Title

“Impact of bystander intervention on clinical outcome in out-of-hospital cardiac arrest. A study of 8,253 Polish cases from the European Registry of Cardiac Arrest (2014-2022)”

Affiliations:

Anna Żądło [1] https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2493-5911 anna.zadlo@uj.edu.pl

Dawid Wilczek [2] https://orcid.org/0009-0006-1811-0437 dawidwilczek97@gmail.com

Grzegorz Cebula [1]https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4009-0605 grzegorz.cebula@uj.edu.pl

Daria Orzechowska [3] https://orcid.org/0009-0007-5844-6928 daria.orzechowska@student.uj.edu.pl

Tomasz Tokarek [1,4] https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0836-1877 tomasz.tokarek@uj.edu.pl

1. Department of Medical Education, Centre of Innovative Medical Education, Jagiellonian University Medical College, Cracow, Poland.
2. Students’ Scientific Society, Department of Anesthesiology and Intensive Care, Faculty of Medical Sciences in Katowice, Medical University of Silesia, Katowice, Poland
3. Jagiellonian University Medical College, Cracow, Poland.
4. Center for Invasive Cardiology, Electrotherapy and Angiology, 33-300 Nowy Sacz, Poland.

Corresponding author

Anna Żądło anna.zadlo@uj.edu.pl zadlo.anna@gmail.com 0048883264348

Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest to disclose related to this study. No financial, personal, or professional relationships influenced the research, analysis, or reporting of the findings presented in this manuscript.

This declaration ensures the integrity and transparency of the study.

Abstract

Background: Out-of-Hospital Cardiac Arrest (OCHA) remains a significant challenge for healthcare systems, with actions by witnesses playing a critical role. This study examines Polish data from the European Registry of Cardiac Arrest (EuReCa), identifying progress in updated paramedic protocols and public availability of automated external defibrillators (AED) while noting issues such as delays in emergency call localization, lack of synchronization in defibrillator maps, inadequate reporting, and absence of information on long-term neurological outcomes.

Aims: The aim of this study was to assess the role of bystanders and dispatchers in the chain of survival for OHCA.

Methods: A retrospective analysis was conducted on 8,253 patients included in the EuReCa between 2014 and 2022. Data were collected from emergency medical team reports, and survival outcomes at 30 days were obtained from the national death registry.

Results: Full cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) performed by witnesses, including both chest compressions and rescue breaths, combined with the use of AED, significantly increased the likelihood of return of spontaneous circulation (ROSC) compared to chest compressions alone or no intervention. Dispatcher-guided resuscitation increased ROSC from 22.1% to 30.6% (p=0.01), though the increase in 30-day survival from 42.8% to 48.2% was not statistically significant (p=0.27). CPR by witnesses increased the number of patients transported to hospital with ROSC(74.0% vs. 26.0%; p=0.01).

Conclusions:: Bystanders and dispatchers are pivotal in the chain of survival. Improving the quality of reporting on actions taken by witnesses, including dispatcher-assisted resuscitation and the use of automated defibrillators, is critical for identifying effective strategies and allocating resources to improve survival and outcomes for cardiac arrest outside hospitals in Poland.

Key Words:

Death, Sudden, Cardiac;Out-of-Hospital Cardiac Arrest; Poland; Resuscitation;Epidemiology;

Introduction

Out-of-Hospital Cardiac Arrest (OHCA) presents a significant challenge for healthcare systems. The European Resuscitation Council (ERC) initiated the European Registry of Cardiac Arrest (EuReCa) study, involving multiple European countries to collect and analyze data. This article is based on a retrospective analysis of Polish data from three EuReCa editions. Researchers examine the importance and limitations of the chain of survival in OHCA and specifically evaluate the role of bystanders, measuring their actions such as cardio – pulmonary resuscitation (CPR), Telephone-assisted cardiopulmonary resuscitation (T-CPR), and Automated external defibrillator (AED) usage. Despite various initiatives aimed at improvement of emergency medical services (EMS) in Poland, there are still gaps that weaken the system. On the contrary, the average Polish citizen can quickly localize for taxi services, emergency calls for ambulances still take approximately 120 seconds to localize due to Poland's exclusion from the Advanced Mobile Location (AML) system. Since 2000 AED were acquired for public use by private companies and firefighters, leading to the creation of two AED location maps. Paramedic report Karta Medycznych Czynności Ratunkowych (KMCR) was updated twice, and new protocols for medical dispatchers were introduced to improve emergency response. Despite these advancements, technological support for witnesses at incident scenes remains insufficient. While a unified dispatcher system exists, the number of dispatchers who can effectively guide witnesses to AED locations is unclear not systematically reported and measured. The AED map is unsynchronized, and reporting on AED usage is minimal. Crucially, there is no data on neurological outcomes, with available information only detailing the timing of patient deaths. This article examines the role of bystanders, assessing their actions such as recognizing the emergency, calling for help and T-CPR received, locating and using AEDs, CPR, and defibrillation based on data gathered for EuReCa study.

Methods

Detailed information's were published previously[1][. In brief, a comprehensive retrospective analysis was conducted on all patients (n=8253) included in the EuReCa study in Poland across three editions between 2014-2022. EuReCa One (one month -October 2014) used paper-based, voluntary data collection prepared by Polish Resuscitation Council rep and the anonymized National Death Registry. Whole study ware registered on ClinicalTrials.gov (T02236819). EuReCa Two (1st October to 31st December 2017) continued with the same methods and data sources, registered on ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT03130088). EuReCa Three (1st September to 30th November 2022) introduced electronic, mandatory data collection, including patient ambulance records, and is registered with the German Registry of Clinical Trials (DRKS00028591), searchable via the WHO meta-registry. Data were collected from the documentation completed by emergency medical teams at the scene of an OHCA. Due to significant discrepancies in the data across all three editions, the definitions from EuReCa One were adopted to ensure a consistent evaluation of the collected information. All categories introduced in the second and third editions were excluded. Among the missing information are: the time of patient discharge from the hospital, the age of witnesses, the individual who initiated CPR, and details regarding deaths confirmed at the scene. Considering these factors, further analysis of the data was rendered impossible, limiting the results obtained. Information about 30-day survival was anonymized and obtained by the Air Ambulance Service from the national death registry. We excluded all data labeled as "unknown" or "not recorded" and focused on

analyzing factors related to the role of bystanders in OHCA. The study was provided in congruence with ethical principles derived from the Declaration of Helsinki with later amendments. No financial support was provided for this registry. Statistical analysis was executed by MedCalc v.18 statistical software (MedCalc Software, Ostend, Belgium). Standard descriptive statistics were used in the analysis. The normality of the data was assessed with the Shapiro-Wilk test. We expressed the categorical variables as numbers and percentages. Quantitative variables were described using median supplemented by interquartile range. The level of statistical significance was set at $p<0.05$. One-way ANOVA with post hoc Dunn's test (for normal distribution with equal variance between groups) or Kruskal–Wallis test (for not normally distributed data).

Results

3. 1. Population characteristics and EuReCa editions differences Table 1.



Figure 1. Percentage of Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation Cases before EMS arrival in EuReCa Studies
CPR YES : Percentage of cases in which cardiopulmonary resuscitation was performed
CPR NO: Percentage of cases in which cardiopulmonary resuscitation was not performed.

Since first the EuReCa study in 2014 we have seen a significant increase of the performed CPR (p=0.01) - especially in the third edition, where 95.7% of the OHCA were attempted by bystander or EMS (Figure 1).



Figure 2. Effectiveness of Return of Spontaneous Circulation in EuReCa Studies
ROSC: Cases in which return of spontaneous circulation (ROSC) was achieved.
NO ROSC: Cases in which ROSC was not achieved.

The highest return of spontaneous circulation (ROSC) incidence was noticed in EuReCa One study, where the proportion of successful CPRs amounted to 39.7%. The worst results were observed in the second edition of the study (Figure 2). Although, the ROSC incidence was indifferent in EuReCa Three, we found a highly significant improvement of the 30-days survival from 37.5% and 32.7% in the first and second edition to 50.5% in EuReCa Three (p=0.01).

3. 2. Bystander and dispatcher role in OHCA



Figure 3. Contribution of Bystander-Assisted Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation in EuReCa Studies
NO CPR: Instances where a bystander did not initiate any resuscitation efforts.
Any bystander w/o any information: Resuscitation provided by a bystander, but no specific details about the type, quality, or extent of the intervention are available
Full CPR: Cases where complete resuscitation techniques, including chest compressions and ventilations, were performed.
CCO CPR: Cases where only chest compressions were performed without ventilations.

In the general analysis, we found that full CPR performed by bystander may have an impact on achieving the ROSC comparing to the CCO CPR and no CRP (26.0% vs. 23.3% vs. 21.7%; p=0.01). In this case, we also had a better ROSC incidence in a group, where the CPR was performed by bystander, although the precise technique of CPR performed was not comprehensively documented by EMS (26.2%; p=0.01). However, it is important to note that the survival rate is lower only in the case of patients where bystander CPR was not administered (Figure 3.)Analysis of the effect of cardiopulmonary resuscitation before ambulance arrival on 30-day survival showed survival rates of 48.4% for cases without CPR compared to 50.7% with CPR (not specified in the KMCR) and 52.4% for both full CPR and CCO CPR). Although survival appeared to be slightly higher for full CPR and CCO CPR compared to no CPR, the difference was not statistically significant (42.2% vs. 25.4%; p = 0.30).

The analysis of the situation immediately after cardiac arrest at the scene and during transport to the hospital showed that performing full CPR by a bystander, had a positive impact on reducing the number of patients who died at the scene and increasing the number of patients transported to the hospital with ROSC (74.0% vs. 26.0%; p=0.01). However, the best outcomes in OHCA were observed in the group of patients where there was information solely about the initiation of CPR without additional details (CCO CPR or full CPR). In this group, ROSC was achieved in 32.8% of cases, compared to 25.6% and 21.8% in the groups where bystanders performed full CPR and CCO CPR, respectively (p=0.01). The lowest ROSC rate was observed in the group where bystanders did not initiate CPR (78.3% vs. 21.7%; p=0.01).According to the current guidelines T-CPR improves patient outcome [2], the significant increase in CPR

performed by the support of the dispatcher was seen (p=0.01). This trend is shown in Figure 4 .



Figure 4. Impact of Dispatcher-Assisted CPR on ROSC in EuReCa Studies
TeleCPR/T-CPR: Dispatcher-Assisted CPR

During the analysis, we proved that T-CPR may increase the ROSC incidence from 22.1% to 30.6% (p=0.01). On the other hand, the 30-days survival expand from 42.8% to 48.2%, respectively, but without statistical significance (p=0.27).

The last comparison showed that T-CPR decrease the number of patients dead on scene and transferred ongoing CPR and increase the number of ROSC incidence carried to the hospital. The implementation of T-CPR reduced the proportion of patients who died at the scene from 69.0% to 63.8% (p=0.01) and also increased the rate of ROSC from 21.0% to 27.4% (p=0.01).

Discussion

In our study, we demonstrated that bystander-initiated CPR, particularly when supported by dispatcher, plays a pivotal role in improving immediate outcomes for OHCA in Poland. Notably, the increased T-CPR was associated with a higher incidence of ROSC. These findings highlight the importance of integrating real-time guidance into prehospital care, alongside further improvements such as AED mapping, to strengthen the chain of survival in Poland. Performing CPR with the guidance and support of a medical dispatcher can greatly improve outcomes [2]. In Poland, there are two emergency numbers: 999, where medical operators are stationed, and 112, which is used in most European countries. The 112 number is managed by emergency dispatchers who transfer calls to medical dispatchers if necessary. Despite substantial investments in emergency call centers and repeated assurances at 112 conferences to eliminate the redundant 999 number, this change has yet to be implemented. Our study showed that the use of T-CPR lowered the percentage of patients who died on-site from 69.0% to 63.8% (p=0.01) and also raised the ROSC rate from 21.0% vs 27.4% (p=0.01). This suggests that T-CPR not only improves the likelihood of achieving return of spontaneous circulation but also significantly decreases the immediate mortality rate at the scene of the incident. These findings highlight the critical impact of remote assistance in improving outcomes for cardiac arrest patients, particularly in situations where immediate, on-site medical intervention is limited. This likely results from the fact that guidance from a medical dispatcher during the resuscitation process helps to minimize uncertainties and facilitates the quicker execution of critical interventions. The study by Xu et al. demonstrated that T-CPR may reduce the time to first chest compression and other essential actions, such as opening the airway [3]. By providing instructions dispatcher improves the efficiency and effectiveness of emergency response, leading to better patient outcomes during cardiac arrest situations. Certain studies suggest that the implementation of T-CPR can enhance survival rates, increasing them T-CPR appears to have a positive impact on the reduction of long-term neurological complications. Specifically, it has been observed to decrease the prevalence of brain complications from 40% to 32.1% [2]. These findings underscore the potential of T-CPR not only to improve immediate survival outcomes but also to mitigate the risk of adverse neurological effects, contributing to a better quality of life for survivors. The evidence supports the critical role of T-CPR in improving both short- and long-term outcomes in patients experiencing cardiac arrest. Despite the increased availability and usage of AEDs in Poland, the absence of a updated AED map and longer than in most of Europe accuracy to locate caller decrease dispatchers capacity. AML is being rolled out across most EU countries to provide emergency services with precise caller location data within 5 meters outdoors and 25 meters indoors. Poland is set to adopt AML by 2027, though its initial implementation faced significant public resistance, causing a delay. A new timeline for the rollout is now established [4]. Post-incident, dispatchers, bystanders and device owners are not required to report AED usage [5].The use of automated AEDs by either a bystander or a person sent to help dispatched to help is essential [6]. It should be noted that there are two versions of “person send to help”, one involving institution registered in the "National Rescue and Firefighting System" [7] involving volunteer firefighters, PCK, mountain and water rescuers who can provide assistance and growing community of “First rescuer” initiative. The presence of bag-valve masks or pocket masks increases the chances of performing full CPR comparing to chest compression only as data show it might increase ROSC in the future. Early CPR is crucial for survival, our study shows increase of the CPR attempts, but assessing its impact is challenging due to the dependence on the entire survival chain. American studies of HEARTSafe communities found no significant differences in 30-day survival between communities with and without first responder systems. Similarly, the EuReCa Three study in

Poland, which evaluated bystander CPR, first responder actions, and AED use, found no significant correlation with 30-day survival. Although early CPR improves survival to hospital admission, it has not yet shown a difference in 30-day survival, highlighting the need for further research and system improvements. Our findings are consistent with those of Cone et al., who also found no significant differences in long-term survival outcomes despite increased survival to hospital admission with early CPR, T-CPR, or AED [8]. The ideal treatment at the scene involves the use of on-site AED [9]. The concept of Public Access to Defibrillation (PAD), proposed by the AHA Task Force in 1995, aims to improve cardiac arrest survival rates. There is data about the AED usage published as observational study covering 1 January 2008 to 31 December 2018, analyzed 120 cases of AED use in public places in Poland, excluding emergency services, which also have AEDs [10]. The necessity of creating high-quality maps applied on dispatcher one and information regarding the availability of AEDs in the vicinity is of paramount importance. Such improvements are likely to increase the use of AEDs by bystanders in cases of cardiac arrest in public places and on the streets, although they may have a limited impact on their use in residences, where the incidence of OHCA is significant. An analysis of existing AED location maps reveals that the majority of AEDs are situated in public buildings. Developing accurate and up-to-date maps showing the locations of AEDs in public spaces can significantly aid bystanders in quickly finding these life-saving devices. These maps should be accessible across various platforms, including mobile applications, websites, and physical signage in public areas. Additionally, the integration of AED location data with navigation apps and emergency service platforms could prove crucial, as it can streamline the process of locating the nearest AED. Consideration should be given to planning and implementing solutions that could potentially increase the use of AEDs during cardiac arrests occurring in residences [6]. Our findings across the EuReCa studies show significant variability in ROSC outcomes. EuReCa One had the highest ROSC rates, while EuReCa Two saw a decline. In EuReCa Three, CPR attempts increased sharply, ROSC success was low, likely due to pandemic-related factors like bystander hesitation and EMS strain. Although the ROSC incidence decreased in EuReCa Three, we observed a highly significant improvement in 30-day survival rates, rising from 37.5% in EuReCa One and 32.7% in EuReCa Two to 50.5% in EuReCa Three (p=0.01). This finding may be influenced by substantial differences in the populations across the EuReCa One, Two, and Three studies, as well as variations in how data was collected. This highlights the need for robust and standardized data collection methods like Utstein in future studies [11,12] In Poland, EURECA studies indicate a growing trend in the proportion of shockable rhythms among OHCA cases, increasing from 10.9% in 2014 to 22.6% (p=0.01) in 2022. Havranek et al. demonstrated that shockable rhythms significantly improve ROSC and survival outcomes in refractory OHCA, with 40% achieving favorable results compared to 5% with non-shockable rhythms (2022). These findings reflect progress in OHCA management and underscore the importance of early recognition and intervention such is early/high quality CPR etc. in improving survival rates [13]. In summary, the growing involvement of bystanders in CPR has been pivotal, particularly with the support of tools like T-CPR, which are proven to enhance both survival rates and neurological outcomes for cardiac arrest patients. Systematic improvements in public AED availability, precise location mapping, and real-time dispatcher assistance also hold the potential to significantly boost survival rates in out-of-hospital cardiac arrest cases. Moreover, comprehensive evaluation of bystander and first responder interventions, coupled with continued research, is crucial to better understand the economic implications and long-term impacts of these efforts on survival and neurological health.

Limitations

The most important limitation is the nonrandomized design. Some unmeasured confounding variables might have impact on outcome. Experience and personal skills in CPR were also not incorporated in the analysis; thus, it might also be an important limitation. Another major limitation is lack of long-term follow-up of patients. The influence of the duration and variant of mechanical ventilation or circulatory support was not involved in the database. Finally, the sample size might not be sufficient to detect the difference in mortality and adverse event rates. The significant differences in the populations between EuReCa One and EuReCa Three, may have contributed to the observed decline in 30-day survival rates despite the similar ROSC incidence. The short time frame of data collections limits the generalizability of the results, as it does not account for fluctuations in the incidence of OHCA over the course of a year/year. While EuReCa Three required digital and mandatory completion of KMCR, earlier studies (EuReCa ONE and TWO) relied on optional and paper based, but more accurate documentation designed especially for this research according to Utstein criteria, which could lead to difficulties in data analysis [14]. We have to consider a potential bias caused by the patients lost during follow-up. In Poland, the use of the PESEL system to monitor deaths excluded some patients who had not yet been assigned identification numbers, resulting in missing data and underrepresentation of cases in terms of 30-day survival. Moreover, paramedics often filled out records retrospectively, which introduced bias and affected the validity of key variables such as response times and interventions. Collectively, these limitations limit the study's ability to provide a fully comprehensive and reliable analysis of OHCA outcomes in Poland. Regardless of all these limitations, our study exemplified national practice from a large, unselected cohort of patients. Thus, we revealed comprehensive insights into real-world clinical outcome

Conclusions

The results of this study stress the key role of bystanders and dispatchers in the chain of survival in OHCA cases. The results underscore the importance of improving the quality of CPR reporting in Poland to identify effective strategies and allocate resources efficiently. While the trends in the study are consistent with evidence from similar research in other countries, differences in prehospital systems and protocols may limit the direct applicability of these results.

Characteristic	All editions (n=8253)	EuReCa One (n=275)	EuReCa Two (n=741)	EuReCa Three (n=7237)	P
Age (median; IQR)	68 (58 – 77)	64(55 – 78)	69(59 – 80)	68(58 – 77)	<0.01
Sex based on insurance number (male/female) (n)	4758(67.2%) /2326(32.8%)	181(66.1 %)/93(33.9 %)	467(63.3%) /271(36.7%)	4110 (67.7%) /1962(32.3%)	<0.05
CPR attempted by EMS or bystander (no/yes) (n)	n=	n=	n=	n=	<0.01
	812(9.8%) /7440(90.2%)	141(51.5 %) /133(48.5 %)	359(48.4%) /382(51.6%)	312(4.3%) /6925(95.7%)	
CPR performed with the support of a dispatcher (no/yes) (n)	n=	n=	n=	n=	<0.01
	1325(73.0%) /490(27.0%)	199(83.3 %) /40(16.7%)	487(74.1%) /170(25.9%)	639(69.5%) /280(30.5%)	
Rythm (shockable/not shockable) (n)	n=	n=	n=	n=	<0.01
	1560(20.9%) /5896(79.1%)	26(10.9%) /212(89.1 %)	67(9.2%) /662(90.8%)	1467(22.6%) /5022(77.4%)	
ROSC (no/yes) (n)	n=	n=	n=	n=	<0.01
	5634(75.5% /1833(24.5%)	79(60.3%) /52(39.7%)	609(83.7%) /119(16.3%)	4946(74.8%) /1662(25.2%)	
30 – days survival (no/yes) (n)	n=	n=	n=	n=	<0.01
	3542(49.9%)/ 3559 (50.1%)	30(62.5%) /18(37.5%)	66(67.3%) /32(32.7%)	3446(49.5%)/ 3509(50.5%)	

Table 1. Study population characteristics with the EuReCa editions division.
CPR.Cardio-Pulmonary Resuscitation
EMS: Emergency Medical Team
EuReCa: The European Registry of Cardiac Arrest
IQR: Interquartile Range
n: Number of Cases
ROSC: Return of Spontaneous Circulation

List of references:

1. Gräsner JT, Lefering R, Koster RW, et al. EuReCa ONE—27 Nations, ONE Europe, ONE Registry: A prospective one-month analysis of out-of-hospital cardiac arrest outcomes in 27 countries in Europe. Resuscitation. 2016; 105: 188–195, doi: 10.1016/j.resuscitation.2016.06.004.

2. Bagheri S, Sadeghi SM, Kazemi T, et al. Dispatcher-Assisted Bystander Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation (Telephone-CPR) and outcomes after out-of-hospital cardiac arrest. Bull Emerg Trauma. 2019; 7(3): 307–313.

3. Xu J, Qu M, Dong X, et al. Tele-instruction tool for multiple lay responders providing cardiopulmonary resuscitation in telehealth emergency dispatch services: Mixed methods study. J Med Internet Res. 2023; 25: e42788, doi: 10.2196/42788.

4. Announcement of the Marshal of the Sejm of the Republic of Poland dated April 10, 2024, regarding the publication of the consolidated text of the Act on National Medical Rescue Services. 2024.

5. Żuratyński P, Ślęzak D, Dąbrowski S, et al. Use of public automated external defibrillators in out-of-hospital cardiac arrest in Poland. Medicina (Kaunas). 2021; 57(3): 256, doi: 10.3390/medicina57030256.

6. Elhussain MO, Ahmed FK, Mustafa NM, et al. The role of automated external defibrillator use in the out-of-hospital cardiac arrest survival rate and outcome: A systematic review. Cureus. 2023; 15(10): e38879, doi: 10.7759/cureus.38879.

7. Zuratyński P, Ślęzak D, Krzyżanowski K, et al. State Medical Emergency System in Poland. Postępy Nauk Medycznych. 2019; 32(4): 325–331.

8. Cone DC, Burns K, Maciejewski K, et al. Sudden cardiac arrest survival in HEARTSafe communities. Resuscitation. 2020; 146: 13–18, doi: 10.1016/j.resuscitation.2019.11.021.

9. Folke F, Shahriari P, Hansen CM, et al. Public access defibrillation: Challenges and new solutions. Curr Opin Crit Care. 2023; 29(2): 168–174, doi: 10.1097/MCC.0000000000001004.

10. Ślęzak D, Robakowska M, Żuratyński P, et al. Network of automated external defibrillators in Poland before the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic: An in-depth analysis. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2022; 19(15): 9502, doi: 10.3390/ijerph19159502.

11. Cummins RO, Chamberlain DA, Abramson NS, et al. Recommended guidelines for uniform reporting of data from out-of-hospital cardiac arrest: The Utstein style. A statement for health professionals from a task force of the American Heart Association, the European Resuscitation Council, the Heart and Stroke Foundation of Canada, and the Australian Resuscitation Council. Available from: http://ahajournals.org.

12. Gräsner JT, Bray JE, Nolan JP, et al. Cardiac arrest and cardiopulmonary resuscitation outcome reports: 2024 update of the Utstein out-of-hospital cardiac arrest registry template. Resuscitation. 2024; 201: 1–15, doi: 10.1016/j.resuscitation.2024.08.001.

13. Havranek S, Fingrova Z, Rob D, et al. Initial rhythm and survival in refractory out-of-hospital cardiac arrest: Post-hoc analysis of the Prague OHCA randomized trial. Resuscitation. 2022; 181: 289–296, doi: 10.1016/j.resuscitation.2022.12.002.

14. Idris AH, Bierens JJLM, Perkins GD, et al. 2015 revised Utstein-style recommended guidelines for uniform reporting of data from drowning-related resuscitation: An ILCOR advisory statement. Resuscitation. 2017; 118: 147–158, doi: 10.1016/j.resuscitation.2017.09.002.