



**VŠEOBECNÁ FAKULTNÍ
NEMOCNICE V PRAZE**






**1. LÉKAŘSKÁ
FAKULTA**
Univerzita Karlova

**Cardiac Rhythm Conversions
and the Outcome
In Refractory Out-of-Hospital Cardiac Arrest:
Extracorporeal Versus Conventional
Resuscitation**

Š.Havránek, J. Neuhofer, M. Veselá, P. Kaválková, D. Rob,
Z. Fingrová, J. Šmalcová, O. Franěk, M. Huptych, M. Dusík,
J. Pudil, V. Weiss, A. Linhart, J. Bělohlávek

Shockable and Non-shockable rhythms



Outcomes and Initial Heart Rhythm


Post-hoc analysis of Prague OHCA trial

Prague OHCA trial

Randomization

Sustained ROSC

Final approach



	No. (%)		Absolute difference, % (95% CI)	P value
	Invasive strategy (n = 124)	Standard strategy (n = 132)		
Primary outcome				
Survival with minimal or no neurologic impairment at 180 d ^a	39 (31.5)	29 (22.0)	9.5 (−1.3 to 20.1)	.09
Secondary outcomes				
Survival with minimal or no neurologic impairment at 30 d ^a	38 (30.6)	24 (18.2)	12.4 (1.9 to 22.7)	.02
Cardiac recovery at 30 d ^b	54 (43.5)	45 (34.1)	9.4 (−2.5 to 21)	.12

Baseline clinical and demographical data

Initial rhythm	VF (n = 156)	PEA (n = 45)	Asystole (n = 55)	P
Age (years)	56 (45-64)	62 (54; 66)	58 (47; 69)	0.07
Gender (Male)	141 (90 %)	31 (69 %)	40 (73 %)	0.0003
Bystander CPR	154 (99 %)	44 (98 %)	54 (98 %)	0.89
Dispatcher assisted CPR	133 (85 %)	24 (53 %)	46 (84 %)	<0.0001
Randomized to				
Standard	84 (54 %)	24 (53 %)	24 (44 %)	0.41
Invasive	72 (46 %)	21 (47 %)	31 (56 %)	
Time of CPR (time to ROSC or ECLS) (min)	54 (33; 69)	50 (42; 68)	56 (37; 67)	0.62
Declared death	33 (21 %)	20 (44 %)	22 (40 %)	0.0015
Prehospital	20/33 (61 %)	12/20 (60 %)	14/22 (64 %)	0.009
Within 1 hour of admission	13/33 (39 %)	8/20 (40 %)	8/22 (36 %)	0.15
ECLS implanted	57 (37 %)	17 (38 %)	18 (33 %)	0.85
Laboratory values on admission				
pH	7.00 (6.87-7.17)	6.85 (6.75; 6.97)	6.85 (6.77; 6.99)	<0.0001
Lactate (mmol/L)	10.7 (7.8-13.8)	13.1 (11.1; 17.0)	13.9 (8.9; 18.0)	0.001
Cause of cardiac arrest (including autopsy findings)				
Acute coronary syndrome	89 (57 %)	15 (33 %)	23 (42 %)	<0.0001
Chronic coronary artery disease	29 (19 %)	1 (2 %)	2 (4 %)	
Pulmonary embolism	1 (1 %)	15 (33 %)	8 (15 %)	
Chronic heart failure	8 (5 %)	2 (4 %)	4 (7 %)	
Cardiomyopathy	7 (5 %)	1 (2 %)	1 (2 %)	
Unknown	6 (4 %)	3 (7 %)	6 (11 %)	
Primary endpoint	63 (40 %)	3 (7 %)	2 (4 %)	<0.0001

Primary and secondary endpoints


INVASIVE

STANDARD / CONVENTIONAL

Initial rhythm	Shockable (N = 72)	Non-shockable (N = 52)	P	Shockable (N = 84)	Non-shockable (N = 48)	P
Primary outcome						
Survival with CPC at 180 days						
1 or 2	35 (49 %)	4 (8 %)	<0.001	28 (33 %)	1 (2 %)	<0.001
≥3	37 (51 %)	48 (92 %)		56 (67 %)	47 (98 %)	
Secondary outcomes						
Cardiac recovery at 30 days						
Yes	43 (60 %)	11 (21 %)	<0.001	41 (49 %)	4 (8 %)	<0.001
No	29 (40 %)	41 (79 %)		43 (51 %)	44 (92 %)	
Neuro recovery at 30d days						
Yes	34 (47 %)	4 (8 %)	<0.001	24 (29 %)	0 (0 %)	<0.001
No	38 (53 %)	48 (92 %)		60 (17 %)	48 (100 %)	

Heart rhythms could change

Longer CPR – higher rate of rhythm change



Shockable → Non-shockable Rhythm

The role of treatment strategy Invasive / ECPR vs. Standard / Conventional

	Intention to treat			As treated		
Treatment arm	Invasive (N = 72)	Standard (N = 84)	P	Invasive (N = 80)	Standard (N = 76)	P
Ongoing VF (all other rhythms excluded)	7/20 (35 %)	1/8 (13 %)	0.48	8/22 (36 %)	0/6 (0 %)	0.2
VF + ROSC anytime (non-shockable intermittent rhythms included)	26/34 (76 %)	24/50 (48 %)	0.02	27/36 (75 %)	23/48 (48 %)	0.02
VF + ROSC anytime (non-shockable intermittent rhythms excluded)	18/20 (86 %)	17/29 (59 %)	0.03	19/21 (91 %)	16/28 (57 %)	0.02
VF → last rhythm ROSC (non-shockable intermittent rhythms excluded)	15/16 (94 %)	17/28 (61 %)	0.04	16/17 (94 %)	16/27 (59 %)	0.02
VF + PEA anytime (asystole excluded)	7/16 (44 %)	8/24 (33 %)	0.74	9/19 (47 %)	6/21 (29 %)	0.37
VF + last rhythm PEA (asystole excluded)	3/6 (50 %)	1/11 (9 %)	0.2	4/8 (50 %)	0/9 (0 %)	0.06
VF + asystole anytime (PEA included)	3/16 (19 %)	2/23 (9 %)	0.65	4/18 (22 %)	1/21 (5 %)	0.25
VF + last rhythm asystole (PEA included)	0/7 (0 %)	0/17 (0 %)	x	0/7 (0 %)	0/17 (0 %)	x

CPC 1, 2 / all patients

Non-shockable Rhythms

Prague OHCA trial data

Initial Rhythm	PEA (<i>n</i> = 45)	Asystole (<i>n</i> = 55)	<i>p</i>
No rhythm change	15 (33%)	17 (31%)	Not significant
Rhythm change	30 (67%)	38 (69%)	
Intermittent rhythm			
ROSC	11 (24%)	4 (7%)	0.008
Asystole ^a	2 (4%)	38 (100%)	
VF	8 (18%)	13 (24%)	
PEA ^a	30 (100%)	2 (4%)	
Last rhythm			
ROSC	6 (13%)	16 (29%)	0.0002
Asystole	12 (27%)	29 (53%)	
VF	5 (11%)	2 (4%)	
PEA	22 (49%)	8 (15%)	

Out of all non-shockable patients, CPC 1, 2 was achieved in 5 cases.

Non-shockable Rhythms

Prague OHCA trial data

Patient No	1	2	3	4	5
Age (years)	35	45	66	58	68
Gender	Male	Female	Male	Male	Male
Bystander CPR	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Time from collapse to EMS (min)	4	Collapse after EMS arrival		10	9
Randomized to	Invasive	Invasive	Invasive	Invasive	Standard
Time of CPR	50	34	49	49	28
Initial rhythm	EMD	EMD	EMD	Asystole	Asystole
Rhythm profile	EMD →VF →EMD →ROSC	EMD →ROSC	EMD →ECLS	Asystole →VF →ROSC	Asystole →ROSC →BRADY →ROSC
Sustained ROSC on admission	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Time to hospital admission (min)	45	34	39	63	61
ECLS implanted	No	No	Yes	No	No
Cause of cardiac arrest (including autopsy findings)	Cardiomyopathy	Pulmonary embolism	Most likely myocardial infarction	Chronic heart failure	Aortic valve stenosis

Prognostic Role of Rhythms – Cox Regression Analyses

Model	Model A (Parameters Available During Ongoing CPR, $n = 256$)		Model B (Parameters After Initial In-Hospital Evaluation, $n = 156$)	
	HR (95% CI)	p	HR (95% CI)	p
Age ≥ 65 yr	1.09 (0.79–1.5)	0.61	0.94 (0.64–1.37)	0.76
Sex = woman	0.92 (0.64–1.34)	0.68	1.19 (0.77–1.86)	0.43
Telephone assisted bystander CPR = yes	0.91 (0.64–1.28)	0.58	0.84 (0.57–1.23)	0.37
Length CPR > 45 min = yes	–	–	1.85 (1.11–3.08)	0.02
Acute coronary syndrome = yes	–	–	0.92 (0.66–1.3)	0.65
ROSC anytime = yes	0.39 (0.28–0.53)	< 0.0001	–	–
Asystole anytime = yes	2.43 (1.79–3.3)	< 0.0001	–	–
Sustained ROSC at admission = yes	–	–	0.55 (0.32–0.93)	0.02
Asystole at admission = yes	–	–	2.37 (1.53–3.69)	0.0001

Conclusions

Conclusions

The post-initial rhythm profile could more precisely identify an outcome in refractory OHCA patients.

Deterioration of the initial shockable rhythm to asystole has a poor prognosis, even when ECPR is readily available.

An **ECPR-based approach seems beneficial** in patients with **ongoing VF** and **regular electrical activity**.

An **initial non-shockable rhythm** has an inauspicious prognosis, and a conversion to a shockable rhythm does not seem to improve outcomes.

CLINICAL INVESTIGATION

OPEN

Cardiac Rhythm Conversions and the Outcome in Refractory Out-of-Hospital Cardiac Arrest: Extracorporeal Versus Conventional Resuscitation

OBJECTIVES: A Prague out-of-hospital cardiac arrest (OHCA) study has demonstrated that an invasive approach (early transport to the hospital, extracorporeal cardiopulmonary resuscitation [ECPR]) is a feasible and effective treatment strategy in refractory OHCA. This post hoc analysis of the Prague OHCA study aimed to stratify the prognosis of patients according to the detailed course of heart rhythm during prehospital and early hospital periods.

DESIGN, SETTING, AND PATIENTS: This analysis included all 256 patients (median age 58, 17% females) randomized to the Prague OHCA study. The sequence of heart rhythms during the prehospital period was analyzed in terms of neurologic outcomes after 180 days. The primary outcome was a composite of survival with Cerebral Performance Category 1 or 2 at 180 days.

INTERVENTIONS: None.

MEASUREMENTS AND MAIN RESULTS: Within the study cohort, 156 (61%) manifested ventricular fibrillation (VF), 45 pulseless electrical activity, and 55 asystole as the initial rhythm. Patients with an initial VF who reached a sus-

Stepan Havranek¹, MD, PhD¹

Jakub Neuhöfer¹

Michaela Vesela, MD¹

Petra Kavalkova, PhD¹

Daniel Rob, MD, PhD¹

Zdenka Fingrova, MSc, PhD¹

Jana Smalcova, MD¹

Ondrej Franek, MD²

Michal Huptych, MSc, PhD³

Milan Dusik, MD, PhD¹

Jan Pudil, MD¹

Vojtech Weiss, MD¹

Ales Linhart, MD, PhD¹

Jan Belohlavek, MD, PhD¹

Thank you!