1994;154:1013-20.
51. Grubb A, Walsh P, Lambe N, Murrells T, Robinson S. Survey of British clinicians' views on management of patients in persistent vegetative state. *Lancet* 1996;348:35-40.
52. Faber-Langendoen K. The clinical management of dying patients receiving mechanical ventilation: a survey of physician practice. *Chest* 1994;106:880-8.
53. The Society of Critical Care Medicine Ethics Committee. Attitudes of critical care medicine professionals concerning forgoing life-sustaining treatments. *Crit Care Med* 1992;20:320-6.
54. American College of Chest Physicians/Society of Critical Care Medicine Consensus Panel. Ethical and moral guidelines for the initiation, continuation, and withdrawal of intensive care. *Chest* 1990;97:949-58.
55. Withholding and withdrawing life-sustaining therapy: this official statement of the American Thoracic Society was adopted by the ATS Board of Directors, March 1991. *Am Rev Respir Dis* 1991;144:726-31.
56. Task Force on Ethics of the Society of Critical Care Medicine. Consensus report on the ethics of foregoing life-sustaining treatments in the critically ill. *Crit Care Med* 1990;18:1435-9.
57. Meisel A, Cerminara KL. The right to die: the law of end-of-life decisionmaking. 3rd ed. New York: Aspen, 2004.
58. *In re Conroy*, 486 A.2d 1209 (NJ 1985).
59. Superintendent of Belchertown State School vs. Saikewicz. *Mass.* 370 NE 2d 417 (1977).
60. Buchanan AE, Brock DW. Deciding for others: the ethics of surrogate decision making. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
61. Morrison RS, Meier DE. High rates of advance care planning in New York City's elderly population. *Arch Intern Med* 2004;164:2421-6.
62. Teno JM, Branco KJ, Mor V, et al. Changes in advance care planning in nursing homes before and after the Patient Self-Determination Act: report of a 10-state survey. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 1997;45:939-44.
63. Molloy DW, Guyatt GH, Russo R, et al. Systematic implementation of an advance directive program in nursing homes: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA* 2000;283:1437-44.
64. Hofmann JC, Wenger NS, Davis RB, et al. Patient preferences for communication with physicians about end-of-life decisions. *Ann Intern Med* 1997;127:1-12.
65. Tulskey JA, Fischer GS, Rose MR, Arnold RM. Opening the black box: how do physicians communicate about advance directives? *Ann Intern Med* 1998;129:441-9.
66. Morrison RS, Zayas LH, Mulvihill M, Baskin SA, Meier DE. Barriers to completion of health care proxies: an examination of ethnic differences. *Arch Intern Med* 1998;158:2493-7.
67. Fried TR, Bradley EH, Towle VR, Allore H. Understanding the treatment preferences of seriously ill patients. *N Engl J Med* 2002;346:1061-6.
68. Hakim RB, Teno JM, Harrell FE Jr, et al. Factors associated with do-not-resuscitate orders: patients' preferences, prognoses, and physicians' judgments. *Ann Intern Med* 1996;125:284-93.
69. Happ MB, Capezuti E, Strumpf NE, et al. Advance care planning and end-of-life care for hospitalized nursing home residents. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2002;50:829-35.
70. Patrick DL, Starks HE, Cain KC, Uhlmann RF, Pearlman RA. Measuring preferences for health states worse than death. *Med Decis Making* 1994;14:9-18.
71. Casarett DJ, Inouye SK. Diagnosis and management of delirium near the end of life. *Ann Intern Med* 2001;135:32-40.
72. National Consensus Project for Quality Palliative Care. Clinical practice guidelines for quality palliative care. (Accessed November 28, 2005, at <http://www.nationalconsensusproject.org>.)
73. World Health Organization. WHO definition of palliative care. (Accessed November 28, 2005, at <http://www.who.int/cancer/palliative/definition/en/>.)
74. Mitchell SL, Tetroe J, O'Connor AM. A decision aid for long-term tube feeding in cognitively impaired older persons. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2001;49:313-6.
75. Mitchell SL, Teno JM, Roy J, Kabumoto G, Mor V. Clinical and organizational factors associated with feeding tube use among nursing home residents with advanced cognitive impairment. *JAMA* 2003;290:73-80.
76. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. Description of the RUG-III classification system. (Accessed November 28, 2005, at <http://www.cms.hhs.gov/medicaid/reports/rp1201-g.pdf>.)
77. Mitchell SL, Buchanan JL, Littlehale S, Hamel MB. Tube-feeding versus hand-feeding nursing home residents with advanced dementia: a cost comparison. *J Am Med Dir Assoc* 2004;5:Suppl 2:S22-S29.
78. Meisel A. Barriers to forgoing nutrition and hydration in nursing homes. *Am J Law Med* 1995;21:335-82.
79. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. Nursing home compare. (Accessed November 28, 2005, at <http://www.medicare.gov/NHCompare>.)
80. Uniform Health-Care Decisions Act. Presented at the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, Kansas City, Mo., July 30–August 6, 1993. (Accessed November 28, 2005, at <http://www.law.upenn.edu/bll/ulc/fnact99/1990s/uhcda93.pdf>.)
81. Tolle SW, Tilden VP, Nelson CA, Dunn PM. A prospective study of the efficacy of the physician order form for life-sustaining treatment. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 1998;46:1097-102.
82. Physician Orders for Life-Sustaining Treatment (POLST) Program, 2005. (Accessed November 28, 2005, at <http://www.ohsu.edu/ethics/polst/>.)
83. Casarett DJ, Karlawish JH, Byock I. Advocacy and activism: missing pieces in the quest to improve end-of-life care. *J Palliat Med* 2002;5:3-12.

Copyright © 2005 Massachusetts Medical Society.