

1 **Device-led versus human-led feedback on chest compressions for**
2 **cardiopulmonary resuscitation and providers' experience and**
3 **preference: a randomised crossover study**

4
5

6 Muhaimin Noor Azhar^{1¶}, Aida Bustam^{1¶}, Khadijah Poh^{1¶}, Chew Keng Sheng^{2¶}, Asraff Azman^{3¶},
7 Anhar Kamarudin^{1¶}, Aliyah Zambri^{1*}

8
9

10

11 ¹ Academic Unit of Emergency Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, University of Malaya, Kuala
12 Lumpur, Malaysia

13

14 ² Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Universiti Malaysia Sarawak
15 Kota Samarahan, Sarawak, Malaysia

16

17 ³ Department of Emergency Medicine, University Malaya Medical Center, Kuala Lumpur,
18 Malaysia

19

20

21

22 * Corresponding author

23 Email: nuraliyah@ummc.edu.my

24

25 [¶] These authors contributed equally to this work.

26

27

28

29 **Abstract**

30

31 **Background:** High cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) quality is associated with better
32 patient survival from cardiac arrest. However, CPR providers may not have an accurate
33 perception of the depth and rate of their chest compressions (CC). Realtime feedback during
34 resuscitation improves CPR quality compared to no feedback. Evidence comparing audio-visual
35 feedback device (AVF) and team leader's feedback (TLF) in improving CPR performance is
36 limited and conflicting.

37

38 **Methodology:** We performed a randomized crossover study to evaluate CC performance with
39 AVF and TLF. Seventy participants performed CC for 1 minute on a CPR manikin connected to
40 ZOLL R series defibrillator with CPR-sensing capability in a randomised crossover sequence.
41 We interviewed participants to explore their perception and preference with both feedback
42 methods.

43

44 **Results:** Mean CC rate was higher with AVF than with TLF ($121.8 \text{ min}^{-1} \pm 17.7$ vs. $117.4 \text{ min}^{-1} \pm$
45 13.5 , $p = 0.005$). There was no significant difference in proportions of participants performing
46 CC within the recommended rate of 100-120 beats per minute between AVF and TLF (48.6%
47 and 51.4%, $p = 0.824$). Overall, CC depth was below the recommended target regardless of
48 feedback method with mean CC depth of $4.4 \text{ cm} \pm 0.8$ in AVF and $4.3 \text{ cm} \pm 0.9$ in TLF
49 respectively ($p = 0.479$). Most participants felt that TLF was easier to follow, more motivating
50 and preferable compared to AVF. Those who preferred TLF performed CC at rates above the
51 recommended range with AVF compared to TLF ($124.1 \text{ min}^{-1} \pm 19.4$ versus $118.2 \text{ min}^{-1} \pm 14.9$,
52 $p = 0.004$).

53

54 **Conclusion:** A well-trained team leader is as effective as an AVF device in leading high-quality
55 CC. CPR providers' performance may be influenced by their preferred feedback method.

56

57 **Introduction**

58

59 Cardiac arrest is one of the major public health issues worldwide with a global incidence of as
60 high as 110.8 cases per 100,000 people (1). One of the life-saving interventions in the
61 management of cardiac arrest is cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR). CPR involves the
62 provision of chest compressions and ventilations to deliver oxygenated blood to the brain.
63 However, patient survival rates from cardiac arrest remain low even among those who received
64 CPR (1). The quality of CPR provided during resuscitation has an important association with
65 patient survival from cardiac arrest (2-4). CPR guidelines have emphasised on the delivery of
66 high-quality CPR which includes targeted optimal compression rate, adequate compression
67 depth and minimising interruptions between chest compression (5). The 2015 American Heart
68 Association (AHA) and European Resuscitation Council (ERC) CPR guidelines recommend an
69 optimum chest compression rate of 100 to 120 min⁻¹ and a chest compression depth of 5 to 6
70 cm (6, 7).

71

72 Despite an increasing knowledge about CPR physiology in optimising blood flow during cardiac
73 arrest (8), and of its impact on neurological and survival outcome of patients with cardiac arrest
74 (9), challenges still exist in its implementation. It has been shown that high quality CPR is
75 infrequently delivered in clinical practice even among well-trained healthcare providers (10, 11).
76 CPR providers may not have an accurate perception of the depth and rate of their chest
77 compressions (12). This reinforces the need to monitor and improve the quality of CPR during
78 resuscitation of cardiac arrest patients. Real-time monitoring and prompt feedback on CPR
79 quality during a resuscitative effort can guide real-time corrective measures by the CPR
80 provider. Traditionally, this is done through subjective visual assessment by a team leader or
81 another rescuer who monitors and provides guidance and feedback on the provider's CPR
82 performance. Team leaders in the context of resuscitation is considered a role adopted by one
83 member of the team who assumes responsibility for managing a cardiac arrest. Recently, CPR
84 feedback devices equipped with sensors and accelerometer technology have become available
85 that enable the detection of CPR metrics such as rate and depth of chest compressions. These

86 devices provide automated audio feedback, and/or visual feedback in the form of graphs and
87 numbers, to alert the provider when the CPR metric values fall outside of the pre-programmed
88 range.

89

90 Previous studies investigating the effectiveness of CPR feedback devices have found improved
91 CPR quality when compared with no feedbacks (13-18). CPR feedback devices can be useful
92 as part of a strategy to improve CPR quality during resuscitation. However, well-trained CPR
93 providers may remain as the predominant and effective team leaders during CPR, particularly in
94 limited-resource environments (19). Evidence for CPR performance comparing feedback device
95 with human-led feedback is still limited, with one study reporting improved CPR quality with
96 feedback device (20), and another study that otherwise found comparable CPR quality between
97 device-led and human-led feedback (21). Furthermore, CPR providers' comparative perception
98 of experience and preference with both methods of feedback during CPR have yet to be
99 explored.

100

101 In this study, we aimed to (1) determine whether the use of an audio-visual CPR feedback
102 device compared with team leader feedback improves chest compression quality in a simulation
103 setting, (2) explore CPR providers' perception and preference with both feedback methods, and
104 (3) evaluate if providers' perception or preference is associated with quality of chest
105 compressions.

106

107 **Materials and Methods**

108

109 **Study design and setting**

110 This was a manikin-based simulation study comparing chest compression (CC) performance by
111 participants with audio-visual feedback (AVF) versus team leader's feedback (TLF). We
112 performed a randomized 2-sequence, 2-intervention periods crossover study design. The study
113 flow is shown in Fig. 1. This study was conducted from November to December 2019 in an
114 emergency department (ED) of a university-affiliated hospital in Malaysia. A crossover study

115 design was chosen because of advantages over a parallel-group randomized controlled design:
116 each participant could serve as his or her own matched control and therefore reducing within-
117 participant variation, a smaller sample size is required to detect meaningful effect at the same
118 level of statistical power as a parallel design, and participants in this crossover study could
119 express their preferences by comparing their experiences of the two interventions (22). This
120 study is reported according to the Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials approach with the
121 extension for simulation-based research. This study was granted ethics approval from the
122 hospital Medical Research Ethics Committee (MREC 201919-6992) and the Malaysian National
123 Medical Research Register (NMRR-19-1174-48443) in accordance with the International
124 Conference on Harmonization - Guidelines for Good Clinical Practice (ICH-GCP) and
125 Declaration of Helsinki.

126

127 **Fig 1.** Study flowchart

128 TLF: team-leader feedback, AVF: audio-visual feedback, CC: chest compression

129

130 **Participant selection and recruitment**

131 Eligible participants were Basic Life Support (BLS)-certified ED healthcare personnel and
132 students. Exclusion criteria were previous experience with using AVF devices and any physical
133 disabilities, injuries and/ or chronic medical illnesses that may impair the ability to perform high
134 quality CC. Due to work scheduling constraints, participant recruitment was by convenience
135 sampling. All recruited participants enrolled voluntarily and signed an informed consent form.

136

137 **Randomization and crossover**

138 A study investigator not involved in participant recruitment and study interventions, randomized
139 the participants using computer-generated block-stratified random sequence and concealed the
140 lists in opaque envelopes. The stratification was by profession using block size of 4. Enrolled
141 participants were randomized in a 1:1 allocation ratio into AVF-led CC followed by TLF-led CC
142 (Group 1), or TLF-led CC followed by AVF-led CC (Group 2). We allocated a 10-minute
143 washout interval between intervention periods to minimize participant fatigue.

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#) .

145 **Equipment**

146 The CPR manikin used was Little Anne™ (Laerdal, Orpington, UK) with a spring constant of
147 4.46 kg/cm and a 22.3 kg-force required to press 5 cm and maximum compression depth of 7
148 cm. The CPR manikin was connected to a ZOLL R Series Plus® (ZOLL Medical Corporation)
149 defibrillator with CPR-sensing capability and AVF aptitude algorithm based on the 2015 AHA
150 guidelines. The CPR Dashboard™ using Real CPR Help® technology in the device provided
151 real-time AVF on rate, depth, and release of each compression via an accelerometer.

152

153 **Interventions**

154 The CPR manikin was placed on the floor to avert mattress compressibility as a confounding
155 variable. Participants were instructed to perform CC as they would usually perform in real
156 practice, but with a small CPR sensor placed underneath their hands on the manikin's chest.
157 AVF configuration was enabled during the AVF-led intervention and was disabled during the
158 TLF-led intervention. For the TLF-led intervention, three certified BLS trainers were assigned as
159 team leaders. Based on their availability, one of the three team leaders conducted the TLF-led
160 session and provided verbal feedback for compression rate and depth. The team leader was not
161 present during the AVF-led intervention to minimize bias. Each participant performed a 1-
162 minute chest compression in each intervention period.

163

164 **Data collection and outcome measures**

165 We collected participants' demographic data comprising of age, gender, and profession. The
166 primary outcome measured were CC rate (min^{-1}) and depth (cm). We extracted the CC rate and
167 depth data stored in the built-in memory storage of the defibrillator using the ZOLL CodeNet
168 software provided by the manufacturer. For secondary outcome measures, we interviewed each
169 participant immediately after completion of both interventions to obtain qualitative feedback
170 regarding their perception and experience. Each interview was audio-recorded and later
171 transcribed for analysis to look for common themes. We also asked if they felt they performed
172 better with AVF or with TLF, and their preferred method of feedback during resuscitation.

173

174 **Sample size calculation**

175 An earlier 2 x 2 crossover study of CC with and without feedback device showed mean chest
176 compression rates of $113 \text{ min}^{-1} (\pm 7)$ and $113 \text{ min}^{-1} (\pm 13)$ respectively (17). Based on this and
177 the AHA-recommended CC target rate range of 100 to 120 min^{-1} , we defined the minimal
178 clinically significant difference in CC rate as 7 min^{-1} for this study (since difference of $>7 \text{ min}^{-1}$
179 would exceed the recommended CC target rate). Using sample size calculation for two-
180 intervention crossover study, a total of 57 participants will have 80% power to detect a
181 difference in mean of 7 min^{-1} at a two-sided 0.05 significance level, if the within-participant
182 standard deviation is 13 min^{-1} (for a more conservative estimate). Sample size calculation was
183 performed with a web-based sample size calculator software (23). We recruited 70 participants
184 to include an estimated 20% dropout rate.

185

186 **Statistical analysis**

187 Statistical analysis was performed with SPSS version 26 for Mac OS. Demographic
188 characteristics were analyzed with descriptive statistics. Test of normality was performed by
189 examining skewness z-score, kurtosis z-score, and Shapiro-Wilk test. Parametric data was
190 analyzed with paired t-test and non-parametric data with Wilcoxon signed rank test. Categorical
191 data was analyzed with McNemar's test. All tests were performed at the significance level of $p <$
192 0.05.

193

194 **Results**

195

196 **Participants**

197 A total of 70 participants (mean age 29.17 ± 5.36 years) were enrolled and no participants were
198 excluded from the study. Thirty-nine (55.7%) participants were female. The participants were
199 made up of 31 doctors (44.3%), 16 nurses (22.9%), 9 paramedics (12.9%) and 14 medical
200 students (20%).

201

202 **Chest compression performance**

203 The comparison of CC rate and depth between TLF-led CC and AVF-led CC is shown in **Table**
204 **1**. The mean CC rate was higher in AVF-led CC compared with TLF-led CC (121.75 ± 17.66
205 min^{-1} vs. $117.43 \pm 13.45 \text{ min}^{-1}$, $p = 0.005$). The mean CC rate with AVF was also slightly above
206 the recommended target rate ($>120 \text{ min}^{-1}$). There was no significant difference between AVF-
207 led CC and TLF-led CC in the proportion of participants who performed CPR at rates within and
208 not within the recommended target rate ($p = 0.824$). Mean CC depth performed by participants
209 did not meet the recommended target of 5-6 cm in both interventions (4.37 ± 0.78 cm in AVF-
210 led CC and 4.33 ± 0.92 cm in TLF-led CC, $p = 0.479$). There was no significant difference
211 between AVF-led CC and TLF-led CC in the proportion of participants who performed CPR with
212 depth within and not within the recommended target ($p = 0.754$).

213

214 **Table 1.** Comparison of chest compression rate and depth between TLF-led CC and AVF-led
215 CC, and proportion of participants performing below, within or above recommended targets in
216 guideline.
217

CC variables	AVF-led	TLF-led	p-value
Rate, min⁻¹			
Mean (SD)	121.8 (17.7)	117.4 (13.5)	0.005 ^a
95% CI	117.5, 126.0	114.2, 120.6	
CC rate performance categories, n (%)			
Below target (<100)	4 (5.7)	5 (7.1)	
Within target (100-120)	34 (48.6)	36 (51.4)	0.824 ^b
Above target (>120)	32 (45.7)	29 (41.4)	
Depth, cm			
Mean (SD)	4.4 (0.8)	4.3 (0.9)	0.479 ^a
95% CI	4.2, 4.6	4.1, 4.6	
CC depth performance categories, n (%)			
Below target (<5)	52 (74.3)	49 (70.0)	
Within target (5-6)	18 (25.7)	20 (28.6)	0.754 ^b
Above target (>6)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.4)	

218 ^aPaired t-test.

219 ^bMcNemar's test performed to evaluate the difference in proportion with CC variables
220 categorized into within target and not within target.

221 TLF: team-leader feedback, AVF: audio-visual feedback, CC: chest compression, SD: standard
222 deviation, CI: confidence interval
223

224 **Exploration of participants' feedback**

225 Three common themes emerged from the subjective participant feedback: focus,
226 comprehension, and motivation (**Table 2**).

227

228 **Table 2.** Participants' feedback (N = 70)

229

Feedback	n (%)
Focus	
Difficult to focus with TLF	1 (1.4)
Difficult to focus with AVF	41 (58.6)
Comprehension	
Easy to follow TLF	70 (100.0)
Easy to follow AVF	43 (61.4)
Motivation	
Motivated by TLF	67 (95.7)
Motivated by AVF	17 (24.3)
Perception of performance	
Perceived they performed better with TLF	34 (48.6)
Perceived they performed better with AVF	18 (25.7)
Perceived they performed well with both feedback methods	18 (25.7)
Overall preference	
Preferred resuscitating with TLF	50 (71.4)
Preferred resuscitating with AVF	8 (11.4)
Did not mind either feedback method	12 (17.1)

230 TLF: team-leader feedback, AVF: audio-visual feedback

231

232 **Focus**

233 Forty-one participants (58.60%) reported difficulty to concurrently focus on delivering high
234 quality CC and AVF as illustrated below:

235

236 *“With the machine, I needed to keep counting the rate in my head, while looking at the*
237 *monitor. I needed to focus on many things at once. Whereas with the team leader, I*
238 *could concentrate better by just listening to one voice.”*

239

240 *“Better with the team leader. With the machine, I needed to look at the monitor, listen*
241 *and follow the voice prompts. I cannot perform many things simultaneously – to see, to*
242 *listen, to interpret all at the same time.”*

243

244 **Comprehension**

245 All participants reported that it was easy to follow TLF instructions as opposed to only 43
246 (61.4%) who found AVF easily understood. Some participants were inclined to push faster when
247 the AVF prompted them to “push harder”. For example:

248

249 *“When the machine says push harder, I have the tendency to push faster just to fulfil the*
250 *aim set by the machine.”*

251

252 *“I prefer team leader even though the machine seems more objective, but the team*
253 *leader’s instruction is simpler and easier to understand. The machine can be*
254 *distracting.”*

255

256

257 **Motivation**

258 Sixty-seven participants (95.7%) felt motivated during TLF-led CC compared to 17 (24.3%)
259 participants in AVF-led CC. Examples include:

260

261 *“When I was performing CPR with the machine, when the machine said “push harder” I*
262 *panicked and had the tendency to push harder. Whereas, with team leader, he would*
263 *encourage me by saying “good compressions”, and so, it made me calmer in doing*
264 *CPR.”*

265

266 *“I prefer the team leader because she gives constructive feedback. The team leader’s*
267 *voice and commands are clear and it is not dull or monotonous voice like that of the*
268 *machine. When we perform chest compressions, we have to be very energetic. A*
269 *human voice will keep us motivated and energetic to give our best during CC.”*

270

271 **Perception of performance**

272 Thirty-four (48.6%) participants felt they performed CC better with TLF, whereas 18 (25.7%)
273 participants felt they performed better with AVF, and 18 (25.7%) participants felt they performed
274 well with both feedback methods. For instance:

275

276 *“I think I did better chest compressions guided by team leader, as I can solely focus only*
277 *on my compressions without having to multitask.”*

278

279 *“I think my compressions were more effective with the machine. It gave me objective*
280 *feedback if I need to push harder or faster. I feel my compressions are much better*
281 *because of that.”*

282

283 **Overall preference**

284 Overall, 50 (71.4%) participants preferred instructions from TLF compared to only 8 (11.4%)
285 participants who preferred instructions from AVF. Reasons for preferring TLF included the
286 provision of a more comprehensive and holistic feedback. For example:

287

288 *“I prefer the team leader because he gave me very specific and personalized feedback*
289 *like I needed to straighten and lock my elbows. Whereas for the machine, it only tells me*
290 *about the depth and rate of compression”*

291

292 Those who preferred AVF generally cited “more objective and straightforward feedback” as the
293 reason.

294

295 *“I prefer the instructions given by the machine. Because, first, I can observe how much I*
296 *need to improve – the rate, the depth, I know exactly how much I need to improve.*
297 *Whereas with team leader, while it is also helpful, when he or she says push harder, but*
298 *I am not seeing how much exactly I need to improve on.”*

299

300 **Participants' perceived performance and preference, and chest compression quality**

301 Participants who perceived that they performed better with TLF, and those who preferred TLF,
 302 were noted to perform CC at a mean rate significantly higher and above the recommended
 303 target rate when performing with AVF (**Table 3**). Participants who perceived that they performed
 304 better with AVF, and those who preferred AVF, showed similar CC performance during AVF and
 305 TLF.

306

307 **Table 3.** Participants' feedback, and their measured compression rate and depth

308

Feedback	CC variables	AVF-led CC, mean (SD)	TLF-led CC, mean (SD)	<i>p</i> value ^a
Participants' perception				
Perceived they performed better with TLF (n=18)	Rate, min ⁻¹	127.1 (21.4)	118.7 (15.6)	0.002
	Depth, cm	4.1 (0.8)	4.1 (0.9)	0.295
Perceived they performed better with AVF (n=34)	Rate, min ⁻¹	118.8 (12.1)	118.7 (9.8)	0.936
	Depth, cm	4.5 (0.8)	4.3 (0.9)	0.228
Perceived they performed well with both methods (n=18)	Rate, min ⁻¹	114.5 (10.5)	113.7 (12.0)	0.773
	Depth, cm	4.7 (0.5)	4.9 (0.7)	0.163
Participants' preference				
Preferred TLF (n=50)	Rate, min ⁻¹	124.1 (19.4)	118.2 (14.9)	0.004
	Depth, cm	4.3 (0.8)	4.2 (0.9)	0.584
Preferred AVF feedback (n=8)	Rate, min ⁻¹	121.2 (8.5)	119.7 (6.5)	0.569
	Depth, cm	4.3 (1.0)	3.9 (0.8)	0.007
Did not mind either method (n=12)	Rate, min ⁻¹	112.1 (10.1)	112.8 (9.6)	0.653
	Depth, cm	4.9 (0.6)	5.1 (0.8)	0.368

309 ^aPaired t-test.

310 TLF: team-leader feedback, AVF: audio-visual feedback, CC: chest compression, SD: standard
 311 deviation

312

313

314

315 **Discussion**

316

317 The 2015 AHA guideline states that high quality CC requires the following: (1) optimal hand
318 position, (2) compressing the lower part of the sternum by at least one-third of the anterior-
319 posterior diameter of the chest (equivalent to 4 cm in infants and 5 cm in adolescents), (3)
320 achieving compression rate of 100 to 120 min⁻¹, and (4) allowing for complete chest recoil
321 between each CC. In this study, we focused on the CC rates and depth as these parameters
322 have shown a more significant role in affecting clinical outcome (24). Overall, our study found
323 that the participants' CC performance with AVF was similar to that with TLF. Although the
324 average CC rate with AVF in our study was statistically significantly higher than that with TLF
325 (121.8 min⁻¹ vs. 117.4 min⁻¹, $p = 0.005$) and slightly above the recommended target range, this
326 may not be considered significant in real clinical settings.

327

328 The proportion of participants performing CPR at CC rates within the recommended target
329 range of 100 to 120 min⁻¹ was similar between AVF and TLF (48.6% and 51.4%, $p = 0.824$).
330 However, the mean CC depth with both TLF and AVF in this study were below the
331 recommended range, while the mean CC rate inclined toward 120 min⁻¹. This corroborated a
332 previous study reporting significant decrease in CC depth as the CC rate increases (25).

333

334 With AVF, suboptimal compression depth can be due to difficulty in following the audio-visual
335 prompts that demand competent eyes-ears-hands coordination. The heavy cognitive load
336 resulted in reduced attention capacity towards multiple stimuli during CPR (26). Therefore,
337 despite the AVF indicating inadequate compression depth, participants were inclined to ignore
338 them and continued performing CC without corrective actions. The cognitive loads in CC are
339 intrinsic, germane, and extraneous. Chest compressions are the intrinsic load, whereas the
340 germane load is imposed while using an unfamiliar AVF device. Extraneous load occurs due to
341 the requirement for participants to simultaneously look at the monitor, while listening to voice
342 prompts and fine-tuning their CCs (27, 28). A similar conclusion was made by Brown et al in
343 their study on measuring the task of performing CPR with AVF devices based on the National

344 Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Task Load Index. They reported significantly
345 higher physical burden to CPR providers in multitasking feedback interpretation and formulating
346 corrective measures to improve their compressions (29).

347

348 On the other hand, TLF would reduce the extraneous load as participants need to only listen to
349 voice prompts. The germane load would depend on whether participants are familiar to
350 receiving real-time feedback during CC. Team leaders were able to gauge and provide
351 appropriate feedback on the correct compression rate through subjective visual assessment.
352 This suggests that team leaders had conceptual and habitual tacit knowledge of the appropriate
353 CC rate. Tacit knowledge is the implicit knowledge that one possesses based on personal
354 experience (30). It is personal, intuitive, and difficult to be coded, transferred, or taught (31, 32).
355 Schemata on how tacit knowledge and habitual practices influence the management of
356 resuscitation in the ED and other departments have been provided in previous studies (33, 34).
357 Interestingly, assessment and feedback on the CC depth by team leaders in this study were not
358 as accurate as that on CC rate. This may be due to the misidentification of CC depth as
359 adequate at higher compression rates (35).

360

361 A recent study (20) demonstrated better CPR quality with feedback device compared to human
362 instructor feedback. Their study method had measured CPR quality as a composite score
363 including correct hand position, adequate depth, compression rate and complete chest recoil.
364 However, similar to our findings, the average CC rate in their study was comparable between
365 feedback device and human instructor feedback, and their human instructor feedback group
366 showed more compliance to CPR guidelines for CC depth.

367

368 CPR feedback devices were invented and innovated to automate conventionally human-led
369 resuscitations. In a publication regarding automation of tasks with machines, multiple
370 bottlenecks were identified impeding advancement towards task automation. These bottlenecks
371 involved tasks that require complex manipulation and perception, creative-intelligence tasks,
372 and social-intelligence tasks (36). Leading a resuscitation during CPR in a cardiac arrest is

373 recognized as a complex and highly demanding task requiring case-by-case analysis and
374 insight. Extrapolating these bottlenecks into our study may demonstrate AVF limitations in its
375 ability to only provide objective perception in compression depth and rate. Thus, in more
376 complex cardiac arrest cases, team leaders may be more proficient in employing both vertical
377 and lateral thinking to mitigate suboptimal CC. Lateral thinking is defined as reasoning using an
378 indirect and creative approach that may not be immediately obvious whereas vertical thinking is
379 a thinking that proceeds in a stepwise manner while applying specific rules to reach a goal (37,
380 38). For instance, in one participant, the team leader had observed and gave feedback of her
381 suboptimal CC attributed by not straightening and locking the elbows.

382

383 Furthermore, in our setting, the English language is not a native language and is the second
384 spoken language for most residents. This discrepancy of language proficiency may have
385 resulted in misinterpretation of some AVF prompts. We have noted during the study that most
386 participants were inclined to push faster when the defibrillator audio feedback prompted “push
387 harder”. In contrast, the language conversed by the team leader were a fusion of the native
388 Malay language and conversational English language. Our participants felt that the team
389 leader’s tonal voice was more reassuring as it instilled a sense of confidence and was easier to
390 be understood compared to the machine’s monotonous audio prompts. Effective communication
391 is expressed via spoken words, tone, resonance, pitch modulation and other forms of non-
392 verbal communication (39), some of which, are absent in the AVF method. Perhaps, the socio-
393 cultural variations of vocal intonation in these machines (such as using the local Malay
394 language and dialect) should be considered by the manufacturers to strengthen participants
395 engagement and comprehension.

396

397 Previous studies comparing device-led with human-led feedback reported conflicting findings
398 (20, 21). As with Pavo et al, our findings found both methods to be comparable (21). We
399 investigated whether participant’s preference of feedback methods influenced their CC quality,
400 as this has not been previously explored. In our study, participants who perceived that they
401 performed better with TLF and those who preferred TLF performed CC within the recommended

402 range with TLF compared to AVF. However, this was not observed in participants who
403 preferred AVF. Participants who perceived that they performed well with both AVF and TLF, and
404 did not mind one method over the other performed the best.

405

406 **Limitations**

407

408 Our study had some limitations. Firstly, this was a single-center study with participants
409 comprising of ED healthcare personnel and medical students. This may have resulted in
410 selection bias and may not necessarily reflect the overall healthcare providers' competency in
411 CPR. Although all participants had prior training in BLS, their experience in CPR was likely
412 diverse based on their profession. Secondly, team leaders were not randomized and were
413 allocated to participants based on convenience due to their work schedule. Team leaders also
414 varied in terms of experience and leadership positions. These factors may have resulted in the
415 inter-team leader variability. Thirdly, this study was conducted in a manikin-based simulation
416 setting. This allowed us to standardize the assessment, but it could only represent a real patient
417 scenario to a limited extent. We also chose a shorter duration of CC (i.e. 1 min instead of the 2-
418 min cycle periods in CPR guidelines) to minimize rescuers' fatigue as our study aimed to assess
419 whether human feedback or feedback device resulted in better CC performance. Results from
420 previous studies showed that CPR quality started to decline after 1 minute due to fatigue (40,
421 41) regardless of rescuer strength (42), gender, weight, height, or rescuer's profession (43).
422 Fourthly, we did not have a control group (i.e. CC without feedback). Therefore, we do not
423 know to what extent the CC performance was the effect of TLF or AVF alone or of the
424 participants' own knowledge and skills. Lastly, a potential Hawthorne effect may have
425 influenced our results as participants were aware that they were being monitored throughout the
426 simulated CC performance.

427

428 **Conclusions**

429

430 In conclusion, our study found similar CC performance between human TLF and machine AVF,
431 and that CC performance may be associated with the method of feedback depending on the
432 provider's preference. Although AVF provided objective feedback, the need for eyes-ears-hands
433 coordination was perceived as a multitasking challenge for CPR providers to focus on the CC
434 delivery. On the other hand, TLF had a humanistic voice, which was perceived as more
435 reassuring, motivating and easier to follow by CPR providers. The CC performance in our study
436 suggests that more training is needed to improve the quality of CPR regardless of the feedback
437 method used. We suggest that a well-trained team leader could be as effective as an AVF
438 device in leading a good quality CPR.

439

440 **Acknowledgements**

441 The management and medical staff of the Emergency Department of the study center.

442

443 **References**

- 444 1. Wong CX, Brown A, Lau DH, Chugh SS, Albert CM, Kalman JM, et al. Epidemiology of
445 Sudden Cardiac Death: Global and Regional Perspectives. *Heart Lung Circ.* 2019;28(1):6-
446 14, doi:10.1016/j.hlc.2018.08.026.
- 447 2. Talikowska M, Tohira H, Finn J. Cardiopulmonary resuscitation quality and patient survival
448 outcome in cardiac arrest: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Resuscitation.*
449 2015;96:66-77, doi:10.1016/j.resuscitation.2015.07.036.
- 450 3. Nichol G, Aufderheide TP, Eigel B, Neumar RW, Lurie KG, Bufalino VJ, et al. Regional
451 systems of care for out-of-hospital cardiac arrest: A policy statement from the American
452 Heart Association. *Circulation.* 2010;121(5):709-29, doi:10.1161/CIR.0b013e3181cdb7db.
- 453 4. Meaney PA, Bobrow BJ, Mancini ME, Christenson J, de Caen AR, Bhanji F, et al.
454 Cardiopulmonary resuscitation quality: [corrected] improving cardiac resuscitation
455 outcomes both inside and outside the hospital: a consensus statement from the American
456 Heart Association. *Circulation.* 2013;128(4):417-35, doi:10.1161/CIR.0b013e31829d8654.
- 457 5. Soar J, Maconochie I, Wyckoff MH, Olasveengen TM, Singletary EM, Greif R, et al. 2019
458 International Consensus on Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation and Emergency
459 Cardiovascular Care Science With Treatment Recommendations. *Resuscitation.*
460 2019;145:95-150, doi:10.1016/j.resuscitation.2019.10.016.
- 461 6. Perkins GD, Handley AJ, Koster RW, Castren M, Smyth MA, Olasveengen T, et al.
462 European Resuscitation Council Guidelines for Resuscitation 2015: Section 2. Adult basic
463 life support and automated external defibrillation. *Resuscitation.* 2015;95:81-99,
464 doi:10.1016/j.resuscitation.2015.07.015.
- 465 7. Kleinman ME, Brennan EE, Goldberger ZD, Swor RA, Terry M, Bobrow BJ, et al. Part 5:
466 Adult Basic Life Support and Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation Quality: 2015 American Heart
467 Association Guidelines Update for Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation and Emergency
468 Cardiovascular Care. *Circulation.* 2015;132(18 Suppl 2):S414-35,
469 doi:10.1161/CIR.0000000000000259.
- 470 8. Lurie KG, Nemergut EC, Yannopoulos D, Sweeney M. The Physiology of Cardiopulmonary
471 Resuscitation. *Anesth Analg.* 2016;122(3):767-83, doi:10.1213/ANE.0000000000000926.
- 472 9. Stolz U, Murphy RA, Panchal A, Silver A, Vadeboncoeur T, Welch A, et al. Abstract 130:
473 The Effect of CPR Quality on Survival and Neurological Outcome After Out-of-Hospital
474 Cardiac Arrest. *Circulation.* 2012;126(suppl_21):A130-A,
475 doi:doi:10.1161/circ.126.suppl_21.A130.
- 476 10. Wik L, Kramer-Johansen J, Myklebust H, Sorebo H, Svensson L, Fellows B, et al. Quality of
477 cardiopulmonary resuscitation during out-of-hospital cardiac arrest. *JAMA.*
478 2005;293(3):299-304, doi:10.1001/jama.293.3.299.
- 479 11. Abella BS, Alvarado JP, Myklebust H, Edelson DP, Barry A, O'Hearn N, et al. Quality of
480 cardiopulmonary resuscitation during in-hospital cardiac arrest. *JAMA.* 2005;293(3):305-10,
481 doi:10.1001/jama.293.3.305.
- 482 12. Cheng A, Overly F, Kessler D, Nadkarni VM, Lin Y, Doan Q, et al. Perception of CPR
483 quality: Influence of CPR feedback, Just-in-Time CPR training and provider role.
484 *Resuscitation.* 2015;87:44-50, doi:10.1016/j.resuscitation.2014.11.015.
- 485 13. Wutzler A, Bannehr M, von Ulmenstein S, Loehr L, Forster J, Kuhnle Y, et al. Performance
486 of chest compressions with the use of a new audio-visual feedback device: a randomized

- 487 manikin study in health care professionals. *Resuscitation*. 2015;87:81-5,
488 doi:10.1016/j.resuscitation.2014.10.004.
- 489 14. Pritchard J, Roberge J, Bacani J, Welsford M, Mondoux S. Implementation of Chest
490 Compression Feedback Technology to Improve the Quality of Cardiopulmonary
491 Resuscitation in the Emergency Department: A Quality Initiative Test-of-change Study.
492 *Cureus*. 2019;11(8):e5523, doi:10.7759/cureus.5523.
- 493 15. Lin CY, Hsia SH, Lee EP, Chan OW, Lin JJ, Wu HP. Effect of Audiovisual Cardiopulmonary
494 Resuscitation Feedback Device on Improving Chest Compression Quality. *Sci Rep*.
495 2020;10(1):398, doi:10.1038/s41598-019-57320-y.
- 496 16. Cheng A, Brown LL, Duff JP, Davidson J, Overly F, Tofil NM, et al. Improving
497 cardiopulmonary resuscitation with a CPR feedback device and refresher simulations (CPR
498 CARES Study): a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2015;169(2):137-44,
499 doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2014.2616.
- 500 17. Buleon C, Delaunay J, Parienti JJ, Halbout L, Arrot X, Gerard JL, et al. Impact of a
501 feedback device on chest compression quality during extended manikin CPR: a
502 randomized crossover study. *Am J Emerg Med*. 2016;34(9):1754-60,
503 doi:10.1016/j.ajem.2016.05.077.
- 504 18. Aguilar SA, Asakawa N, Saffer C, Williams C, Chuh S, Duan L. Addition of Audiovisual
505 Feedback During Standard Compressions Is Associated with Improved Ability. *West J
506 Emerg Med*. 2018;19(2):437-44, doi:10.5811/westjem.2017.11.34327.
- 507 19. Bhanji F, Mancini ME, Sinz E, Rodgers DL, McNeil MA, Hoadley TA, et al. Part 16:
508 education, implementation, and teams: 2010 American Heart Association Guidelines for
509 Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation and Emergency Cardiovascular Care. *Circulation*.
510 2010;122(18 Suppl 3):S920-33, doi:10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.110.971135.
- 511 20. Wagner M, Bibl K, Hrdliczka E, Steinbauer P, Stiller M, Gropel P, et al. Effects of Feedback
512 on Chest Compression Quality: A Randomized Simulation Study. *Pediatrics*. 2019;143(2),
513 doi:10.1542/peds.2018-2441.
- 514 21. Pavo N, Goliasch G, Nierscher FJ, Stumpf D, Haugk M, Breckwoldt J, et al. Short
515 structured feedback training is equivalent to a mechanical feedback device in two-rescuer
516 BLS: a randomised simulation study. *Scand J Trauma Resusc Emerg Med*. 2016;24:70,
517 doi:10.1186/s13049-016-0265-9.
- 518 22. Mills EJ, Chan AW, Wu P, Vail A, Guyatt GH, Altman DG. Design, analysis, and
519 presentation of crossover trials. *Trials*. 2009;10:27, doi:10.1186/1745-6215-10-27.
- 520 23. Schoenfeld D. Statistical considerations for a cross-over study where the outcome is a
521 measurement [Available from:
522 http://hedwig.mgh.harvard.edu/sample_size/js/js_crossover_quant.html].
- 523 24. Wattenbarger S, Silver A, Hoyne T, Kuntsal K, Davis D. Real-Time Cardiopulmonary
524 Resuscitation Feedback and Targeted Training Improve Chest Compression Performance
525 in a Cohort of International Healthcare Providers. *J Emerg Med*. 2019,
526 doi:10.1016/j.jemermed.2019.09.027.
- 527 25. Idris AH, Guffey D, Pepe PE, Brown SP, Brooks SC, Callaway CW, et al. Chest
528 compression rates and survival following out-of-hospital cardiac arrest. *Crit Care Med*.
529 2015;43(4):840-8, doi:10.1097/CCM.0000000000000824.

- 530 26. van Merriënboer JJ, Sweller J. Cognitive load theory in health professional education:
531 design principles and strategies. *Med Educ.* 2010;44(1):85-93, doi:10.1111/j.1365-
532 2923.2009.03498.x.
- 533 27. Szulewski A, Gegenfurtner A, Howes DW, Sivilotti MLA, van Merriënboer JJG. Measuring
534 physician cognitive load: validity evidence for a physiologic and a psychometric tool. *Adv*
535 *Health Sci Educ Theory Pract.* 2017;22(4):951-68, doi:10.1007/s10459-016-9725-2.
- 536 28. Reason J. Human error: models and management. *West J Med.* 2000;172(6):393-6,
537 doi:10.1136/ewjm.172.6.393.
- 538 29. Brown LL, Lin Y, Tofil NM, Overly F, Duff JP, Bhanji F, et al. Impact of a CPR feedback
539 device on healthcare provider workload during simulated cardiac arrest. *Resuscitation.*
540 2018;130:111-7, doi:10.1016/j.resuscitation.2018.06.035.
- 541 30. Kit D, Peter B, Debbie R. The Meaning of Tacit Knowledge. *Australasian Journal of*
542 *Information Systems.* 1969;10(1), doi:10.3127/ajis.v10i1.438.
- 543 31. Polanyi M. *The Tacit Dimension: The University of Chicago Press*; 2013.
- 544 32. Heiberg Engel PJ. Tacit knowledge and visual expertise in medical diagnostic reasoning:
545 implications for medical education. *Med Teach.* 2008;30(7):e184-8,
546 doi:10.1080/01421590802144260.
- 547 33. Harteis C, Morgenthaler B, Kugler C, Ittner K-P, Roth G, Graf B. Professional Competence
548 and Intuitive Decision Making: A Simulation Study in the Domain of Emergency Medicine.
549 *Vocations and Learning.* 2012;5(2):119-36, doi:10.1007/s12186-011-9070-9.
- 550 34. Brummell SP, Seymour J, Higginbottom G. Cardiopulmonary resuscitation decisions in the
551 emergency department: An ethnography of tacit knowledge in practice. *Soc Sci Med.*
552 2016;156:47-54, doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2016.03.022.
- 553 35. Nagafuchi K, Hifumi T, Nishimoto N, Kondo Y, Yoshikawa K, Iwami T, et al. Chest
554 Compression Depth and Rate- Effect on Instructor Visual Assessment of Chest
555 Compression Quality. *Circ J.* 2019;83(2):418-23, doi:10.1253/circj.CJ-18-0952.
- 556 36. Frey CB, Osborne MA. The future of employment: How susceptible are jobs to
557 computerisation? *Technological Forecasting and Social Change.* 2017;114:254-80,
558 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2016.08.019>.
- 559 37. Hernandez JS, Varkey P. Vertical versus lateral thinking. *Physician Exec.* 2008;34(3):26-8.
- 560 38. De Bono E. *Lateral Thinking.* London: Penguin 1992.
- 561 39. Mehrabian A, Ferris SR. Inference of attitudes from nonverbal communication in two
562 channels. *J Consult Psychol.* 1967;31(3):248-52, doi:10.1037/h0024648.
- 563 40. Sugerman NT, Edelson DP, Leary M, Weidman EK, Herzberg DL, Vanden Hoek TL, et al.
564 Rescuer fatigue during actual in-hospital cardiopulmonary resuscitation with audiovisual
565 feedback: a prospective multicenter study. *Resuscitation.* 2009;80(9):981-4,
566 doi:10.1016/j.resuscitation.2009.06.002.
- 567 41. McDonald CH, Heggie J, Jones CM, Thorne CJ, Hulme J. Rescuer fatigue under the 2010
568 ERC guidelines, and its effect on cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) performance. *Emerg*
569 *Med J.* 2013;30(8):623-7, doi:10.1136/emermed-2012-201610.
- 570 42. KIM H, YOU JS, CHUNG SP. Influence of rescuer strength and shift cycle time on chest
571 compression quality. *Signa Vitae.* 2017;13(1):70-4, doi:10.22514/sv131.052017.29.

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#) .

- 572 43. Ochoa FJ, Ramalle-Gomara E, Lisa V, Saralegui I. The effect of rescuer fatigue on the
573 quality of chest compressions. *Resuscitation*. 1998;37(3):149-52, doi:10.1016/s0300-
574 9572(98)00057-4.
- 575