

## Clinical Summary

### Significantly improved ROSC rates in the Emergency Department using LUCAS chest compressions, a team-focused resuscitation strategy and video-reviews

Rolston, DM, Li T, Owens C, et al. Mechanical, team-focused, video-reviewed cardiopulmonary resuscitation improves return of spontaneous circulation after emergency department implementation. *J Am Heart Assoc.* 2020;9:e014420. DOI: 10.1161/JAHA.119.014420

#### Aim

To evaluate cardiac arrest outcomes before and after initiation of mechanical CPR using the LUCAS device, a team-focused nurse-led Advanced Cardiac Life Support (ALS) strategy as well as video-review of the CPR intervention (MTV-CPR) in the Emergency Department.

**Primary outcome:** The return of spontaneous circulation rate before and after the implementation of MTV-CPR.

**Secondary outcomes:** Survival to admission and discharge.

#### Method

Emergency department staff at North Shore University Hospital started to use the LUCAS® chest compression system, adopted a new team-focused strategy with nurse-led ALS, and performed a multidisciplinary biweekly video review of resuscitations.

The team implemented:

- personalised feedback based on video review for those placing the LUCAS device on patients
- new assignment of roles for an eight-person response team during resuscitation efforts
- a coordinated transition method for technicians to go from manual to mechanical CPR to reduce interruption to CPR

“Our data support the benefit of actively reviewing and improving on real-world CPR techniques to save peoples' lives. When we saw a problem, we developed new protocols to overcome each challenge.”

Lance Becker, MD

#### Results

- A total of 248 patients were included in the study; 97 before and 151 after implementation of MTV-CPR.
- ROSC was significantly higher after the implementation of MTV-CPR (41% versus 26%;  $P=0.014$ ).
- These findings were consistent for both out-of-hospital cardiac arrest patients (21.9% preintervention versus 33.9% postintervention) and patients with in-hospital cardiac arrest (37.5% preintervention versus 58.5% postintervention)
- After controlling for covariates, the odds of return of spontaneous circulation remained higher with MTV-CPR than before (odds ratio, 2.11; 95% CI, 1.14–3.89).
- There were nonsignificant increases in survival to admission (26% versus 20%;  $P=0.257$ ) and survival to discharge (7% versus 3%;  $P=0.163$ ). Median chest compression fraction was 88%.
- The video review revealed interruption in chest compressions secondary to successful LUCAS device placement was a median of 50 seconds. This was a sum of all device-related interruptions during the resuscitation event; interruptions at back plate placement, at upper part application, and in some cases interruptions due to a need of repositioning of the device, and in rare cases stops to operation due to e.g. battery depleted.<sup>1</sup>
- The video revealed a median interruption in chest compressions secondary to EMS to ED bed transfer of 5 seconds, and at each defibrillation attempt of 20 seconds.

#### Conclusions

Implementation of mechanical CPR using the LUCAS device, a team-focused strategy and video-reviewed CPR intervention for cardiac arrest patients in the emergency department significantly improved return of spontaneous circulation rates. Survival to hospital admission and discharge did not improve significantly.

## Discussion points

- This study shows that mechanical CPR using the LUCAS device, a team-focused approach with clearly defined tasks and roles, as well as implementing regular performance review using video recordings and training sessions can significantly improve the rate of successful resuscitation outcomes in the emergency care department.
- Having a clear strategy when and how to apply the LUCAS device is important. In this study, the LUCAS device was applied after first or second pause in chest compressions for pulse checks. This approach focuses on and minimises delays to defibrillation in VF patients, who have the highest chance to respond to the early defibrillations.
- Interruptions to CPR should be minimised. In this study two ED technicians coordinated manual CPR and LUCAS device placement on each patient with cardiac arrest, being new to the device initially. The video review showed the sum of all interruptions during the use of LUCAS device over resuscitation events was a median of 50 seconds. This time summed up all pauses including both device application and stops during use. The study authors commented that they are initiating a quality improvement to reduce interruptions.
- One agency has, in a different publication, demonstrated that a quality improvement program can reduce interruptions in chest compressions due to LUCAS device placement from 21 to 7 seconds in the prehospital setting.<sup>2</sup> Another publication from a hospital trial found that the interruptions due to the application of the LUCAS back plate and upper part were typically less than 10 seconds each.<sup>3</sup>

“Enhanced resuscitation education has the potential to improve patient outcomes as much as any new scientific breakthroughs in the field.”

Cheng A, Nadkarni VM, Mancini MB, et al. Resuscitation education science: educational strategies to improve outcomes from cardiac arrest: a scientific statement from the American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 2018;138:e82–e122.

## References

1. Correspondence with the author Daniel M Rolston
2. Levy M, Yost D, Walker RG, et al. A quality improvement initiative to optimize use of a mechanical chest compression device within a high-performance CPR approach to out-of-hospital cardiac arrest resuscitation. *Resuscitation*. 2015;92:32–37.
3. Couper K, Quinn T, Booth K et al, Interruptions in CPR during deployment of a mechanical chest compression device: results from a randomized controlled trial (COMPRESS-RCT). *Resuscitation* 2019; 142 (S1); e36 (AP018)

For further information, please contact your Stryker representative or visit our website at [strykeremergencycare.com](http://strykeremergencycare.com)

## Emergency Care

This document is intended solely for the use of healthcare professionals. A healthcare professional must always rely on his or her own professional clinical judgment when deciding whether to use a particular product when treating a particular patient. Stryker does not dispense medical advice and recommends that healthcare professionals be trained in the use of any particular product before using it.

The information presented is intended to demonstrate Stryker's product offerings. A healthcare professional must always refer to operating instructions for complete directions for use indications, contraindications, warnings, cautions, and potential adverse events, before using any of Stryker's products. Products may not be available in all markets because product availability is subject to the regulatory and/or medical practices in individual markets. Please contact your representative if you have questions about the availability of Stryker's products in your area. Specifications subject to change without notice. The products depicted are CE marked in accordance with applicable EU Regulations and Directives.

Stryker or its affiliated entities own, use, or have applied for the following trademarks or service marks: LUCAS, Stryker. All other trademarks are trademarks of their respective owners or holders.

The absence of a product, feature, or service name, or logo from this list does not constitute a waiver of Stryker's trademark or other intellectual property rights concerning that name or logo.

07/2020

GDR 3344293\_A

Copyright © 2020 Stryker



### CE Class IIB (2460)

Jolife AB  
Scheelevägen 17  
Ideon Science Park  
SE-223 70  
LUND, Sweden

Stryker European  
Operations B.V.  
Herikerbergweg 110  
1101 CM Amsterdam  
Netherlands  
Tel +31 (0)43 3620008  
Fax +31 (0)43 3632001

### Distributed by:

Stryker UK Ltd  
Stryker House  
Hambridge Road  
Newbury, Berkshire  
RG14 5AW  
United Kingdom