

1 **FULL TITLE: Females are less likely to receive bystander cardiopulmonary**  
2 **resuscitation in witnessed out-of-hospital cardiac arrest: An Australian perspective.**

3 **SHORT TITLE: Sex-related differences in bystander cardiopulmonary resuscitation**  
4 **provision**

5  
6 **AUTHORS NAMES AND AFFILIATIONS**

7 Sonali Munot<sup>1</sup>, Janet E Bray<sup>2</sup>, Julie Redfern<sup>3</sup>, Adrian Bauman<sup>4</sup>, Simone Marschner<sup>1</sup>,  
8 Christopher Semsarian<sup>5</sup>, Alan Robert Denniss<sup>6</sup>, Andrew Coggins<sup>1,7</sup>, Paul M Middleton<sup>8</sup>,  
9 Garry Jennings<sup>9</sup>, Blake Angell<sup>10</sup>, Saurabh Kumar<sup>1,6</sup>, Pramesh Kovoov<sup>6</sup>, Matthew Vukasovic<sup>7</sup>,  
10 Jason C Bendall<sup>11,12</sup>, Evens T<sup>11</sup>, Clara K Chow<sup>1,6,10</sup>.

- 11  
12 1. Westmead Applied Research Centre, Faculty of Medicine and Health, The  
13 University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia.  
14 2. School of Public Health and Preventive Medicine, Monash University, Victoria,  
15 Australia.  
16 3. School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Medicine and Health, The University of  
17 Sydney, Sydney, Australia.  
18 4. School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine and Health, The University of  
19 Sydney, Sydney, Australia.  
20 5. Agnes Ginges Centre for Molecular Cardiology at Centenary Institute, The  
21 University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia.  
22 6. Department of Cardiology, Westmead Hospital, Sydney, Australia.  
23 7. Department of Emergency Medicine, Westmead Hospital, Sydney, Australia.  
24 8. South Western Emergency Research Institute, Ingham Institute, SWSLHD,  
25 Sydney, Australia.  
26 9. Sydney Health Partners, Charles Perkins Centre, The University of Sydney,  
27 Australia  
28 10. The George Institute for Global Health, University of New South Wales,  
29 Newtown, Australia  
30 11. New South Wales Ambulance, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.  
31 12. School of Medicine and Public Health (Anaesthesia and Intensive Care), The  
32 **University of Newcastle, Australia**

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

33

34 **Corresponding author: Sonali Munot**

35 **Email:** [sonali.munot@sydney.edu.au](mailto:sonali.munot@sydney.edu.au)

36 **Postal address:** The University of Sydney, Western Sydney (Baludarri) Precinct, Faculty of  
37 Medicine and Health, Westmead Applied Research Centre, Level 5, Block K, Entrance 10,  
38 Westmead Hospital, Hawkesbury Road, Westmead, NSW, 2145

39

40 **Main text word count: 3521 words**

41

42

## 43 **CLINICAL PERSPECTIVE**

### 44 **What is new?**

- 45 ● Female OHCA patients in New South Wales, Australia were less likely to receive  
46 bystander CPR, irrespective of arrest location.
- 47 ● In public locations, recognition of OHCA during the emergency call was lower in  
48 women and this partly explained the observed sex difference in bystander CPR  
49 provision.

50

### 51 **What are the clinical implications?**

- 52 ● Public education campaigns and training programs that address bystander response  
53 should consider sex differences as a potential barrier to bystander CPR in OHCA
- 54 ● Future research that examines reasons for lower rates of bystander response in women  
55 and ways of addressing this barrier could help address sex disparities in the future.

56

57 **ABSTRACT**

58

59 **Background:** Bystander cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) plays a significant role in  
60 survival from out-of-hospital cardiac arrest (OHCA). This study aimed to assess whether  
61 bystander CPR differed by patient sex among bystander-witnessed arrests.

62

63 **Methods:** Data on all OHCAs attended by New South Wales (NSW) paramedics between  
64 January 2017 and December 2019 was obtained from the NSW Public Health Risks and  
65 Outcomes Registry (PHROR). This observational study was restricted to bystander-witnessed  
66 cases with presumed medical aetiology. OHCA from arrests in aged care, medical facilities,  
67 and cases with an advance care directive (do-not-resuscitate) were excluded. Multivariate  
68 logistic regression was used to examine the association of patient sex with bystander CPR.  
69 Secondary outcomes were OHCA recognition, bystander AED applied, initial shockable  
70 rhythm, and survival outcomes.

71

72 **Results:** Among the 4,491 bystander-witnessed cases, females were less likely to receive  
73 bystander CPR in both private residential (Adjusted Odds ratio [AOR]: 0.82, 95%CI: 0.70-  
74 0.95) and public locations (AOR: 0.58, 95%CI:0.39-0.88). Recognition of OHCA in the  
75 emergency call was lower for females, particularly in those who arrested in public locations  
76 (84.6% vs 91.6%-males,  $p=0.002$ ) and it partially explained the association of sex with  
77 bystander CPR (~44%). There was no significant difference in OHCA recognition by sex for  
78 arrests in private residential locations ( $p=0.2$ ). Females had lower rates of bystander AED use  
79 (4.8% vs 9.6%,  $p<0.001$ ) however, after adjustment for arrest location and other covariates,  
80 this relationship was attenuated and no longer significant (AOR: 0.83, 95%CI: 0.60-1.12).  
81 Females were significantly less likely to record an initial shockable rhythm (AOR: 0.52,

82 95%CI: 0.44-0.61). Although females had greater odds of event survival (AOR: 1.34, 95%CI:  
83 1.15 – 1.56), there was no sex difference in survival to hospital discharge (AOR: 0.96,  
84 95%CI: 0.77-1.19).

85

86 **Conclusion:** OHCA recognition and bystander CPR provision differs by patient sex in NSW.

87 Given their importance to patient outcomes, research is needed to understand why this

88 difference occurs and to raise awareness of this issue to the public.

89

90 **KEYWORDS:** Out-of-hospital Cardiac Arrest, Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation, Sex,

91

92

93

## 94 INTRODUCTION

95 Out-of-hospital cardiac arrest (OHCA) is associated with poor survival [1, 2, 3]. Bystander  
96 response, including cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) and the use of an automated  
97 external defibrillator (AED), is associated with greater survival and better neurological  
98 outcomes [4, 5, 6]. However, rates of AED use are suboptimal, and the provision of  
99 bystander CPR varies by physical, social, and attitudinal factors related to the bystander and  
100 patient [7, 8]. There is also emerging evidence that bystander response may differ depending  
101 on the patient's sex [9, 10, 11].

102  
103 Lower rates of bystander CPR have been reported for female OHCA patients across several  
104 jurisdictions, for example, in the United States and Asia. However, this difference has been  
105 reported to vary depending on arrest location, patient age and other factors (e.g., bystander  
106 characteristics) [9, 12, 13]. Witnessed status also varies by sex, with females less likely to  
107 have a witnessed arrest than men, and this may explain some of the variation seen in  
108 bystander CPR [14]. In Australia, a study examining OHCA outcomes noted lower bystander  
109 CPR in females, however these were unadjusted estimates [15]. In contrast, a systematic  
110 review of data examining sex and OHCA survival, reported higher rates of bystander CPR in  
111 female patients [16]. However, their results were based on a comparison of weighted means  
112 of bystander CPR percentages and were not adjusted estimates.

113  
114 Bystander CPR relies on OHCA recognition in the emergency call, which is needed to  
115 receive telephone CPR instructions[17]. It has been suggested that OHCA identification and  
116 misperceptions about women being in medical distress as a potential barrier in CPR for  
117 female patients [18]. To our knowledge, whether there are sex differences in OHCA  
118 recognition has not been examined.

119 The primary aim of this study was to assess if patients' sex is associated with bystander CPR.

120 The secondary objectives were to examine whether sex was associated with bystander AED

121 application, shockable rhythm, survival outcomes, and recognition of OHCA by emergency

122 call takers as well as explore whether this mediated the association between patient sex and

123 bystander CPR provision.

124

125

## 126 **METHODS**

### 127 **Study design and setting**

128 This observational study examined data prospectively collected on all OHCA attended by  
129 NSW Ambulance between January 2017 – December 2019. NSW Ambulance provides  
130 emergency medical services (EMS) to all of NSW and NSW Ambulance handles over 1.2  
131 million emergency calls annually. NSW has the highest population of any state in Australia  
132 (8,153,000 residents as of 30 June 2022), with over three-quarters living in metropolitan areas  
133 [19]. NSW Ambulance call-takers are accredited with the International Academies of  
134 Emergency Dispatch (IAED) and use the structured call-taking system Medical Priority  
135 Dispatch System™ (MPDS) [20]. OHCA calls include instructions for CPR and defibrillator  
136 retrieval . Ethics approval for this study was obtained from The University of Sydney Ethics  
137 Committee (Ref: 2021/017).

138

### 139 **Data source**

140 De-identified data on OHCA was obtained from the NSW Public Health Risks and  
141 Outcomes Registry which is maintained by the NSW Ministry of Health. The registry  
142 includes all cases of EMS-attended OHCA [21, 22], and data is collected, coded, and  
143 recorded as per the OHCA Utstein Template [23] [24].

144

### 145 **Inclusion and exclusion criteria**

146 Analyses were restricted to bystander-witnessed cases of arrest due to presumed medical  
147 causes that were attended by the EMS. Arrests from external causes (drowning, overdose,  
148 trauma), paramedic-witnessed, unwitnessed, with an advance care directive (do-not-  
149 resuscitate (DNR) order), arrests occurring in nursing homes, medical centres / GP clinics,



150 police stations, correctional facilities/jails and ambulance stations were excluded from our  
151 analysis (Figure 1). Patients with unknown or missing sex data were also excluded.

152

### 153 **Definition of variables**

#### 154 *Primary and secondary outcome variables*

155 Bystander CPR, defined as “CPR provided by any person who happens to be nearby and is  
156 not part of the organised emergency response system”, was categorised as yes or no [21]. A  
157 small proportion of responses recorded as unknown/not stated (3.7% females; 2.9% males)  
158 were classified as ‘no bystander CPR’ for the purpose of our analyses. Sensitivity analyses  
159 were conducted with unknown responses excluded.

160 Secondary outcomes were: AED application by a bystander (defined as an AED connected to  
161 the patient prior to ambulance arrival), initial shockable rhythm, OHCA recognition  
162 documented in the emergency call, and, survival outcomes, including event survival (defined  
163 as patients with a return of spontaneous circulation on arrival at the hospital emergency  
164 department) and survival to hospital discharge.

165 Recognition of OHCA in the emergency call is documented in the registry as ‘call-taker  
166 identified presence of OHCA and is a binary response (yes vs no). Emergency services call-  
167 taker assistance is known to influence bystander CPR [7, 25], but requires that the OHCA is  
168 recognized in the call. This variable was also assessed as a potential mediator between sex  
169 and bystander CPR.

#### 170 *Primary independent variable*

171 The primary independent variable was patients’ biological sex, recorded as male or female.

#### 172 *Covariates*

173 Patients’ age, arrest aetiology (presumed cardiac vs other medical), witnessed status (yes vs  
174 no), arrest location (private residential vs public location), arrest site (urban vs nonurban),

175 advance directive (Do Not Resuscitate order) and ambulance response time were all  
176 considered as factors that could potentially influence the association between bystander CPR  
177 and patient sex. This was based on previous studies in this space, data availability, and  
178 clinical reasoning. These potentially confounding variables were managed by  
179 restriction/exclusion, statistical adjustment or presented as subgroups (arrest location: private  
180 residential vs public location). Arrest aetiology was collapsed into binary categories of  
181 presumed cardiac v/s other medical cause). Non-cardiac medical causes included cancer  
182 (6.7%), respiratory disease (6.5%), terminal illness, other (3.0%), neurological (1.3%), Other  
183 medical cause, not specified (23.0%). Arrest site areas' level of remoteness (urban vs  
184 nonurban) was defined using the Accessibility and Remoteness Index of Australia (ARIA)  
185 score [26]. ARIA classifies an area as urban/metropolitan or nonurban (regional, rural) based  
186 on their relative access to services. Missing data for covariates was excluded from analysis  
187 (Table 1 footnote).

188


### 189 **Statistical analysis**

190 Analyses were conducted using R, version 4.1.0 [27]. Descriptive statistics were calculated  
191 with categorical data reported as counts and proportions, and continuous data as medians and  
192 interquartile range (IQR). Pearson's  $\chi^2$  test was used to examine group differences and the  
193 Wilcoxon rank sum test was used for continuous data. For both tests, the p-value was  
194 considered significant if below 0.05. Missing data was excluded from analysis (see Table 1  
195 footnote). Primary analysis involved the examination of the association between patients' sex  
196 and bystander CPR. Multivariate logistic regression models were adjusted for potentially  
197 confounding variables that were retained in the model if clinically relevant and associated  
198 with bystander CPR at  $p < 0.05$  (Table 2). The primary outcome was stratified by arrest  
199 location that were grouped into private residential locations (homes) versus public locations.

200 Public locations included public building /public place (15.1%), street / road / highway  
201 (2.7%), sporting / recreation event (2.3%), vehicle (1.4%), workplace / industrial (1.4%),  
202 airport (0.7%), school /educational institution (0.4%), public transport (0.3), other- not  
203 specified (0.7%). Multivariable models for secondary outcomes use the total sample and were  
204 not split by location, given the limited sample size.

205 Mediation analysis was conducted to test whether the association between the patients' sex  
206 and bystander CPR could be potentially explained by recognition of OHCA during the  
207 emergency call, and this was examined using the *mediation package* in R [28]  
208 (Supplementary section 2). This required comparing regression models with and without the  
209 proposed mediator variable and involved a bootstrapping approach to arrive at an estimate of  
210 the proportion mediated [29, 30]. Mediation was assessed when the following prerequisites  
211 were fulfilled: (a) the independent variable (patient sex) affects the mediator (OHCA  
212 recognition) (b) the mediating variable affects the outcome (bystander CPR) [31, 32]  
213

214 **Figure 1. Selection of study analytic cohort**



215

Note: EMS=Emergency Medical Services; NSW=New South Wales; OHCA: Out-of-hospital Cardiac Arrest

216

## 217 RESULTS

218 In the three years between January 2017 and December 2019, NSW Ambulance attended  
219 21,836 OHCA from a medical cause (Figure 1). Of the bystander-witnessed cohort  
220 (n=4491), 30% were female (Table 1). Most arrests occurred in private residential locations,  
221 although this was significantly higher in females (84.6% females vs 70.7% males,  $p<0.001$ )  
222 (Table 1). Females were also older (median age: 71 vs 68 years,  $p<0.001$ ), and less likely to  
223 have a presumed cardiac cause than males (54.0% females vs 61.9% males,  $p<0.001$ ). The  
224 majority of bystanders in private residential locations were related to the patient as compared  
225 with those in a public location (72.3% vs 6.5%,  $p<0.001$ ) (Supplementary Table S1). The rate  
226 of OHCA recognition documented during the emergency call was significantly lower for  
227 females that arrested in a public location (84.6% vs 91.6%,  $p=0.002$ ), but was not  
228 significantly different for arrests in private residential locations (89.2% vs 90.5%,  $p=0.2$ )  
229 (Supplementary section Table S1). Ambulance response times were similar for male and  
230 female patients irrespective of location ( $p=0.06$ ). Compared with males, bystander CPR was  
231 significantly lower for female patients overall (64.6% vs 73.7%,  $p<0.001$ ), and in both  
232 private residential (61.5% vs 67.8%,  $p<0.001$ ) and public locations (81.5% vs 88.2%,  
233  $p=0.010$ ) (Supplementary section Table S1).

234 In sensitivity analysis, excluding cases where bystander CPR status was unknown/not stated  
235 did not make a significant difference to the results.

236

237 **Table 1: Distribution of key arrest/patient characteristics by patient sex in**  
238 **bystander-witnessed OHCA NSW January 2017 – December 2019**

Characteristic	Study sample N=4491	Females N=1369	Males N=3122	p-value
<b>Arrest location</b>				<0.001
Private residential	<b>3366 (75.0)</b>	1158 (84.6)	2208 (70.7)	
Public	<b>1125 (25.0)</b>	211 (15.4)	914 (29.3)	
<b>Arrest Site</b> Urban/metropolitan	<b>3024 (67.4)</b>	933 (68.2)	2091 (67.1)	0.50
<b>Presumed cardiac aetiology</b>	<b>2675 (59.6%)</b>	744 (54.0%)	1931 (61.9%)	<0.001
<b>Age (years), Median (IQR)</b>	<b>69 (58 - 80)</b>	71 (59 - 82)	68 (57 - 78)	<0.001
<b>Bystander CPR</b>	<b>3186 (71.0)</b>	884 (64.6)	2302 (73.7)	<0.001
<b>Bystander AED used</b>	<b>366 (8.2)</b>	66 (4.8)	300 (9.6)	<0.001
<b>OHCA recognized in call</b>	<b>4001 (90.1)</b>	1191 (88.5)	2810 (90.8)	0.017
<b>Ambulance response time (minutes), Median (IQR)</b>	<b>9 (7 - 14)</b>	10 (7, 14)	9 (7, 13)	0.06
<b>Shockable initial rhythm</b>	<b>1565 (35.5)</b>	301 (22.4)	1264 (41.2)	<0.001
<b>Survived event</b>	<b>1270 (28.3)</b>	394 (28.8)	876 (28.1)	0.60
<b>Survived to hospital discharge</b>	<b>602 (13.8)</b>	142 (10.6)	460 (15.1)	<0.001

239 *Excluded n/a/missing: Arrest site(7); Age(36); EMS call-taker identified OHCA (51); Shockable*  
240 *initial rhythm (80); Survived event (0); Survived to hospital discharge (114). All n/a excluded from*  
241 *analysis except for Bystander CPR (140) or AED use (9) -where n/a were included in the 'No'*  
242 *category. Note: CPR: Cardiopulmonary resuscitation; AED: Automated External Defibrillator; IQR:*  
243 *Interquartile range (Q1 – Q3). Differences in characteristics by location subgroup are detailed in*  
244 *Supplementary Table S1.*

245

246 The likelihood of bystander CPR was significantly lower with increasing age (OR: 0.98  
247 95%CI: 0.97 – 0.98); in arrests presumed to be of a non-cardiac medical aetiology (OR: 0.50  
248 95%CI: 0.44 – 0.58); when OHCA was not recognised during the emergency call (OR: 0.15  
249 95%CI: 0.12 – 0.18) and when the ambulance arrived at the arrest scene in under five minutes  
250 (Global p<0.0001) (Table 2).

251

252 **Table 2: Univariate associations of key patient/arrest characteristics and the**  
253 **likelihood of receiving bystander CPR (OR and 95%CI)**

	All arrests	Private residential location	Public location
<b>Arrest location</b>			
Public place	Reference		
Private residential	0.29 (0.24 - 0.34)	n/a	n/a
<b>Arrest site:</b>			
Urban	Reference	Reference	Reference
Regional/Rural	0.86 (0.75 - 0.99)	0.90 (0.77 - 1.04)	0.73 (0.51 - 1.05)
<b>Patient sex</b>			
Male	Reference	Reference	Reference
Female	0.65 (0.57 - 0.74)	0.76 (0.66 - 0.88)	0.59 (0.40 - 0.89)
<b>Patient age</b>			
(per one-year increase in age)	0.98 (0.97 - 0.98)	0.98 (0.98 - 0.99)	0.99 (0.98 - 1.00)
(By age group)			
<55 years	Reference	Reference	Reference
55-75 years	0.65 (0.53 - 0.78)	0.71(0.55 - 0.88)	0.52 (0.32 - 0.83)
>75 years	0.35 (0.29 - 0.43)	0.39 (0.32 - 0.49)	0.56 (0.32 - 0.96)
<b>Arrest aetiology</b>			
Presumed cardiac	Reference	Reference	Reference
Other medical	0.50 (0.44 - 0.58)	0.52 (0.45 - 0.60)	0.73 (0.51 - 1.05)
<b>OHCA recognized in call</b>			
Yes	Reference	Reference	Reference
No	0.15 (0.12 - 0.18)	0.13 (0.10 - 0.17)	0.11 (0.07 - 0.18)
<b>Ambulance response time (minutes)</b>			
<5	Reference	Reference	Reference
5-7	1.64 (1.25 - 2.14)	1.55 (1.13 - 2.14)	3.65 (1.98 - 6.99)
7-10	1.50 (1.18 - 1.91)	1.52 (1.13 - 2.03)	2.86 (1.71 - 4.80)
10-14	1.32 (1.03 - 1.68)	1.38 (1.03 - 1.85)	2.69 (1.56 - 4.71)
>14	1.10 (0.86 - 1.39)	1.19 (0.89 - 1.58)	1.84 (1.10 - 3.07)

Note: OR: Odds ratio; CI: Confidence interval; Arrest site (Urban vs nonurban); OHCA: Out-of-hospital cardiac arrest

254  
255  
256

257 After adjusting for covariates, females had significantly lower odds of receiving bystander  
258 CPR (Private location: AOR 0.82, 95%CI:0.70 - 0.95; Public location: AOR 0.58,  
259 95%CI:0.39 - 0.88) (Figure 2). The association between patient sex and bystander CPR in  
260 public locations was partially mediated (estimate ~44%) by recognition of OHCA in the call  
261 – with the inclusion of this variable in the adjusted model attenuating the association  
262 (between patient sex and bystander CPR) (AOR: 0.67 95%CI:0.43 – 1.06).

263


## 264 **Secondary outcomes**

265 OHCA recognition documented by the emergency call taker was lower for females arresting  
266 in public locations (AOR: 0.52 95%CI: 0.33 – 0.83). Bystander AED use was significantly  
267 lower among females (4.8% vs 9.6%  $p<0.001$ ) (Table 1). Most of AED application reflects  
268 use in public locations compared with private residential locations (28.3% vs 1.4%,  $p<0.001$ )  
269 (Supplement Table S1). After adjusting for location there was no significant difference in  
270 AED application by patient sex (AOR 0.83 95%CI:0.60-1.12) (Figure 2). Females had lower  
271 odds of presenting with a shockable initial rhythm compared with male patients (AOR 0.51,  
272 95%CI:0.43 - 0.60) (Figure 2). Females had a greater likelihood of surviving the event to  
273 reach the emergency department (AOR: 1.34, 95%CI:1.15 - 1.56), but this survival advantage  
274 was not sustained to hospital discharge (AOR: 0.96 95%CI:0.77 - 1.19).

275



276 **Figure 2: Crude and Adjusted odds ratios explaining the association between patient sex with primary and secondary**  
 277 **outcomes**



278  
 279 *OR: Odds Ratio; CI: Confidence interval; CPR: Cardiopulmonary resuscitation; AED: Automated external defibrillator. All multivariate models were adjusted for patient*  
 280 *age, presumed aetiology, and ambulance response time. Furthermore, Bystander AED use model additionally adjusted for arrest location, while shockable initial rhythm and*  
 281 *survival outcomes models additionally adjusted for arrest location, arrest site, bystander CPR and bystander AED use.*

## 282 **DISCUSSION**

283 Female OHCA patients are less likely to receive bystander CPR compared with male patients  
284 and this association was significant after accounting for covariates including age, presumed  
285 aetiology, and ambulance response time. This relationship was consistent for both public  
286 locations and private residential locations. Emergency call takers were less likely to  
287 document recognition of OHCA in females, and mediation analysis demonstrated that this  
288 partially explained the lower rates of bystander CPR in females. Rates of bystander AED use  
289 were low overall and while females were less likely to have an AED applied, they were also  
290 less likely to present in shockable rhythm, however the association of sex with AED use  
291 became non-significant after adjusting for covariates. Survival to hospital discharge was  
292 similar by sex.

293

294 Several studies have found differences in provision of bystander CPR by sex with most  
295 indicating lower rates in females and some suggesting the observed differences vary by arrest  
296 location or patient age [9, 11, 12, 14]. For example in the United States, males had higher  
297 odds of receiving bystander CPR in public locations, but not in private residential  
298 locations[9]. Similar observations were made across Asian countries where an analysis of  
299 56,192 OHCA cases found females had lower rates of bystander CPR in public locations, but  
300 in private locations there were higher rates of CPR for females compared to males[11]. Such  
301 observations have been explained as potentially due to the bystander knowing or being  
302 related to the patient in private locations versus a discomfort of touching the chest of an  
303 unknown female in public locations [9, 13, 18]. Indeed, one study from the U.S. suggests it  
304 may be less socially acceptable to perform CPR in women with hesitancy in touching females  
305 suggested as a factor in a public survey conducted in the United States [18]. In our cohort,  
306 majority of bystanders were related with patients in private residential locations, less so in

307 public locations. Despite this we observed a disadvantage in CPR provision for females in  
308 private residences.

309

310 A variety of factors have been hypothesized to explain lower rates of bystander CPR in  
311 women including concerns around modesty, fear of causing harm or legal liability and  
312 perceptions of fragility[18, 33]. OHCA may present differently in females compared to  
313 males. The current study demonstrating the contributing role of recognition of OHCA by the  
314 call taker is also consistent with a mixed methods investigation in which audio recordings of  
315 emergency calls were analysed to examine factors associated with emergency call-takers  
316 sensitivity in OHCA recognition finding a lower recognition in females [34]. Call-takers  
317 generally apply standard algorithms in triage and identification of OHCA [35] which depend  
318 on the caller's description of the patient's condition. The lower sensitivity in OHCA  
319 identification for female could be related to callers' description of symptoms or the  
320 seriousness of patients' condition. Blom et al (2019) examined if there were delays in OHCA  
321 recognition by assessing the time from emergency call to ambulance dispatch but found no  
322 difference by patient sex [14]. They noted that they could not factor in delays from OHCA  
323 onset to recognition by bystanders. Researchers have pointed to sex-related differences in  
324 warning symptoms prior to cardiac arrest noting that while chest pain was more commonly  
325 experienced by men, women more typically had shortness of breath [36, 37]. Linguistic  
326 factors were also found to be important in influencing whether the emergency call will  
327 progress to bystander CPR provision [38, 39]. Future investigations that involve listening to  
328 emergency call recordings and analysing the interaction between caller and call-taker may be  
329 able to specifically identify barriers unique to women.

330

331 Our findings noted that while rates of bystander AED use were lower among females, the  
332 difference was not significant after accounting for covariates. Women were significantly  
333 more likely to arrest in residential locations compared with males and use of AEDs in private  
334 residential locations was very low. Studies from larger populations in the United States and  
335 Japan have found that men were significantly more likely to have public AEDs applied by a  
336 bystander [10, 40]. They speculated that the differences observed could relate to  
337 embarrassment or fear of sexual assault [10, 40].

338  
339 Females also had a lower likelihood of presenting in a shockable initial rhythm irrespective of  
340 age and location. This could be related to differences in arrest aetiology and mechanisms of  
341 cardiac arrest [15]. However, a lack of or a delay in CPR provision could also play a role,  
342 given that over time shockable rhythms degenerate to non-shockable rhythms without chest  
343 compressions [41]. As reported in other studies, females were more likely to survive to  
344 hospital, but there was no difference in survival to hospital discharge [15, 42]. Several studies  
345 have examined the differences in aetiology and comorbidities among women. However, it is  
346 uncertain whether a real difference in survival exists after accounting for known patient,  
347 prehospital and treatment factors that could explain disparities [42].

348  
349 Our study has limitations. We were limited in our ability to control for unmeasured  
350 confounders that could explain the observed sex-based disparities (e.g., bystander  
351 characteristics, perceived frailty, comorbidities) [43, 44]. We controlled for this to some  
352 extent by excluding arrests with a DNR order and nursing home/medical facility arrests  
353 where females were overrepresented. Additionally, we adjusted for age and arrest aetiology  
354 given the higher age at arrest in females and a greater rate of non-cardiac causes (e.g.,  
355 terminal illness) compared with males. Witness status was missing for several cases and these

356 cases were excluded from our analysis [14, 45]. The registry data did not distinguish if  
357 bystander CPR provision was spontaneous (bystander-initiated) or in-time (telephone  
358 guided). Dispatcher assistance has been shown to influence initiation and quality of bystander  
359 CPR [46] and rates of recognition by OHCA by emergency call takers were high, suggesting  
360 that dispatcher assistance could be high in this cohort [47, 48]. The mediation analysis  
361 examining the role of OHCA recognition during the emergency call should only be  
362 considered as hypothesis generation of the suggested mechanism rather than definitive  
363 evidence of causal processes given that it is based on non-experimental or observational data  
364 [32, 49]. Finally, our sample size limited precision and analysis of secondary outcomes and  
365 sub-groups.

366

## 367 **CONCLUSION**

368 This study provides novel new data demonstrating in Australia's most populous state which  
369 has high rates of CPR training in the general population, females are less likely to receive  
370 bystander CPR in OHCA. It also describes a potential mitigating mechanism for the  
371 observation of sex differences with demonstrating the potential role of call takers in  
372 recognising OHCA over the phone. The findings suggest that public education, campaigns  
373 are needed to address these inequalities and possibly the utility of targeting emergency  
374 personnel to help with redressing the issue of recognition of possible OHCA over a call.  
375 However further research is needed to better understand this issue and to also develop  
376 interventions to address them.

377

378

## 379 **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS STATEMENT**

380 SM conceived the study design, submitted the ethics application, analysed the data,  
381 interpreted the results, and wrote the first draft of this manuscript. JB and SMarschner  
382 assisted with analysis. All authors (SMunot, JB, JR, AB, SMarschner, CS, ARD, AC, PMM,  
383 GJ, BA, SK, PK, MV, JB, ET, CC) have reviewed, critiqued, and provided intellectual input  
384 on various drafts and approved the submitted draft. CC acquired the data, critiqued the  
385 analysis plan, multiple drafts and approved the final draft and is the overall guarantor.

386

387

## 388 **FUNDING AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

389 This work was supported by the National Health and Medical Research Council  
390 (NHMRC) of Australia partnership project grant (#1168950). In addition, and as part of  
391 the NHMRC partnership grant, the study received support from the following partner  
392 organisations: NSW Ministry of Health, Surf Life Saving NSW, Western Sydney Local  
393 Health District, NSW Ambulance, The National Heart Foundation of Australia,  
394 Michael Hughes Foundation (now merged with Heart of the Nation), Heart Support  
395 Australia, City of Parramatta, Take Heart Australia, and the NSW Data Analytics  
396 Centre. SMunot was funded by PhD scholarships from The University of Sydney  
397 centres (Westmead Applied Research Centre and Charles Perkins Centre Westmead  
398 node), JB is funded by a Heart Foundation of Australia Fellowship (##104751), JR is  
399 funded by an NHMRC Investigator Grant (GNT1143538), CS is funded by an NHMRC  
400 Practitioner Fellowship (#1154992) and NSW Health, BA is supported by an NHMRC  
401 Emerging Leadership Grant (GNT2010055). The authors would like to acknowledge  
402 the data custodian NSW Ministry of Health and the statistical assistance of Haeri Min  
403 and Desi Quintans.

404

405 **CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

406 None

## REFERENCES

1. Bray J, Howell S, Ball S, Doan T, Bosley E, Smith K, et al. The epidemiology of out-of-hospital cardiac arrest in Australia and New Zealand: A binational report from the Australasian Resuscitation Outcomes Consortium (Aus-ROC). *Resuscitation*. 2022 Mar;172:74-83.
2. Gräsner JT, Wnent J, Herlitz J, Perkins GD, Lefering R, Tjelmeland I, et al. Survival after out-of-hospital cardiac arrest in Europe - Results of the EuReCa Two study. *Resuscitation*. 2020;148:218-226.
3. Cardiac arrest registry to enhance survival (CARES). Annual report 2022. Available from: <https://mycares.net/sitepages/data.jsp>. accessed on 15 November 2023.
4. 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*. 2018;26(1):86.
5. Bækgaard JS, Viereck S, Møller TP, Ersbøll AK, Lippert F, Folke F. The effects of public access defibrillation on survival after out-of-hospital cardiac arrest: A systematic review of observational studies. *Circulation*. 2017;136(10):954-965.
6. Odom E, Nakajima Y, Vellano K, Al-Araji R, Coleman King S, Zhang Z, et al. Trends in EMS-attended out-of-hospital cardiac arrest survival, United States 2015–2019. *Resuscitation*. 2022;179:88-93.
7. Case R, Cartledge S, Siedenburg J, Smith K, Straney L, Barger B, et al. Identifying barriers to the provision of bystander cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) in high-risk regions: A qualitative review of emergency calls. *Resuscitation*. 2018;129:43-47.
8. Munot S, Rugel EJ, Von Huben A, Marschner S, Redfern J, Ware S, et al. Out-of-hospital cardiac arrests and bystander response by socioeconomic disadvantage in communities of New South Wales, Australia. *Resuscitation Plus*. 2022;9:100205.
9. Blewer AL, McGovern SK, Schmicker RH, May S, Morrison LJ, Aufderheide TP, et al. Gender disparities among adult recipients of bystander cardiopulmonary resuscitation in the public. *Circulation: Cardiovascular Quality and Outcomes*. 2018;11(8):e004710.
10. Jadhav S, Gaddam S. Gender and location disparities in prehospital bystander AED usage. *Resuscitation*. 2021;158:139-142.
11. Liu N, Ning Y, Ong MEH, Saffari SE, Ryu HH, Kajino K, et al. Gender disparities among adult recipients of layperson bystander cardiopulmonary resuscitation by location of cardiac arrest in Pan-Asian communities: A registry-based study. *eClinicalMedicine*. 2022;44.
12. Ishii M, Tsujita K, Seki T, Okada M, Kubota K, Matsushita K, et al. Sex- and Age-Based Disparities in Public Access Defibrillation, Bystander Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation, and Neurological Outcome in Cardiac Arrest. *JAMA Network Open*. 2023;6(7):e2321783-e2321783.
13. Matsuyama T, Okubo M, Kiyohara K, Kiguchi T, Kobayashi D, Nishiyama C, et al. Sex-Based Disparities in Receiving Bystander Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation by Location of Cardiac Arrest in Japan. *Mayo Clin Proc*. 2019;94(4):577-587.
14. Blom MT, Oving I, Berdowski J, van Valkengoed IGM, Bardai A, Tan HL. Women have lower chances than men to be resuscitated and survive out-of-hospital cardiac arrest. *Eur Heart J*. 2019;40(47):3824-3834.
15. Bray JE, Stub D, Bernard S, Smith K. Exploring gender differences and the “oestrogen effect” in an Australian out-of-hospital cardiac arrest population. *Resuscitation*. 2013;84(7):957-963.



16. Lakbar I, Ippolito M, Nassiri A, Delamarre L, Tadger P, Leone M, et al. Sex and out-of-hospital cardiac arrest survival: a systematic review. *Ann Intensive Care*. 2022;12(1):114.
17. Kurz MC, Bobrow BJ, Buckingham J, Cabanas JG, Eisenberg M, Fromm P, et al. Telecommunicator Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation: A Policy Statement From the American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 2020;141(12):e686-e700.
18. Perman SM, Shelton SK, Knoepke C, Rappaport K, Matlock DD, Adelgais K, et al. Public Perceptions on Why Women Receive Less Bystander Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation Than Men in Out-of-Hospital Cardiac Arrest. *Circulation*. 2019;139(8):1060-1068.
19. Australian Bureau of Statistics. National, state and territory population [Internet] 2023. Available from: <https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/people/population/national-state-and-territory-population/latest-release>. accessed on August 20 2023.
20. Priority Dispatch Corp. Medical Priority Dispatch System 13 ed. Salt Lake City, Utah, USA 2017.
21. Packham N WS, Faddy SC, Fouche PF, Arnold J, Burns B & Bendall JC. Out-of-Hospital Cardiac Arrest in NSW 2020 Annual Report. Sydney: NSW Ambulance; 2020. Available from: [https://www.ambulance.nsw.gov.au/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0006/643722/DE487-OHCAR-Report-2019\\_V6.pdf](https://www.ambulance.nsw.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0006/643722/DE487-OHCAR-Report-2019_V6.pdf). accessed on 07 Jan 2022.
22. Centre for Health Record Linkage (CHeReL). CHeReL Datasets and Data Dictionaries 2021. Available from: <https://www.cherel.org.au/datasets>. accessed on 05 Dec 2022.
23. Perkins GD, Jacobs IG, Nadkarni VM, Berg RA, Bhanji F, Biarent D, et al. Cardiac arrest and cardiopulmonary resuscitation outcome reports: update of the Utstein Resuscitation Registry Templates for Out-of-Hospital Cardiac Arrest: a statement for healthcare professionals from a task force of the International Liaison Committee on Resuscitation (American Heart Association, European Resuscitation Council, Australian and New Zealand Council on Resuscitation, Heart and Stroke Foundation of Canada, InterAmerican Heart Foundation, Resuscitation Council of Southern Africa, Resuscitation Council of Asia); and the American Heart Association Emergency Cardiovascular Care Committee and the Council on Cardiopulmonary, Critical Care, Perioperative and Resuscitation. *Circulation*. 2015;132(13):1286-1300.
24. Dyson S. NSW ambulance cardiac arrest registry. 2017 report. 2020. Available from: <https://www.ambulance.nsw.gov.au/about-us/corporate-publications> accessed on 15 Sept 2023.
25. Viereck S, Palsgaard Moller T, Kjaer Ersboll A, Folke F, Lippert F. Effect of bystander CPR initiation prior to the emergency call on ROSC and 30day survival-An evaluation of 548 emergency calls. *Resuscitation*. 2017;111:55-61.
26. Australian Government: Department of Health. 2.3 Accessibility Remoteness Index of Australia (ARIA) Remoteness Area (RA) in *Accessibility Remoteness Index of Australia (ARIA) Review Analysis of Areas of Concern—Final Report*. Canberra 2011.
27. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria Vienna, Austria. 2021. Available from: <https://www.R-project.org/>. accessed on 3 May 2021.
28. Tingley D, Yamamoto T, Hirose K, Keele L, Imai K. mediation: R Package for Causal Mediation Analysis. *Journal of Statistical Software*. 2014;59(5):1 - 38.
29. Kim B. "Introduction to Mediation Analysis" UVA Library StatLab 2016. Available from: <https://library.virginia.edu/data/articles/introduction-to-mediation-analysis>. accessed on 1st December 2023.

30. Baron RM, Kenny DA. The Moderator-Mediator Variable Distinction in Social Psychological Research: Conceptual, Strategic, and Statistical Considerations. *Journal of personality and social psychology*. 1986;51(6):1173-1182.
31. Judd CM, Kenny DA. Process Analysis: Estimating Mediation in Treatment Evaluations. *Evaluation Review*. 1981;5(5):602-619.
32. Shrout PE, Bolger N. Mediation in experimental and nonexperimental studies: new procedures and recommendations. *Psychol Methods*. 2002;7(4):422-445.
33. Kramer CE, Wilkins MS, Davies JM, Caird JK, Hallihan GM. Does the sex of a simulated patient affect CPR? *Resuscitation*. 2015;86:82-87.
34. Watkins CL, Jones SP, Hurley MA, Benedetto V, Price CI, Sutton CJ, et al. Predictors of recognition of out of hospital cardiac arrest by emergency medical services call handlers in England: a mixed methods diagnostic accuracy study. *Scandinavian Journal of Trauma, Resuscitation and Emergency Medicine*. 2021;29(1):7.
35. Perera N, Birnie T, Whiteside A, Ball S, Finn J. "If you miss that first step in the chain of survival, there is no second step"-Emergency ambulance call-takers' experiences in managing out-of-hospital cardiac arrest calls. *PloS one*. 2023;18(3):e0279521.
36. Reinier K, Dizon B, Chugh H, Bhanji Z, Seifer M, Sargsyan A, et al. Warning symptoms associated with imminent sudden cardiac arrest: a population-based case-control study with external validation. *The Lancet Digital Health*. 2023;5(11):e763-e773.
37. Gnesin F, Mills EHA, Jensen B, Møller AL, Zylyftari N, Bøggild H, et al. Symptoms reported in calls to emergency medical services within 24 hours prior to out-of-hospital cardiac arrest. *Resuscitation*. 2022;181:86-96.
38. Riou M, Ball S, Whiteside A, Bray J, Perkins GD, Smith K, et al. 'We're going to do CPR': A linguistic study of the words used to initiate dispatcher-assisted CPR and their association with caller agreement. *Resuscitation*. 2018a;133:95-100.
39. Riou M, Ball S, Williams TA, Whiteside A, Cameron P, Fatovich DM, et al. 'She's sort of breathing': What linguistic factors determine call-taker recognition of agonal breathing in emergency calls for cardiac arrest? *Resuscitation*. 2018;122:92-98.
40. Kiyohara K, Katayama Y, Kitamura T, Kiguchi T, Matsuyama T, Ishida K, et al. Gender disparities in the application of public-access AED pads among OHCA patients in public locations. *Resuscitation*. 2020;150:60-64.
41. Cournoyer A, Chauny JM, Paquet J, Potter B, Lamarche Y, de Montigny L, et al. Electrical rhythm degeneration in adults with out-of-hospital cardiac arrest according to the no-flow and bystander low-flow time. *Resuscitation*. 2021;167:355-361.
42. Kotini-Shah P, Del Rios M, Khosla S, Pugach O, Vellano K, McNally B, et al. Sex differences in outcomes for out-of-hospital cardiac arrest in the United States. *Resuscitation*. 2021;163:6-13.
43. Lee G, Ro YS, Park JH, Hong KJ, Song KJ, Shin SD. Interaction between bystander sex and patient sex in bystander cardiopulmonary resuscitation for Out-of-Hospital cardiac arrests. *Resuscitation*. 2023;187:109797.
44. Levinson M, Mills A. Cardiopulmonary resuscitation - time for a change in the paradigm? *Medical Journal of Australia*. 2014;201(3):152-154.
45. Rob D, Kavalkova P, Smalcova J, Franek O, Smid O, Komarek A, et al. Gender differences and survival after out of hospital cardiac arrest. *The American Journal of Emergency Medicine*. 2022;55:27-31.
46. Kwak J, Ok Ahn K, Chan PS. Sex difference in the association between type of bystander CPR and clinical outcomes in patients with out of hospital cardiac arrest. *Resuscitation Plus*. 2023;13:100342.

47. Ko SY, Ahn KO, Do Shin S, Park JH, Lee SY. Effects of telephone-assisted cardiopulmonary resuscitation on the sex disparity in provision of bystander cardiopulmonary resuscitation in public locations. *Resuscitation*. 2021;164:101-107.
48. Faddy S, Cohen S, Peresson C. Accuracy in the identification of cardiac arrest by emergency medical dispatchers in New South Wales (NSW), Australia. *Resuscitation*. 2019;142:e104.
49. Nguyen TQ, Schmid I, Stuart EA. Clarifying causal mediation analysis for the applied researcher: Defining effects based on what we want to learn. *Psychol Methods*. 2020.

## Figure legends

**Figure 1. Selection of study analytic cohort**

**Figure 2: Crude and Adjusted odds ratios explaining the association between patient sex with primary and secondary outcomes**