

TITLE PAGE

“Study of pre-hospital care of Out of Hospital Cardiac Arrest victims in India and their outcome in a tertiary care hospital”

Short running title: Pre-hospital Cardiac Arrest REsuscitation (Pre-CARE) study

Authors:

Rachana Bhat¹, Prithvishree Ravindra¹, Ankit Kumar Sahu², Roshan Mathew², William Wilson¹

¹ Assistant Professor, Department of Emergency Medicine, Kasturba Medical College, Manipal, Manipal Academy of Higher Education, Manipal, Karnataka, India.

²Resident, Department of Emergency Medicine, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi, India

Corresponding author:

Name: Prithvishree Ravindra

Department of Emergency Medicine, Kasturba Medical College, Manipal, Manipal Academy of Higher Education, Manipal, Karnataka, India- 576104

Email address: prithvishree@gmail.com

Phone number: (+91) 9035296971

Word count (total): 1692 (excluding abstract, legends and references)

Word count (abstract): 250

Study of pre-hospital care of Out of Hospital Cardiac Arrest victims and their outcome in a tertiary care hospital in India

Pre-hospital Cardiac Arrest REsuscitation (Pre-CARE) study

Abstract

BACKGROUND:

India does not have a formal cardiac arrest registry and a centralized emergency medical system. In this study, we aimed to assess the prehospital care received by the patients with OHCA and to predict the factors that could influence their outcome.

METHODS:

We performed a prospective observational study, including OHCA patients presenting to the emergency department (ED) between February 2019 and January 2020. A structured proforma was used to capture information like basic demography, prehospital details like bystander cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR), use of an automated external defibrillator (AED), clinical profile, and outcome.

RESULTS:

Among the included 205 patients, the majority were male (71.2%) and belonged to older age (49.3%). The nature of arrest was predominantly non-traumatic (82.4%). The initial rhythm at presentation was non-shockable (96.5%). Return of spontaneous circulation (ROSC) was achieved in 17 (8.3%) patients, of which only 3 (1.4%) patients survived till discharge. The home was the most common location of OHCA (116, 56.6%). Among the OHCA patients, witnessed arrests were seen only in 64 (31.2%), of which 15 (7.8%) received bystander CPR, and AED was used in 1% of the patients. The initial shockable rhythm was a significant predictor of ROSC (OR 18.97 95%CI 3.83-93.89; $p < 0.001$) and survival to discharge (OR 42.67; 95%CI 7.69-234.32; $p < 0.001$).

CONCLUSION:

In a developing country like India, this study underlines the poor status of the prehospital system like lower bystander CPR, AED and ambulance usage. Moreover, ROSC was seen only in less than 10% of patients, and only 1.3% got discharged from the hospital.

Introduction

The global incidence of out of hospital cardiac arrest (OHCA) is estimated to be 55 per 100,000 person-years¹, making it an important public health challenge. The data from India regarding OHCA is lacking as there is no national cardiac arrest registry at present. The challenges pertaining to OHCA in India are unique and multifaceted. The awareness among the community regarding cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) and AED is low.^{2,3} Bystander CPR rate has been found to be 1.3%⁴, much lower than most countries. The emergency medical services (EMS) are fragmented and not accessible throughout the country. Most ambulances are used as a transport vehicle to reach the hospital, without simultaneously delivering emergency care in the ambulance. The Emergency Medicine paramedic courses have been initiated in a few institutes in the last decade, though a robust system of EMS is yet to be developed.

Our study objective was to assess the prehospital care received by the patients presenting to the Emergency Department with OHCA in a tertiary care hospital in India and to predict the factors that could influence their outcome.

Methods

The study was a prospective observational study conducted at a tertiary care centre in India. This study was started only after waiver of ethical approval from Institutional Review Board, Kasturba Medical College, Manipal, Manipal Academy of Higher Education, Manipal, Karnataka. Every patient presenting to the hospital with OHCA during the period from Feb 2019 to January 2020 were considered for the study. Cases with age less than 18 years or where the legally acceptable representative denied consent for the study were excluded. The primary objective of the study was to assess the pre-hospital care received by victims of

OHCA including bystander CPR, EMS utilisation & interventions, AED use. The secondary objective was to assess the factors influencing ROSC and survival to hospital discharge.

After informed consent from the legally acceptable representative, details of patients presenting to the Emergency Department with OHCA were collected. The patients attaining ROSC were followed up to discharge/death. CPC was calculated at discharge to assess the neurological outcome. During the course of hospital stay, details such as initiation of targeted temperature management, time to revascularization (if applicable), final diagnosis was noted.

The data was entered in MS EXCEL spreadsheet and analysis was done using SPSS (version 23; IBM, Armonk, NY). Categorical variables were presented in number and percentage (%) and continuous variables were presented as mean (standard deviation) and median (interquartile range). Logistic regression analyses were used to predict the effect of different variables on the ROSC, 24-h survival, and survival to discharge. The variables included in the logistic regression model were age, gender, arrival time to hospital, witnessed arrest, Bystander CPR received, duration of cardiac arrest, traumatic/non-traumatic cardiac arrest and type of rhythm (shockable or non- shockable). A p value less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Results

The study included 205 patients with OHCA presenting to the Emergency Medicine department of a tertiary care hospital. The Modified Utstein template is provided in Figure 1. 56.6% (n=116) of the patients sustained cardiac arrest at home and 30.7% (n=63) of the patients sustained cardiac arrest in transit. The demographic characteristics, comorbidity profile and the initial presenting symptoms of the patients are provided in Table 1.

Pre-hospital factors such as place of arrest, mode of transport to hospital and bystander CPR were analysed and details mentioned in Table 2. A significant percentage of our patients (41.5%) reached the hospital by means other than the ambulance. Of the available data, median ambulance response time was 10(IQR: 10-20) minutes. It is worthy to note that only 6.8% (n=14) patients received bystander CPR. Among the patients transported in the ambulance only 7.8% (n=15) had received CPR. AED was used only in one percent of the patients. No patients had received prehospital shocks during resuscitation or achieved prehospital ROSC.

Among the patients with witnessed arrest (31.2%, n=64), the median time of cardiac arrest before arrival to our hospital was 30 (IQR: 15 - 41.25) minutes. With respect to the initial rhythm on presentation, shockable rhythm was seen in seven patients (3.4%); ventricular fibrillation in 6 patients and pulseless ventricular tachycardia in one patient. 96.6% (n=198) had non shockable rhythm of which 13 patients (6.3%) had pulseless electrical activity (PEA). Return of Spontaneous Circulation (ROSC) was achieved in 17 (8.3%) patients. The final diagnoses of patients based on clinical gestalt and post-mortem reports are provided in Figure 2. Amongst the patients who achieved ROSC, ten patients(4.8%, 10/205) survived more than 24 hours and only three(1.4%) could survive till hospital discharge of which one had a cerebral performance score of 3 and two had a score of 4. Four out of seven patients (57%; p=0.001) with initial shockable rhythm achieved ROSC as compared to 13 out of 185 (7%) with non-shockable rhythm (p=0.001).

Factors associated with ROSC, survival to hospital discharge and favourable neurological outcome at discharge were analysed with logistic regression analysis and it was found that the duration of cardiac arrest and shockable rhythm at presentation had a statistically significant association with ROSC (Table 3). Non-traumatic cardiac arrest had a higher incidence of ROSC than traumatic cardiac arrest, although it was not statistically significant. Longer the

duration of cardiac arrest, lower the odds of ROSC (OR 0.937; 95% CI 0.88-0.99; p=0.047) whereas initial shockable rhythm was associated with higher odds of survival (OR 18.97 95% CI 3.83-93.89; p<0.001). Similarly, patients with initial shockable rhythm had statistically significant and higher odds of survival for more than 24 hours of ROSC (OR 42.67; 95%CI 7.69-234.32; p<0.001).

Discussion

Our study aimed to understand the pre-hospital care received by the OHCA victims and factors that could influence ROSC in a developing country like India. We report that the majority of OHCA happened at home (56.6%); however a significant proportion (30.8%) happened during transit (24.9% in ambulances, 5.9% in private vehicles). This is in line with the findings of the Cardiac Arrest Resuscitation Outcome (CARO) study which had 92% of the arrests at home.⁴ The Swedish Cardiac arrest registry also found that the majority of older adults suffered a cardiac arrest at home followed by in transit (ambulance) to the hospital.⁵ In our study we noted that a significant percentage (41.4%) of cardiac arrest victims were transported in means other than ambulance. Wijeshkara et al found that only 1.4% to 19.4% of ED patients utilised EMS to get to the ED.⁶ A systematic review & meta-analysis by Yan et al showed that prehospital stage was the most impactful stage for care of OHCA patients and where efficient CPR from EMS translated to highest incidence of ROSC (36.3%; 95% CI 23.8 - 48.9%).⁷ This emphasizes the need to educate the community regarding the importance of using an ambulance and EMS systems, so that earlier AED use and ACLS interventions can be administered.⁸

Continuing with the quality of the EMS services available to our patient group only 7.8% received CPR, with only 12.5% of ambulances having Basic Life Support (BLS) trained personnel. Ramanujam et al in a single centre study in Chennai found that 85% of the trauma

victims did not receive any formal prehospital interventions, further emphasizing the lack of prehospital EMS facilities available although in a different patient group.⁹ Our study also found that the AED use was limited and there were no prehospital shocks administered or prehospital ROSC. This underlines the fact that ambulances are being used as mere transport vehicle rather than a device to deliver pre-hospital care. BLS ambulance of >4 per neighbourhood and Advanced Life Support (ALS) ambulances of >1.5 per neighbourhood have been linked with successful ROSC.¹⁰ Considering that a significant proportion of cardiac arrests are happening in the ambulance during transit, it is essential to realise the importance of having trained EMS personnel in fully BLS and ALS equipped ambulance and develop a stronger EMS system in the country.

It is well established that by-stander CPR is one of the cornerstones in improving OHCA results with better survival and discharge rates as compared to no bystander CPR.^{11,12} Amongst the sparse data available from India, the CARO study reported bystander CPR rate of 1.3%⁴ Our study found that bystander CPR was done only in 6.8% of our patients which falls way below the impact goal of bystander response of 62% set by the AHA-ECC.¹³ The recent Sweden registry which reported bystander CPR rates of 26-54% across the adult age groups.⁵ To bridge this gap, we need to increase the knowledge in the community about CPR by having widespread training programs throughout the country aimed at dispelling myths and educational campaigns and also initiate school based training.¹⁴

Among the available final diagnoses assessed of the OHCA victims, majority had cardiovascular cause. This is consistent with studies elsewhere showing cardiovascular cause as the leading diagnoses among the victims.¹⁵ In our study, 15.6% had clinical/ post-mortem final diagnosis as acute coronary syndrome. It has been shown that reduced transport times may benefit patients with OHCA and STEMI also translating to significantly better neurological outcomes.¹⁶ This emphasises the need for transport using the EMS with an AED

with BLS/ALS trained personnel, along with STEMI alert system. Haemorrhagic shock was the cause of death for 6.8% of the patients, which also included isolated limb injuries. The resuscitation of these patients in transit including simple measures such as compression of the bleeding site and fluid resuscitation may have improved outcome.

We found that 8.3% had ROSC, 4.9% had 24-hour survival and 1.4% survived to discharge. The factors positively influencing outcome included initial shockable rhythm and shorter duration of arrest. None of the discharged patients had favourable CPC (CPC 1, 2). CARO study found that 32.5% had ROSC, 8.8% had survival to discharge and 3.8% had favourable CPC. They concluded that there is a need for creating a centralised medical emergency body to oversee the setting up of EMS.⁴ This re-emphasises the importance of community training to initiate early CPR, stronger EMS system, early AED use to improve the outcomes of OHCA in India.

Conclusion

The pre-hospital care received by the OHCA victim in India needs immediate attention. Low by-stander CPR rate, under-utilised and under-equipped EMS system are the challenges that we face. Community education and training programs along with strengthening the EMS systems are the way forward to improve care of OHCA victims in India.

Limitations

As the number of patients who had 24 hour survival and survived to discharge were less, the study may not have been able to detect all the factors influencing these outcomes. The information such as ambulance response time was missing in few cases.

References

1. Berdowski J, Berg RA, Tijssen JGP, Koster RW. Global incidences of out-of-hospital cardiac arrest and survival rates: Systematic review of 67 prospective studies. *Resuscitation* [Internet]. 2010 Nov 1 [cited 2020 May 16];81(11):1479–87. Available from: [https://www.resuscitationjournal.com/article/S0300-9572\(10\)00432-6/abstract](https://www.resuscitationjournal.com/article/S0300-9572(10)00432-6/abstract)
2. Aroor AR, Saya RP, Attar NR, Saya GK, Ravinanthanan M. Awareness about basic life support and emergency medical services and its associated factors among students in a tertiary care hospital in South India. *J Emerg Trauma Shock* [Internet]. 2014 [cited 2020 May 18];7(3):166–9. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4126115/>
3. Joseph N, Narayanan T, Zakaria SB, Nair AV, Belayutham L, Subramanian AM, et al. Awareness, attitudes and practices of first aid among school teachers in Mangalore, south India. *J Prim Health Care*. 2015;
4. Krishna CK, Showkat HI, Taktani M, Khatri V. Out of hospital cardiac arrest resuscitation outcome in North India — CARO study. *World J Emerg Med* [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2020 May 11];8(3):200–5. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5496828/>
5. Herlitz J, Svensson L, Engdahl J, Gelberg J, Silfverstolpe J, Wisten A, et al. Characteristics of cardiac arrest and resuscitation by age group: an analysis from the Swedish Cardiac Arrest Registry. *Am J Emerg Med* [Internet]. 2007 Nov 1 [cited 2020 May 18];25(9):1025–31. Available from: [https://www.ajemjournal.com/article/S0735-6757\(07\)00202-1/abstract](https://www.ajemjournal.com/article/S0735-6757(07)00202-1/abstract)
6. Wijesekera O, Reed A, Chastain PS, Biggs S, Clark EG, Kole T, et al. Epidemiology of Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Utilization in Four Indian Emergency Departments. *Prehospital Disaster Med*. 2016 Dec;31(6):675–9.
7. Yan S, Gan Y, Jiang N, Wang R, Chen Y, Luo Z, et al. The global survival rate among adult out-of-hospital cardiac arrest patients who received cardiopulmonary resuscitation: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Crit Care* [Internet]. 2020 Feb 22 [cited 2020 May 16];24(1):61. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13054-020-2773-2>
8. Modi PD, Solanki R, Nagdev TS, Yadav PD, Bharucha NK, Desai A, et al. Public Awareness of the Emergency Medical Services in Maharashtra, India: A Questionnaire-based Survey. *Cureus* [Internet]. [cited 2020 May 16];10(9). Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6239430/>
9. Ramanujam P, Aschkenasy M. Identifying the Need for Pre-hospital and Emergency Care in the Developing World □: A Case Study in Chennai, India. 2007;55:6.
10. Chocron Richard, Loeb Thomas, Lamhaut Lionel, Jost Daniel, Adnet Frédéric, Lecarpentier Eric, et al. Ambulance Density and Outcomes After Out-of-Hospital Cardiac Arrest. *Circulation* [Internet]. 2019 Mar 5 [cited 2020 May 11];139(10):1262–71. Available from: <https://www.ahajournals.org/doi/10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.118.035113>

11. Wissenberg M, Lippert FK, Folke F, Weeke P, Hansen CM, Christensen EF, et al. Association of National Initiatives to Improve Cardiac Arrest Management With Rates of Bystander Intervention and Patient Survival After Out-of-Hospital Cardiac Arrest. *JAMA* [Internet]. 2013 Oct 2 [cited 2020 May 19];310(13):1377–84. Available from: <https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/1745678>
12. Song J, Guo W, Lu X, Kang X, Song Y, Gong D. The effect of bystander cardiopulmonary resuscitation on the survival of out-of-hospital cardiac arrests: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Scand J Trauma Resusc Emerg Med* [Internet]. 2018 Oct 11 [cited 2020 May 19];26. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6182861/>
13. About CPR & ECC [Internet]. cpr.heart.org. [cited 2020 May 12]. Available from: <https://cpr.heart.org/en/resources/about-cpr-and-ecc>
14. Nambiar M, Nedungalaparambil NM, Aslesh OP. Is current training in basic and advanced cardiac life support (BLS & ACLS) effective? A study of BLS & ACLS knowledge amongst healthcare professionals of North-Kerala. *World J Emerg Med*. 2016;7(4):263–9.
15. Holmgren C, Abdon NJ, Bergfeldt L, Edvardsson N, Herlitz J, Karlsson T, et al. Out-of-hospital cardiac arrest: Causes according to autopsy and electrocardiography - Analysis of 781 patients with neither hospital care nor prescribed medication during the preceding two years. *Resuscitation*. 2020 May;150:65–71.
16. Wengenmayer T, Staudacher DL. Need for speed in out-of-hospital cardiac arrest. *Resuscitation* [Internet]. 2019 Nov 1 [cited 2020 May 12];144:187–8. Available from: [https://www.resuscitationjournal.com/article/S0300-9572\(19\)30594-5/abstract](https://www.resuscitationjournal.com/article/S0300-9572(19)30594-5/abstract)

Legends of figures

Figure 1: Modified Utstein template

OHCA: Out of hospital cardiac arrest; ROSC: Return of Spontaneous circulation; CPC: Cerebral performance category

Figure 2: Final diagnoses of patients of OHCA

Legends of tables

Table – 1: Basic characteristics of the included patients

Table – 2: Pre-hospital response system

Table – 3: Factors affecting ROSC, 24-hour survival and survival to discharge

Table 1: Basic Characteristics of the included patients

Characteristics	
Age¹	58.4(17.1)
Age Group²	
18-39 years	32 (15.6%)
40-59 years	72 (35.1%)
> 59 years	101 (49.3%)
Gender²	
Male	146 (71.2%)
Female	59 (28.8%)
Initial presentation²	
Unresponsive	64 (31.2%)
Breathlessness	37 (18%)
Trauma	36 (17.6%)
Chest pain	24 (11.7%)
Giddiness/ syncope	18 (8.8%)
Fever	6 (2.9%)
Bleeding	4 (2%)
Hanging	4 (2%)
Headache	3 (1.5%)
Abdominal Pain	3 (1.5%)
Drowning	3 (1.5%)
Poisoning	2 (1%)
Electrocution	1 (0.5%)
Co-morbid illness²	
Hypertension	71 (34.6%)
Diabetes	59 (28.8%)
Coronary artery disease	38 (18.5%)
Asthma/COPD	14 (6.8%)
Cerebrovascular accident	11 (5.3%)
Chronic Kidney disease	7 (3.4%)
Heart failure	7 (3.4%)
Malignancy	5 (2.4%)
Others ³	9 (4.3%)
Type of arrest²	
Non-traumatic cardiac arrest	169 (82.4%)
Traumatic cardiac arrest	36 (17.6%)

1. Mean (SD)

2. N (%)

3. **Others:** Chronic liver disease (2), Seizure (1), Deep vein thrombosis/Pulmonary embolism (1), Hypertrophic cardiomyopathy (1)

Table 2: Pre-hospital response system

Place of arrest	
Home	116 (56.6%)
In transit	63 (30.7%)
Road	22 (10.7%)
Workplace	2 (1%)
Railway station	1 (0.5%)
Restaurant	1 (0.5%)
Pre hospital response	
Witnessed	64 (31.2%)
By-stander CPR	20 (9.8%)
AED used	2 (1%)
Mode of arrival to study centre	
Ambulance	120 (58.5%)
Personal vehicle	76 (37.1%)
Three-wheeler	8 (3.9%)
Bus	1 (0.5%)
Who Brought	
Bystander	185 (90.2%)
Relatives	162(79%)
Colleagues/Friends	14(6.8%)
Civilian	9(4.4%)
First responders	20 (9.8%)
Paramedics	14(6.8%)
Police	4 (2%)
Fire Rescuer	2 (1%)

Factors	ROSC	24-hour survival	Survival to hospital discharge
Age	0.98 (0.96-1.02) <i>p=0.457</i>	0.98(0.95- 1.02) <i>p=0.541</i>	0.954 (0.893-1.020) <i>p=0.168</i>
Gender¹	1.83 (0.66-5.06) <i>p=0.244</i>	1.69(0.46-6.24) <i>p=0.42</i>	1.241 (0.11-13.95) <i>p=0.861</i>
Arrival time² (Night vs Morning)	0.41 (0.12-1.2) <i>p=0.127</i>	0.33(0.07-1.63) <i>p=0.176</i>	----
Witnessed³	2.09 (0.76-5.7) <i>p=0.148</i>	2.31(0.64-8.26) <i>p=0.2</i>	1.103 (0.098-12.392) <i>p=0.937</i>
Bystander CPR⁴	1.25 (0.26-5.93) <i>p=0.771</i>	2.46(0.49-12.47) <i>p=0.278</i>	----
Duration of CA	0.94 (0.88-0.99) <i>p=0.047</i>	0.98(0.92-1.04) <i>p=0.558</i>	1.002 (0.911-1.101) <i>p=0.972</i>
Non-traumatic vs Traumatic⁵	3.66 (0.47-28.52) <i>p=0.216</i>	1.96 (0.24-16.04) <i>p=0.527</i>	----
Shockable⁶	18.97 (3.83-93.89) <i>p<0.001</i>	42.67(7.69-234.32) <i>p<0.001</i>	16.33(1.29-205.89) <i>p=0.031</i>

Table 3: Factors affecting ROSC, 24-hour survival and survival to discharge

Reference variables: 1: Male 2: Morning duty hours (8 am-8 pm) 3: Unwitnessed 4: No CPR 5: Traumatic CA 6: Non shockable

CREDIT authorship contribution statement

Conceptualisation: RB, PR

Data curation: WW

Formal analysis: AS, RM

Investigation: RB, PR, WW

Methodology: RB



Software: AS, RM

Supervision: RB, PR

Visualisation: AS

Writing – original draft: RM, WW, PR

Writing – review and editing: RM, RB




medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.12.20129402>; this version posted June 16, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

Count

Age group

- 18 - 39 years
- 40 - 59 years
- More than 59 years



Final Diagnosis