This is a Sample version of the

The Delirium Rating Scale-Revised-98 (DRS-R-98)

The **full version** of the The Delirium Rating Scale-Revised-98 (DRS-R-98) comes without 'sample' watermark

.

The full complete version includes –

- Review
- Scoring Guide
- Test/ ScoreSheet

Buy full version here - Buy now **for $6.00**

Once you have paid for your item you will receive a direct link to download your full complete e-book instantly. You will also receive an email with a link to download your e-book. Each purchased product you order is available to download for 24 hours from time of purchase.

The Delirium Rating Scale-Revised-98 (DRS-R-98)

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR USE OF THE DRS-R-98

The Delirium Rating Scale-Revised-98 (DRS-R-98) is a 16-item clinician-rated scale with two sections and a score sheet. The 13-item severity section can be scored separately from the 3-item diagnostic section; their sum constitutes the total scale score. The severity section functions as a separate scale for repeated measures at short intervals within an episode of delirium. The total scale can be scored initially to enhance differential diagnosis by capturing characteristic features of delirium, such as acute onset and fluctuation of symptom severity. Concomitant use of diagnostic criteria such as from the International Classification of Disease (ICD)-10 Research Manual or versions of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (DSM) will enhance its ability to measure delirium when demented patients are involved because the DRS-R-98 is mostly a severity scale.

All items are anchored by text descriptions as guides for rating along a continuum from normal to severely impaired. Severity items are rated from 0 to 3 points and diagnostic items from 0 to either 2 or 3 points. The scoresheet offers space to circle item ratings and to optionally note characteristics of symptoms (e.g., type of hallucination) or the condition of patients during the ratings (e.g., restrained).

Though designed to be rated by psychiatrists, other physicians, nurses, and psychologists can use it if they have had appropriate clinical training in evaluating psychiatric phenomenology in medically ill patients. It can be used in research or comprehensive clinical evaluations. It does require enough clinical expertise to distinguish, for example, language problems from thought process abnormalities or delusions from confabulation. Even with sufficient clinical expertise, at times it may be difficult to make certain distinctions and more than one item may need to be rated to reflect that presentation (e.g., Wernicke's aphasia and severe loose associations).

The DRS-R-98 can be used in conjunction with the Delirium Rating Scale (DRS) for certain research purposes because they differ substantially in descriptions of items. For example, the DRS may be more helpful for patients emerging from stupor.

The DRS-R-98 measures symptoms without regard to cause. Thus, preexisting conditions may add points, for example, dysphasia will affect the language item. However, longitudinal ratings will clarify effects of preexisiting conditions after the delirium has cleared. The inclusion of mentally retarded and Cognitive Disorder Not Otherwise Specified subjects during the validation study suggests that delirium can still be reliably assessed in the presence of such confounds.

All sources of available information are used to rate the patient—family, visitors, hospital staff, doctors, medical chart, and so on. Even a hospital roommate can contribute information. During interviews for such collateral information, ensure that terms used are mutually understood before accepting others' interpretation of symptoms.

Any time frame can be chosen for the DRS-R-98. Time frames greater than 24 hours are probably not necessary as this coincides with circadian rhythms and their possible disruptions. Shorter periods (e.g., 4 to 12 hours) may be helpful for intervention assessment—either for clinical or research purposes—though the fluctuating nature of symptom severity may need to be considered when interpreting the scores. Choosing periods less than 2 hours risks not adequately capturing some items (e.g., hallucinations, sleep-wake cycle disturbance) that occur intermittently. In such circumstances, a researcher may wish to use a smaller subset of items to monitor the patient, though such a subscale has not been validated.

Some items are rated based on examination and history, while others incorporate formal testing (e.g., cognitive and language items). It may be useful for a given clinician to standardize the questions used routinely in his/her practice, for example, asking months of the year backwards for attention, clockface or puzzle pieces for visuospatial ability, and par- ticular items for confrontational naming. Adjunctive use of the Cognitive Test for Delirium (CTD) or some of its items offers the advantage of not needing the patient to write or speak. Evaluation of general information included in the long- term memory item should be geared appropriately to the educational and cultural background of the patient.

When both interview behavior and formally elicited responses are used, the relative contribution of each needs to be weighed by the clinician and a scoring judgment needs to be made. For example, on the attention item a patient has difficulty with reciting months of the year backwards but attends fairly well during the interview, or on long-term memory a patient recalls personal remote information accurately, but cannot recall well on formal testing of three words after 15 minutes.

Despite text descriptions for each item rating, the rater may need to exercise judgment in scoring. At times an inter- mediate rating with a 0.5 point interval may be needed (e.g., 2.5 points) if the rater cannot decide between two choices. Also, the time frame chosen may affect how to weigh the presence of certain symptoms. For example, a patient who has periods of intense hyperactivity and hypoactivity in a 24-hour period would be rated as "3" on both items #7 and 8. If this same patient is rated for a shorter interval that only involved hyperactivity, then item #7 would be rated as "3" and item
#8 would be "0".

In cases where an item cannot be rated at all, the rater should make a notation on the score sheet and decide later how to handle that item's scoring. If used for research, a statistical consultant may have to advise. If used clinically, altering the denominator of the maximum possible score may be acceptable.

DELIRIUM RATING SCALE-R-98 (DRS-R-98)

This is a revision of the Delirium Rating Scale (Trzepacz et al. 1988). It is used for initial assessment and repeated measurements of delirium symptom severity. The sum of the 13 item scores provides a severity score. All available sources of information are used to rate the items (nurses, family, chart) in addition to examination of the patient. For serial repeated ratings of delirium severity, reasonable time frames should be chosen between ratings to document meaningful changes because delirium symptom severity can fluctuate without interven- tions.

DRS-R-98 SEVERITY SCALE

1. Sleep-wake cycle disturbance
Rate sleep-wake pattern using all sources of information, including from family, caregivers, nurses' reports, and patient. Try to distinguish sleep from resting with eyes closed.

0. Not present
1. Mild sleep continuity disturbance at night or occasional drowsiness during the day
2. Moderate disorganization of sleep-wake cycle (e.g., falling asleep during conversations, napping during the day or several brief awakenings during the night with confusion/behavioral changes or very little nighttime sleep)
3. Severe disruption of sleep-wake cycle (e.g., day-night reversal of sleep-wake cycle or severe circadian fragmentation with multiple periods of sleep and wakefulness or severe sleeplessness.)

2. Perceptual disturbances and hallucinations
Illusions and hallucinations can be of any sensory modality. Misperceptions are "simple" if they are uncomplicated, such as a sound, noise, color, spot, or flashes and ''complex'' if they are multidimensional, such as voices, music, people, animals, or scenes. Rate if reported by patient or caregiver, or inferred by observation.

0. Not present
1. Mild perceptual disturbances (e.g., feelings of derealization or depersonalization; or patient may not be able to discriminate dreams from reality)
2. Illusions present
3. Hallucinations present

3.Delusions
Delusions can be of any type, but are most often persecutory. Rate if reported by patient, family or caregiver. Rate as delusional if ideas are unlikely to be true yet are believed by the patient who cannot be dissuaded by logic. Delusional ideas cannot be explained otherwise by the patient's usual cultural or religious background.

0. Not present
1. Mildly suspicious, hypervigilant, or preoccupied
2. Unusual or overvalued ideation that does not reach delusional proportions or could be plausible
3. Delusional

4. Lability of affect
Rate the patient's affect as the outward presentation of emotions and not as a description of what the patient feels.

0. Not present
1. Affect somewhat altered or incongruent to situation; changes over the course of hours; emotions are mostly under self-control
2. Affect is often inappropriate to the situation and intermittently changes over the course of minutes; emotions are not consistently under self-control, though they respond to redirection by others
3. Severe and consistent disinhibition of emotions; affect changes rapidly, is inappropriate to context, and does not respond to redi-rection by others

5. Language
Rate abnormalities of spoken, written or sign language that cannot be otherwise attributed to dialect or stuttering. Assess fluency, grammar, comprehension, semantic content and naming. Test comprehension and naming nonverbally if necessary by having patient follow com-mands or point.

0. Normal language
1. Mild impairment including word-finding difficulty or problems with naming or fluency
2. Moderate impairment including comprehension difficulties or deficits in meaningful communication (semantic content)
3. Severe impairment including nonsensical semantic content, word salad, muteness, or severely reduced comprehension