



HAL
open science

Veno-Arterial-ECMO in the Intensive Care Unit:From Technical Aspects to Clinical Practice

Arthur Le Gall, Arnaud Follin, Bernard Cholley, Jean Mantz, Nadia Aissaoui,
Romain Pirracchio

► **To cite this version:**

Arthur Le Gall, Arnaud Follin, Bernard Cholley, Jean Mantz, Nadia Aissaoui, et al.. Veno-Arterial-ECMO in the Intensive Care Unit:From Technical Aspects to Clinical Practice. *Anaesthesia Critical Care & Pain Medicine*, 2017, pp.1-43. 10.1016/j.accpm.2017.08.007 . hal-01629078

HAL Id: hal-01629078

<https://inria.hal.science/hal-01629078v1>

Submitted on 6 Nov 2017

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Veno-Arterial-ECMO in the Intensive Care Unit: From Technical Aspects to Clinical Practice

1

2

3 Arthur Le Gall ^{1,4,5}, MD. ; Arnaud Follin^{1,3}, MD. ; Bernard Cholley ^{1,3}, MD. PhD. ;

4 Jean Mantz^{1,3}, MD. PhD. ; Nadia Aissaoui^{2,3}, MD. PhD. ; Romain Pirracchio^{1,3}, MD. PhD.

5 *1 - Anesthesiology and Intensive Care Department, European Hospital Georges Pompidou; 2 - Medical Intensive*

6 *Care Unit, European Hospital Georges Pompidou; 3 - Paris Descartes University, Sorbonne Paris Cité, Paris, France; 4 - INRIA*

7 *Paris-Saclay University, Palaiseau, France; 5- LMS, Paris-Saclay University, Palaiseau, France*

8

9

10

11

12

13 Corresponding author:

14 Romain Pirracchio,

15 Department of Anesthesia and Critical Care Medicine,

16 Hôpital Européen Georges Pompidou

17 20 rue Leblanc, 75015 Paris

18 Tel: +33 (0) 1 56 09 25 13

19 Email : romain.pirracchio@aphp.fr

20

21

22 Word Count: 4665

23 Figures : 03, Tables: 01

24

25 No conflict of interest to be declared.

1	Content	
2		
3	Summary	3
4	Introduction	4
5	Principles and technical aspects	5
6	Vascular access - Peripheral versus Central VA-ECMO	5
7	Peripheral ECMO.....	5
8	Central ECMO.....	7
9	Gas exchanges determinants during VA-ECMO	8
10	Circulatory support during VA-ECMO	9
11	Specific Management during VA-ECMO	11
12	Indications	14
13	Cardiac Arrest	14
14	Acute Cardiac failure	15
15	Indications to Initiate a VA-ECMO	18
16	Weaning strategies	20
17	Conclusion	22
18	Tables	23
19	Figures	26
20	Bibliography	27
21	Fundings	34
22		

1 **Summary**

2

3 The use of Veno-Arterial ExtraCorporeal Membrane Oxygenation (VA-ECMO) as a salvage
4 therapy in cardiogenic shock is becoming of current practice. While VA-ECMO is potentially
5 a life-saving technique, results are sometimes mitigated, emphasizing the need for selecting
6 the right indication in the right patient. This relies upon a clear definition of the individual
7 therapeutic project, including the potential for recovery as well as the possible complications
8 associated with VA-ECMO. To maximize the benefits of VA-ECMO, the basics of
9 extracorporeal circulation should be perfectly understood since VA-ECMO can sometimes be
10 detrimental. Hence, to be successful, VA-ECMO should be used by teams with sufficient
11 experience and initiated after a thorough multidisciplinary discussion considering patient's
12 medical history, pathology as well the anticipated evolution of the disease.

13

1 **Introduction**

2

3 Venous-Arterial Extra-Corporeal Membrane Oxygenation (VA-ECMO) or Extra-Corporeal Life
4 Support (ECLS) are two terms that designate devices originally created to replace heart and
5 lung functions. Both denominations are synonymous and we will keep the term “VA-ECMO”
6 throughout this review for the sake of consistency. While VA-ECMO was initially dedicated
7 to cardiac surgery (*i.e.* cardiopulmonary bypass), technical evolutions such as pump
8 miniaturization, better circuit biocompatibility and easier cannulation have enabled this
9 technique to enter the Intensive Care Unit (ICU). VA-ECMO was tested in various indications
10 [1–7]. Nevertheless, because of inconsistent success rates [1–7], significant complications,
11 and high-related costs, it is of paramount importance to accurately identify the patients in
12 whom VA-ECMO may be reasonably initiated.

13 The goal of this article is to describe some key technical aspects of VA-ECMO, to present a
14 literature overview on the use of VA-ECMO in critically ill patients and ultimately to help the
15 intensivist to identify the appropriate indications for VA-ECMO.

16

17

1 Principles and technical aspects

2

3 The principle is directly derived from extra corporeal circulation techniques used during
4 cardiac surgery. Venous deoxygenated blood is mechanically suctioned, from a large central
5 vein through a venous cannula, by a centrifugal pump. It is then oxygenated, warmed and
6 restituted into systemic circulation through an arterial cannula. Hence, VA-ECMO is used to
7 assist the heart by insuring part or all the systemic blood flow (Figure 1).

8 Vascular access - Peripheral versus Central VA-ECMO

9 Among VA-ECMO circuits, a distinction has to be made between those inserted centrally or
10 peripherally.

11 Peripheral ECMO

12 The typical configuration for *peripheral* VA-ECMO involves blood drainage from a femoral
13 venous access and reinfusion through a femoral arterial cannula. With this configuration, the
14 reinfusion cannula generates a retrograde flow up in the aorta that may encounter the
15 anterograde flow generated by the left ventricle [8].

16 For peripheral VA-ECMO configurations, percutaneous ultrasound guided femoro-femoral
17 access is usually a quick and efficient way of insertion [9], even though it can become more
18 difficult in case of profound arterial hypotension or hemostasis disorders for instance. The
19 alternative is a surgical insertion that allows for a direct visualization of the vessels as well as
20 a simultaneous insertion of the reperfusion cannula (see below) but depends upon the
21 availability of the surgical team.

22 Whatever the insertion technique chosen, peripheral VA-ECMOs carries specific
23 complications. First, peripheral VA-ECMO may lead to an obstruction of the common
24 femoral artery that can cause lower limb ischemia [10–13]. It is thus advised to place a

1 reperfusion catheter in the ipsilateral superficial femoral artery [11]. Another drawback of
2 peripheral VA-ECMO is the competition between the retrograde flow generated by the VA-
3 ECMO and the native anterograde flow [8]. This competition may induce or worsen 2 types
4 of complications: 1) LV overload; and 2) Harlequin syndrome.

5 Left Ventricle (LV) overload

6 Even when the VA-ECMO support is fully covering the cardiac output, there is still blood
7 entering the cardiopulmonary circulation since part of the coronary circulation ends up into
8 the cardiac chambers, including the left atrium or ventricle, through the Thebesian veins [14].
9 This residual filling of a failing left ventricle (LV) may cause a pulmonary edema especially
10 with peripheral VA-ECMO. In this case, whilst VA-ECMO unloads the right heart, the
11 increase in the LV afterload generated by the assistance itself may overload the LV [15].

12 Thus, inotropes should be maintained or introduced in case of ventricular dilation or evidence
13 of pulmonary edema. Mean arterial pressure should always be tightly controlled, and adapted
14 to both organ perfusion and cardiac function. In some cases, vasodilators may also be used, in
15 order to adjust the mean arterial pressure.

16 Additional therapies may be necessary to unload the LV. The use of an Intra-Aortic Balloon
17 Pump (IABP) was reported to be associated with a reduction in the LV afterload [15,16]. It
18 may help to restore pulsatile condition, and lower the Pulmonary Artery Occlusion Pressure in
19 VA-ECMO patients [17,18]. Nevertheless, although an IABP may improve macrocirculatory
20 parameters without significant complications [19], its benefits remain uncertain [20,21].

21 In case of refractory pulmonary edema, a LV vent may be added to the extracorporeal circuit.
22 Percutaneous Trans-Aortic, or surgical vent are possible in this context. Recent data suggest
23 that either the percutaneous trans-Aortic devices or the surgical vents may be beneficial to
24 unload the LV in case of pulmonary edema [22–25] and improve survival in this context [26].

1 Since there is no argument for a clear benefit of one technique over the other [25,27,28], the
2 choice of a percutaneous or a surgical vent should be based upon the VA-ECMO settings
3 (centrally or peripherally inserted - see below -) and the availability of the surgical team.

4 Harlequin Syndrome

5 In case of a concomitant respiratory failure, and especially in the cardiac recovery period, the
6 blood flow competition may also cause a Harlequin syndrome [8,29,30]. Indeed, if the
7 residual heart function is able to generate a native perfusion, the interface (or watershed)
8 between the antegrade (native and poorly oxygenated blood) and retrograde (assisted and
9 well oxygenated blood) flows may be located at the level of the supra-aortic trunks. Its
10 clinical expression (cyanosis in the upper part of the body, with subsequent risk of cerebral or
11 myocardial ischemia, contrasting with pink well-perfused lower part of the body, generating
12 this aspect of “Harlequin”) results from a selective upper body hypoxia.

13 It is recommended [31] to monitor oxygen saturation at left hand, while getting blood sample
14 for arterial blood gas analysis on the right hand, in order to detect promptly a discrepancy
15 between right and left arms. Managing a Harlequin syndrome may include: VA-ECMO
16 withdrawal if cardiac recovery is sufficient, increase of the VA-ECMO flow to reduce the
17 relative participation of the native hypoxemic flow to brain perfusion, “centralization”, or
18 addition of a partial reinjection cannula into the internal jugular vein (so called veno-arterial-
19 venous ECMO, VAV-ECMO) [32]. If the circulatory support is no longer needed, but
20 respiratory support is still requested, a switch toward a veno-venous ECMO can be
21 considered.

22 Central ECMO

23 *Central VA-ECMOs* are always inserted surgically. The venous cannula is placed in the right
24 atrium and the arterial cannula in the ascending aorta. The oxygenated blood is injected

1 anterogradely in the aorta through the arterial cannula. Thus, with central ECMO there is no
2 competition between with the native heart thereby reducing the risk of LV overload and
3 virtually no risk of Harlequin syndrome.

4 At the population level, no cannulation site has proven its superiority over the other in terms
5 of outcome or hemodynamic stability [33]. The choice of the best technique essentially
6 depends on the situation (emergent or less emergent VA-ECMO), on the indication and on the
7 risk of complications at the individual level. Central VA-ECMO is typically considered in
8 case of post-cardiopulmonary bypass related heart failure. It needs a surgical team to be
9 inserted and is associated with a higher risk of complications such as mediastinitis or
10 bleeding, as compared with peripheral VA-ECMO [12,33]. Peripheral VA-ECMO, whether
11 inserted surgically or percutaneously, can be implanted faster, but is associated with higher
12 risk of LV overload or Harlequin syndrome. Thus, any emergent indication for
13 cardiorespiratory assistance should typically lead to prefer peripheral insertion while central
14 VA-ECMO can be considered as an alternative to peripheral VA-ECMO in case of refractory
15 pulmonary edema, Harlequin syndrome or limb ischemia occurring downstream the femoral
16 arterial cannula despite reperfusion.

17 Gas exchanges determinants during VA-ECMO

18 VA-ECMO creates a Venous to Arterial shunt, bypassing the native cardiopulmonary
19 circulation. In order to allow for adequate gas exchanges, the VA-ECMO circuit has to
20 provide optimal oxygen delivery and CO₂ removal. In the artificial lung (*i.e* the oxygenator),
21 as well as in the native lungs, blood oxygenation and decarboxylation result from double
22 convective exchanges occurring alongside a semipermeable membrane. Therefore, during
23 VA-ECMO, PaO₂ and PaCO₂ both depend upon extra-corporeal circulation settings and
24 patient's characteristics.

1 Indeed, the Cardiac Output (CO) and the Pump Flow Rates (PFR), and more specifically their
2 ratio (PFR/CO), are both of crucial importance. If the PFR/CO ratio is close to 0 (*i.e.* the
3 artificial shunt is null), the fraction of oxygenated blood coming from VA-ECMO is
4 negligible and so is the benefit in terms of PaO₂. However such a situation should not be
5 encountered since the minimal Pump Flow Rates should never be lower than 1500 ml/min
6 (risk of circuitry thrombosis, or back flow into the circuitry). If the PFR/CO is close to 1, the
7 CO entirely flows through the membrane, and may thus be oxygenated. Nevertheless, at high
8 PFR, the oxygenator performance by itself and more precisely the quality of the membrane
9 may limit oxygen transfer. Indeed, the membrane may be deteriorated by clots, thereby
10 reducing its performance and its lifetime.

11 Another determinant is the Inspired Oxygen Fraction (FiO₂). The latter drives the oxygen
12 partial pressure on the VA-ECMO side of the oxygenator, and thus also determines the
13 gradient for oxygen exchange across the membrane. Sweep gas flow which is a major
14 determinant for CO₂ removal, has almost no impact on O₂ exchanges unless it is turned down
15 close to zero. Indeed, the magnitude of oxygen gradient through the membrane as well as its
16 high permeability for oxygen, explain that oxygen transfer rate is very high.

17 Blood decarboxylation depends on PFR/CO ratio [34] and sweep gas flow. At membrane
18 entry, CO₂ partial pressure is zero and CO₂ removing gradient equals CO₂ venous partial
19 pressure. As CO₂ exchange occurs alongside the membrane, the gradient decreases, thereby
20 reducing CO₂ transfer, unless the sweep gas is sufficient to “wash” out the CO₂ accumulated
21 on the VA-ECMO side of the membrane.

22 **Circulatory support during VA-ECMO**

23 VA-ECMO is used to restore adequate systemic perfusion. Pump flow depends on the size of
24 the vascular accesses, venous circuit resistance, and the pump itself.

1 For a given Pump Flow Rate, the size of the *venous cannula* is a major determinant of the
2 inflow. Indeed, pump preload depends on the resistance (or the size) of the venous cannula
3 and on the blood volume in the inferior vena cava and the right atrium. The position of the
4 venous cannula is optimal when the tip is located in the right atrium. When positioned in the
5 inferior or the superior vena cava, the risk of venous collapse is more important.

6 Pump rotation speed is an important determinant of the flow rate and of the pressure gradient.
7 Modern VA-ECMO machines use preferentially centrifugal pumps, which allow for high
8 rotation speed and flow rate with a lower risk of hemolysis. Increasing pump rotation speed
9 increases the flow rate (and decreases the right atrial pressure [35]), unless the suction
10 generated precipitates a transient venous or atrial collapse (Kicking lines) (Figure 2). In such
11 a situation, one must decrease pump rotation speed and/or administer intravascular fluids in
12 order to restore venous/atrial transmural pressure. In addition, to avoid complications such as
13 hemolysis, the maximum theoretical pressure generated by the pump should not exceed -300
14 mmHg on the venous side, and +400 mmHg on the arterial side [31].

15 The impact of the size of the *arterial cannula* is less important as the pump easily overcomes
16 the resulting afterload. Nevertheless, a too small arterial cannula may cause hemolysis, alter
17 the performance of the pump and limits the flow. Similarly, mean arterial pressure should be
18 tightly controlled in order to limit the increase in afterload and avoid deleterious
19 consequences (see “Specific Management section”).

20

21

22

23

1 **Specific Management during VA-ECMO**

2

3 While non-specific ICU care should be provided during VA-ECMO management, careful
4 attention should be paid on VA-ECMO and ventilator settings as well as anticoagulation
5 therapy.

6 ECMO management

7 Modifying pump flow rates can induce substantial alteration in hemostasis or worsen a
8 preexisting cardio-respiratory insufficiency. Therefore, daily ICU care should be provided
9 with great caution. For instance, a simple patient mobilization can cause accidental
10 decannulation, with catastrophic consequences. VA-ECMO could also prevent from
11 appropriately positioning the patient. During patients' positioning it is of paramount
12 importance to carefully verify the cannula, in order to prevent any extracorporeal circulation
13 mobilization or soft tissue alteration. Semi-recombinant position may be difficult with a
14 peripheral VA-ECMO, while central VA-ECMO is not compatible with prone positioning.
15 Prone positioning has been described during peripheral Venovenous-ECMO in case of
16 refractory Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS), as described by Otterspoor [36],
17 Kimmoun [37] and Kipping [38]; however, in peripheral VA-ECMO, the risks of kinking of
18 the reperfusion line or accidental withdrawal of the arterial cannula justify that in case of
19 refractory ARDS while on VA-ECMO, a safer alternative to prone positioning can be the
20 addition of a reinjection cannula into the right internal jugular vein (Veno-Arterial-Venous -
21 ECMO).

22 Finally, out-of-ICU exams are also more difficult in patients under ECMO. Double pliers
23 must always be readily available to interrupt quickly the extracorporeal circulation. A manual
24 wheel should always be present to replace the pump in case of outage or dysfunction. The

1 membrane should be checked daily, particularly for clots formation (dark red deposit on the
2 membrane). If requested, blood gases can be performed before and after the membrane to
3 evaluate its performance. When blood gases are performed after the membrane, oxygen
4 partial pressure should be greater than 200 mmHg. Arterial and Venous cannulas should also
5 be carefully screened. There should be a substantial color difference between dark venous
6 blood and red arterial blood. Non-cyclic oscillations of the circuit associated with decrease in
7 the blood flow, should prompt the team to check the inflow pressure and take the appropriate
8 decisions (decrease Pump Flow Rate, administer fluids, etc). Daily examination of
9 cannulation sites is also mandated, tracking for bleeding or infection. In case of peripheral
10 ECMO, clinical and Doppler examination of the peripheral pulse should be part of the nurse
11 surveillance, in order to promptly identify any lower limb ischemia.

12 Ventilator Settings

13 Ventilator settings should be adapted, in order to avoid ventilator-induced lung injury.
14 Positive pressure ventilation may decrease left and increase right ventricular afterload. This
15 can be either beneficial or detrimental depending on the global cardiac function. For instance,
16 positive pressure ventilation may improve a pulmonary edema on the one hand, while
17 worsening a right heart failure on the other hand. It is proposed to use a protective ventilation
18 strategy with a Tidal Volume of 6 to 8 ml/kg of ideal body weight, with a maximum PEEP of
19 10 cmH₂O and/or a plateau pressure of 20-25 cmH₂O, and to adjust the latter settings to the
20 cardiorespiratory function [39]. The recent ELSO guidelines recommend the use of the
21 smallest possible volume and pressure, in order to allow lung rest and recovery [31].

22 Anticoagulation

23 Anticoagulation therapy should also be used, except in presence of a specific bleeding risk.
24 Potentially life threatening bleeding events are the most frequent complication during VA-
25 ECMO [40]. The extracorporeal circuit by itself induces an activation of the inflammatory

1 and the coagulation pathways. This, in turn, favor bleeding or clotting complications such as
2 stroke or pulmonary embolism [41,42].

3 In a study reporting 405 patients under VA-ECMO, the bleeding rate was 31% [42]. In a
4 recent study, Aubron et al. [40] reviewed the complications of veno-venous and veno-arterial
5 ECMO, and evaluated their impact on mortality. Bleeding was the most frequent adverse
6 event (27 %), regardless of the type of ECMO. Moreover, the total number of transfused
7 packed red blood cells was an independent predictor of death during VA-ECMO.

8 On the other hand, avoiding anticoagulation could lead to thrombotic events including stroke.
9 Indeed, clots in the extracorporeal circuit could lead to scatter emboli into the intracranial
10 circulation. On addition, insertion of the arterial cannula into the aorta may damage an
11 atherosclerotic intima, potentially resulting in emboli and multifocal cerebral infarctions. In
12 Hemmila et al. study [42], 5.5% of the patients on VA-ECMO had ischemic neurological
13 adverse events. When a CT scan was performed systematically, Lindegran et al. [41] reported
14 a 45% rate of intracranial hemorrhage or infarction. Consistently, Mateen et al. [43] evaluated
15 42 patients under VA-ECMO, and observed neurological events in 50% of them. However, in
16 the latter study, VA-ECMO indication was refractory cardiac arrest in 16% of the patients, a
17 condition highly prone to neurologic complication.

18 Consequently, anticoagulation is necessary but has to be managed carefully during VA-
19 ECMO. Generalized use of heparine-coated circuit allows for low dose intravenous
20 heparinization with a TCA ratio target around 1.5 [31]. This is especially possible if the pump
21 rotation speed is high enough as the risk for clotting formation is maximal when the pump
22 flow rate is below 1500 ml/min.

1 Infections and other Complications

2 Aubron et al. [40] reported a high incidence of bloodstream infection (13% for va- and vv-
3 VA-ECMO). Hemmila et al. [42] reported a global infection rate of 38%. Consistently, a
4 recent meta-analysis including 1,866 patients from 20 studies [44] confirmed the high
5 infection rate under VA-ECMO (30 [20 - 44] %).

6 Figure 3, using results of [44], summarizes the rates and the types of complication occurring
7 during VA-ECMO for acute cardio-respiratory failure.

8 Indications

9

10 The main indication for VA-ECMO is cardiogenic shock resulting from acute myocardial
11 infarction, fulminant myocarditis, acute decompensation of severe chronic heart failure, drug
12 intoxication, hypothermia or intractable arrhythmia. VA-ECMO is also used in some specific
13 situations such as post-cardiotomy cardiac failure or cardiac arrest requiring cardiopulmonary
14 resuscitation. Furthermore, VA-ECMO is proposed for patients with pulmonary embolism,
15 sepsis-associated cardiomyopathy and pulmonary hypertension.

16 A recent meta-analysis pooled 23 studies (n=1,199) in which VA-ECMO was initiated to treat
17 cardiogenic shock or refractory cardiac arrest. Long-term mortality was reported in 16 studies
18 and overall one-year survival rate was 54.9% [45].

19 Cardiac Arrest

20 Over the past decade, there has been a growing interest for VA-ECMO in out-of-hospital
21 refractory cardiac arrest. However, the benefit of VA-ECMO is apparently higher in patients
22 with intra-hospital cardiac arrest [1,46–50]. This is confirmed in a recent observational
23 propensity-matched study [51] including 320 VA-ECMO for cardiac arrest. Nevertheless,
24 when reducing time to implantation, by implementing pre-hospital ExtraCorporeal Cardio-

1 Pulmonary Resuscitation (eCPR), Lamhaut et al. found no difference in mortality between in-
2 and out- of hospital cardiac arrest patients, resuscitated with VA-ECMO [52]. Cardiac arrest
3 caused by hypothermia or poisoning have better outcomes than cardiac arrest due to other
4 reasons [2,53–56]. The French council for cardio-pulmonary resuscitation as well as the
5 French society of Anesthesiology and Intensive Care Medicine have limited the indications
6 for VA-ECMO initiation in refractory cardiac arrest to “reasonable” low flow durations (<
7 100 min), and to cardiac arrests resulting from poisoning or with deep hypothermia (< 32°C)
8 [57]. North American guidelines still do not recommend VA-ECMO in this indication [58].

9 VA-ECMO has also been used for Post Cardiac Arrest syndrome (PCAS), i.e., patients
10 suffering from a profound cardiogenic shock after return of spontaneous circulation.
11 However, with or without VA-ECMO, mortality reaches 72 to 80% in this indication [59,60].

12

13 Acute Cardiac failure

14 Acute Coronary Syndrome (ACS)

15 Even if European and American guidelines recommend VA-ECMO use in case of ACS
16 leading to heart failure refractory to medical treatment, with IIa and IIb proof levels
17 respectively [61,62], to our knowledge, no randomized study has ever reported any benefit of
18 VA-ECMO as compared to medical treatment alone. These guidelines are only supported by
19 results from observational series [3,63–65]. Indeed, a historical case-control study published
20 in 2010 reported a benefit of VA-ECMO on 30-day survival (OR = 0.22 ; 95%CI [0.06-
21 0.80]) in 71 patients with profound cardiogenic shock and acute coronary syndrome [65].
22 Mortality in the VA-ECMO group was 31.9 %. In a study on 98 patients, Sakamoto et al. [3]
23 reported a much higher mortality rate (67 %). However, the latter study included patients on
24 VA-ECMO for both cardiogenic shock and refractory cardiac arrest. In addition, VA-ECMO-

1 related complications were frequent in this population, and this was associated with a worst
2 prognosis (OR = 4.72 ; 95%CI [1.39–16.1]; p = 0.013). In an attempt to better identify the
3 patients who benefit from VA-ECMO, Muller et al. identified 7 prognostic factors (age > 60,
4 female sex, body mass index >25 kg/m², Glasgow coma score < 6, creatinine > 150 µmol/L,
5 lactate > 2, mmol/L, and prothrombin activity < 50%) in 138 patients under VA-ECMO for
6 Acute Myocardial Infarction [66]. These factors entered into the ENCOURAGE score
7 allowed to predict hospital mortality with an AUC of 0.84, 95%CI [0.77-0.91]

8 Fulminant Myocarditis

9 Fulminant myocarditis or intoxications with cardio-depressant agents are two of the best
10 examples of a bridge to recovery situations. In this pathology, myocardial depression is
11 usually transient and VA-ECMO is used to wait for heart function recovery. VA-ECMO has
12 thus been used with good results and several studies reported survival rates as high as 60-70%
13 [4,67]. VA-ECMO was shown to improve the outcome in this context [4,68].

14 Septic Cardiomyopathy

15 Myocardial depression is a well-recognized consequence of severe septic shock. Septic
16 cardiomyopathy was reported in up to 60% of septic shocks [69]. Because this myocardial
17 depression is potentially fully reversible, VA-ECMO was proposed with survival rate from
18 observational series ranging from 21 to 85% [5,70,71]. However, the level of evidence is still
19 too low to recommend VA-ECMO in this situation.

20 Post cardiotomy cardiogenic shock

21 Postcardiotomy cardiogenic shock occurs in approximately 1% of the patients after cardiac
22 surgery. In such cases, VA-ECMO may be used as a bridge-to-recovery. However, survival
23 rates in this indication are inconsistent, ranging from 24 to 39% [6,72].

1 Primary graft dysfunction (PGD) after transplantation

2 Primary graft failure is the first cause of early mortality after heart, lung, and heart-lung
3 transplantation. Data from the International Society for Heart Lung Transplantation (ISHLT)
4 Transplant Registry show 66%, 24.7% and 27 % mortality rates attributable to primary graft
5 dysfunction, during the first 30 days following heart, lung and heart-lung transplantation,
6 respectively [73–75]. The ISHLT states that mechanical support is the only viable therapeutic
7 option in this context. Indeed, VA-ECMO can improve survival rates (as high as 82%) of
8 patients with graft dysfunction following lung [76] or heart [7,77,78] transplantation.

9 Bridge to Destination Therapy

10 Destination therapies may be considered for end-stage heart failures. They include either heart
11 transplantation or long term Left Ventricular Assist Devices (LVAD). As for lung
12 transplantation, acute decompensation of an end-stage heart failure is associated with a worse
13 prognosis. In this context, VA-ECMO has been proposed to allow recovery from multiple
14 organ failure. In 1999, Pagani et al. [79] reported the feasibility of VA-ECMO as a bridge to
15 destination therapy. The overall survival for patients bridged using VA-ECMO either to
16 LVAD or to transplantation was of 43%. After successful VA-ECMO initiation, survival rates
17 reached 71% at one year. Further studies have reported survival rates ranging from 50% to
18 73% [80] depending on whether the VA-ECMO was used as a bridge to LVAD (50%) or to
19 transplantation (73%). “Bridge to bridge” VA-ECMO has also been reported: VA-ECMO
20 used as a bridge to LVAD, the latter being used as a bridge to transplantation [81]. In this
21 study, the use of VA-ECMO prior to LVAD did not affect mortality at 3 years (13% vs. 23%)
22 or the duration of LVAD assistance (292 [153–448] vs. 311 [175–594] days). Analyses based
23 on the Interagency Registry for Mechanically Assisted Circulatory Support (INTERMACS)
24 registry including approximately 15,000 patients showed that even if VA-ECMO improves
25 the survival rate of patients during decompensation of end-stage diseases, it is a strong

1 predictor of poor outcome. Better results are observed when a LVAD is implanted in patients
2 with a stable condition [82–84].

3 Indications to Initiate a VA-ECMO

4 Because the risks associated with the technique are high, a thorough discussion about the best
5 global therapeutic plan is mandatory, including: 1) the choice of the most appropriate
6 cannulation site and type of assistance, 2) anticipation of the potential complications, and 3)
7 of the weaning strategy. Thus, it is crucial to define whether the VA-ECMO is indicated as a
8 bridge to recovery, to transplantation, or as a bridge to destination therapy [31,85].

9 A “Bridge to recovery” is an assistance initiated to wait for the recovery of a reversible life
10 threatening condition. Typical examples are acute cardiorespiratory failure resulting from
11 acute myocarditis, intoxication with cardiac depressant agents, or coronary syndrome with
12 cardiogenic shock. Prior to inserting the VA-ECMO, the physicians hope that the condition is
13 reversible and that the failing organ will recover after a brief period of support. In the absence
14 of potential reversibility and if none of the alternative support (transplantation or long-term
15 assist device) is deemed feasible, VA-ECMO should not be implanted.

16 VA-ECMO may be used as a “bridge to transplantation” when the failing organ no longer
17 permits survival and needs to be supported. In this context, VA-ECMO may also allow for the
18 recovery of organ dysfunction such as renal or liver failure or for an appropriate neurological
19 evaluation after withdrawal of the sedation medications.

20 In the “bridge to destination therapy”, VA-ECMO is used to support the heart while waiting
21 for the possibility to implant a long-term mechanical assist device. This is indicated for end
22 stage heart failure, when the patient is temporarily or definitely contraindicated to
23 transplantation.

1 In the « Bridge to Bridge » strategy, VA-ECMO is implanted as a bridge to Left Ventricular
2 Assist Device that is a more sustainable therapy allowing the patient to be discharged from
3 the ICU, while waiting for a graft.

4

5

1 Weaning strategies

2

3 After VA-ECMO insertion, daily cardiorespiratory evaluation should be performed to
4 consider VA-ECMO weaning. Indeed, since this assistance carries complications, it is wise to
5 consider withdrawing the VA-ECMO as soon as possible. The evaluation should answers the
6 following questions : i- Has the cardiac function recovered ? ; ii- Has the respiratory function
7 recovered ? ; iii- Could a favorable evolution be predicted ? ; iv- Could further
8 cardiopulmonary aggression be predicted (open heart surgery for example) ? ; v- Will a
9 removal of the assistance be well tolerated ?

10 Weaning Eligibility

11 Weaning from VA-ECMO should usually not be attempted within the first 48 hours, since
12 renal and/or hepatic function should recover first. In addition, the etiology of cardio-
13 circulatory dysfunction must be compatible with myocardial recovery. Substantial myocardial
14 recovery can be expected for acute myocarditis, acute myocardial infarction, post-cardiotomy
15 cardiogenic shock or drug intoxication. On the contrary, in most cases, patients with end-stage
16 cardiac disease cannot be taken off VA-ECMO unless for transplantation or insertion of a
17 long-term assist device.

18 To be eligible for VA-ECMO weaning, patients under VA-ECMO should be deemed
19 hemodynamically stable: mean arterial pressure (MAP) of > 60 mmHg under low doses of
20 vasopressors and a presence of a pulsatile arterial waveform maintained for at least 24 hours.

21 Weaning Trial

22 The weaning trial relies on a thorough clinical and echocardiographic examination. The goal
23 is to assess whether the patient would tolerate to be separated from the VA-ECMO on both
24 respiratory and hemodynamic standpoints. To do so, the VA-ECMO blood flow should be
25 decreased progressively to a minimum of 1 L/min for at least 15 min and the sweep gas flow

1 rate reduced to 1 L/minute, with a FiO₂ on the VA-ECMO at 21%. If the MAP drops
2 significantly and is constantly ≤ 60 mmHg during the trial, the VA-ECMO flow rate must be
3 returned to 100% of the initial flow rate and the trial must be stopped. Echocardiography
4 evaluation relies on the variables assessing LV systolic function (Left Ventricular Ejection
5 Fraction - LVEF - and lateral mitral annulus peak systolic velocity), LV flow (aortic velocity-
6 time integral) and right ventricular diameters and function index (Tricuspid Annular Plane
7 Systolic Excursion - TAPSE). The latter right ventricular function indicators are nevertheless
8 nonconsensual.

9 The oxygen fraction delivered by the extracorporeal circuit should be turned down to 21%
10 and the one delivered by the ventilator should be less than 60%. The resulting PaO₂/FiO₂
11 ratio should not be lower than 200.

12 In summary, VA-ECMO removal can be considered if the patient does not have end-stage
13 cardiac disease, tolerates well the weaning trial, and has a LVEF ≥ 20 –25%, an aortic
14 velocity-time integral ≥ 12 cm and a lateral mitral annulus peak systolic velocity ≥ 6 cm/s
15 under minimal VA-ECMO support [86,87] .

16

17

1 **Conclusion**

2

3 VA-ECMO is an extracorporeal technique that may support cardiorespiratory functions.
4 Because this technique has substantially improved over time, VA-ECMO use is no longer
5 restricted to the operating room and has spread to intensive care units. However, VA-ECMO-
6 related complications are potentially life threatening. Therefore, before starting a VA-ECMO
7 program, it is mandatory to provide to the ICU staff a good understanding and practice of the
8 technical aspects, including insertion of vascular accesses under cardiopulmonary
9 resuscitation. In order to maximize the chances of success, it is of paramount importance to
10 select carefully the patients who can benefit from VA-ECMO and to be able to have multi-
11 disciplinary discussions (involving intensivists, cardiac surgeons and cardiologists) about i)
12 VA-ECMO indications, ii) chances of recovery, iii) the overall plan of care and iv) the
13 appropriate VA-ECMO technique. Hence, the decision to initiate a VA-ECMO and the choice
14 of the best method is best taken by a team of experienced physicians potentially associating
15 intensivists, cardiologists and cardiac surgeons.

16

1 **Tables**

2

3 **Table 1:** Summary of studies per VA-ECMO indication

Authors	Year	Type	Cohort Size	VA-ECMO Sample size	Mortality	Favouring treatment
<i>Acute Coronary Syndrome</i>						
Fujimoto K [64]	2001	Retrospective, Observational		9 pts	56%	Not Given
Chen JS [63]	2006	Prospective, Observational		36 pts	33%	Not Given
Sheu JJ [65]	2010	Retrospective, Observational	71 pts	46 pts	72%	No
<i>Cardiac Arrest</i>						
Chen YS [88]	2003	Retrospective, Observational		57 pts	68%	Not Given
Sung K [89]	2006	Retrospective, Observational		22 pts	54%	Not Given
Megarbane B [2]	2007	Prospective, Observational		17 pts	86%	Not Given
Ruttman E [90]	2007	Retrospective, Observational	59 pts	25 pts	72%	Not Given
Chen YS [1]	2008	Propensity Matched	172 pts	46 pts	67%	No
Chen YS [91]	2008	Retrospective, Observational		135 pts	66%	Not Given
Lin JW [48]	2010	Propensity Matched	118 pts	27 pts	71%	No
Le Guen M[92]	2011	Prospective, Observational		59 pts	96%	Not Given
Liu Y [93]	2011	Retrospective, Observational		11 pts	64%	Not Given
Shin TG [94]	2011	Propensity Matched	406 pts	60 pts	68%	Yes
Avalli L [46]	2012	Retrospective, Observational		42 pts	74%	Not Given
Haneya A [95]	2012	Retrospective, Observational		85 pts	66%	Not Given
Sakamoto S [3]	2012	Retrospective, Observational		64 pts	72%	Not Given
Wu MY [96]	2012	Retrospective, Observational		40 pts	65%	Not Given
Leick J [97]	2013	Retrospective, Observational		28 pts	61%	Not Given
Maekawa K [98]	2013	Propensity Matched	162 pts	24 pts	69%	Yes
Schopka S [50]	2013	Retrospective, Observational		103 pts	72%	Not Given
Chou TH [47]	2014	Retrospective, Observational	66 pts	43 pts	65%	No
Johnson NJ [99]	2014	Prospective, Observational		26 pts	85%	Not Given

Kim SJ [100]	2014	Propensity Matched	499 pts	52 pts	85%	No
Park SB [49]	2014	Retrospective, Observational		152 pts	68%	Not Given
Sakamoto T [101]	2014	Prospective, Observational	454 pts	260 pts	88%	Yes
Sawamoto K [53]	2014	Retrospective, Observational		26 pts	62%	Not Given
Wang CH [102]	2014	Prospective, Observational		230 pts	68%	Not Given
Han SJ [103]	2015	Retrospective, Observational		37 pts	81%	Not Given
Choi DS [51]	2016	Propensity Matched	36 227 pts	320 pts	82%	No
De Chambrun MP [59]	2016	Retrospective, Observational		94 pts	73%	Not Given
Bougouin W [60]	2017	Retrospective, Observational		52 pts	73%	No
Lamhaut L [52]	2017	Prospective, Observational	156 pts	156 pts	87%	Not Given

Fulminant Myocarditis

Maejima Y [68]	2004	Retrospective, Observational		8 pts	25%	Not Given
Rajagopal SK [67]	2010	Retrospective, Observational		255 pts	39%	Not Given
Mirabel M [4]	2011	Retrospective, Observational		41 pts	34%	Not Given

Septic Myocarditis

Bréchet N [5]	2013	Retrospective, Observational		14 pts	39%	Not Given
Huang CTH [104]	2013	Retrospective, Observational		52 pts	85%	Not Given
Park TK [71]	2015	Retrospective, Observational		32 pts	81%	Not Given

Post-Cardiotomy

Doll N [6]	2004	Prospective, Observational		219 pts	76%	Not Given
Rastan AL [72]	2009	Prospective, Observational		517 pts	75%	Not Given
Ma P [15]	2014	Retrospective, Observational		54 pts	61%	Not Given

Primary Graft Dysfunction

Mihaljevic T [77]	2010	Prospective, Observational		53 pts	57%	Not Given
Listijono DR [7]	2011	Retrospective, Observational	124 pts	17 pts	18%	No
Stehlik J [73]	2011	Retrospective, Observational	10 271 pts	180 pts	RR = 3,32	No
Hartwig MG [76]	2012	Prospective, Observational		28 pts	18%	Not Given
Lima EB [78]	2015	Prospective, Observational		11 pts	67%	Not Given

Bridge to Destination Therapy

Pagani FD [79]	1999	Retrospective,		14 pts	50%	No
----------------	------	----------------	--	--------	-----	----

Chung [80]	2009	Observational Retrospective, Observational		31 pts	39%	Not Given
Marasco SF [81]	2015	Retrospective, Observational	58 pts	23 pts	13%	Not Given

1 pts : patients; RR : Relative Risk

1 **Figures**

2

3 **Figure 1:** Schematic representation of cannulation ways for implantation of peripheral and
4 central VA-ECMO. A - Centrally inserted veno-arterial ECMO ; B - Peripherally inserted
5 veno-arterial ECMO

6

7 **Figure 2:** Relationship Between Transmural Pressure (P_{tm}), Venous to Pump Pressure
8 Gradient (P_{p-v}), and Venous Return Curve.

9 Black arrows represent the strength and the direction of the forces inside the vein. Blue
10 arrows represent the net forces applied to the wall of the vein

11 The Venous Gradient (VG) is the difference between the Pressure in the venous system (P_v)
12 and the pressure in the pump (P_p): $VG = P_v - P_p$. The P_{tm} is the difference between the
13 Pressure inside (P_{in}) and outside (P_{out}) the vein: $P_{tm} = P_{in} - P_{out}$. The stronger the P_{p-v} , the
14 higher the flow, until the critical point where the P_v exceeds the P_{tm} and leads the vein to
15 collapse. 1) Decreasing the pump speed will decrease the VG and in turn will allow the blood
16 to flow and/or 2) Giving fluid can increase the P_v and so the P_{tm} and can in turn allows the
17 blood to flow

18

19 **Figure 3:** Main complications reported during circulatory support with veno-arterial ECMO.
20 Barplot realized using data obtained from meta-analysis given in [44]. *Surgical Control of*
21 *bleeding : Reintervention for bleeding at the insertion site. Haemorrhage : Bleeding*
22 *complication others than insertion site (Gastro-Intestinal bleeding for example)*

23

24

25

1 Bibliography

2

- 3 [1] Chen Y-S, Lin J-W, Yu H-Y, Ko W-J, Jerng J-S, Chang W-T, et al. Cardiopulmonary resuscitation
4 with assisted extracorporeal life-support versus conventional cardiopulmonary resuscitation in
5 adults with in-hospital cardiac arrest: an observational study and propensity analysis. *The*
6 *Lancet* 2008;372:554–561.
- 7 [2] Mégarbane B, Leprince P, Deye N, Résière D, Guerrier G, Rettab S, et al. Emergency feasibility in
8 medical intensive care unit of extracorporeal life support for refractory cardiac arrest. *Intensive*
9 *Care Med* 2007;33:758–64. doi:10.1007/s00134-007-0568-4.
- 10 [3] Sakamoto S, Taniguchi N, Nakajima S, Takahashi A. Extracorporeal Life Support for Cardiogenic
11 Shock or Cardiac Arrest Due to Acute Coronary Syndrome. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2012;94:1–7.
12 doi:10.1016/j.athoracsur.2012.01.032.
- 13 [4] Mirabel M, Luyt C-E, Leprince P, Trouillet J-L, Léger P, Pavie A, et al. Outcomes, long-term
14 quality of life, and psychologic assessment of fulminant myocarditis patients rescued by
15 mechanical circulatory support*: *Crit Care Med* 2011;39:1029–35.
16 doi:10.1097/CCM.0b013e31820ead45.
- 17 [5] Bréchet N, Luyt C-E, Schmidt M, Leprince P, Trouillet J-L, Léger P, et al. Venoarterial
18 Extracorporeal Membrane Oxygenation Support for Refractory Cardiovascular Dysfunction
19 During Severe Bacterial Septic Shock*: *Crit Care Med* 2013;41:1616–26.
20 doi:10.1097/CCM.0b013e31828a2370.
- 21 [6] Doll N, Kiaii B, Borger M, Bucarius J, Krämer K, Schmitt DV, et al. Five-Year results of 219
22 consecutive patients treated with extracorporeal membrane oxygenation for refractory
23 postoperative cardiogenic shock. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2004;77:151–7. doi:10.1016/S0003-
24 4975(03)01329-8.
- 25 [7] Listijono DR, Watson A, Pye R, Keogh AM, Kotlyar E, Spratt P, et al. Usefulness of extracorporeal
26 membrane oxygenation for early cardiac allograft dysfunction. *J Heart Lung Transplant*
27 2011;30:783–9. doi:10.1016/j.healun.2011.01.728.
- 28 [8] Stulak JM, Dearani JA, Burkhart HM, Barnes RD, Scott PD, Schears GJ. ECMO Cannulation
29 Controversies and Complications. *Semin Cardiothorac Vasc Anesth* 2009;13:176–82.
30 doi:10.1177/1089253209347943.
- 31 [9] Conrad SA, Grier LR, Scott LK, Green R, Jordan M. Percutaneous Cannulation for Extracorporeal
32 Membrane Oxygenation by Intensivists: A Retrospective Single-Institution Case Series*. *Crit*
33 *Care Med* 2015;43:1010–5. doi:10.1097/CCM.0000000000000883.
- 34 [10] Bisdas T, Beutel G, Warnecke G, Hoepfer MM, Kuehn C, Haverich A, et al. Vascular complications
35 in patients undergoing femoral cannulation for extracorporeal membrane oxygenation support.
36 *Ann Thorac Surg* 2011;92:626–31. doi:10.1016/j.athoracsur.2011.02.018.
- 37 [11] Foley PJ, Morris RJ, Woo EY, Acker MA, Wang GJ, Fairman RM, et al. Limb ischemia during
38 femoral cannulation for cardiopulmonary support. *J Vasc Surg* 2010;52:850–3.
39 doi:10.1016/j.jvs.2010.05.012.
- 40 [12] Kanji HD, Schulze CJ, Oreopoulos A, Lehr EJ, Wang W, MacArthur RM. Peripheral versus central
41 cannulation for extracorporeal membrane oxygenation: a comparison of limb ischemia and
42 transfusion requirements. *Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 2010;58:459–62. doi:10.1055/s-0030-
43 1250005.
- 44 [13] Vanzetto G, Akret C, Bach V, Barone G, Durand M, Chavanon O, et al. [Percutaneous
45 extracorporeal life support in acute severe hemodynamic collapses: single centre experience in
46 100 consecutive patients]. *Can J Cardiol* 2009;25:e179-186.
- 47 [14] Wearn JT. The role of the Thebesian vessels in the circulation of the heart. *J Exp Med*
48 1928;47:293.

- 1 [15] Ma P, Zhang Z, Song T, Yang Y, Meng G, Zhao J, et al. Combining ECMO with IABP for the
2 Treatment of Critically Ill Adult Heart Failure Patients. *Heart Lung Circ* 2014;23:363–8.
3 doi:10.1016/j.hlc.2013.10.081.
- 4 [16] Scheidt S, Wilner G, Mueller H, Summers D, Lesch M, Wolff G, et al. Intra-Aortic Balloon
5 Counterpulsation in Cardiogenic Shock: Report of a Cooperative Clinical Trial. *N Engl J Med*
6 1973;288:979–84. doi:10.1056/NEJM197305102881901.
- 7 [17] Gass A, Palaniswamy C, Aronow WS, Kolte D, Khera S, Ahmad H, et al. Peripheral Venoarterial
8 Extracorporeal Membrane Oxygenation in Combination with Intra-Aortic Balloon
9 Counterpulsation in Patients with Cardiovascular Compromise. *Cardiology* 2014;129:137–43.
10 doi:10.1159/000365138.
- 11 [18] Petroni T, Harrois A, Amour J, Lebreton G, Brechot N, Tanaka S, et al. Intra-Aortic Balloon Pump
12 Effects on Macrocirculation and Microcirculation in Cardiogenic Shock Patients Supported by
13 Venoarterial Extracorporeal Membrane Oxygenation*: *Crit Care Med* 2014;42:2075–82.
14 doi:10.1097/CCM.0000000000000410.
- 15 [19] Bréchet N, Demondion P, Santi F, Lebreton G, Pham T, Dalakidis A, et al. Intra-aortic balloon
16 pump protects against hydrostatic pulmonary oedema during peripheral venoarterial-
17 extracorporeal membrane oxygenation. *Eur Heart J Acute Cardiovasc Care*
18 2017;204887261771116. doi:10.1177/2048872617711169.
- 19 [20] Park TK, Yang JH, Choi S-H, Song YB, Hahn J-Y, Choi J-H, et al. Clinical impact of intra-aortic
20 balloon pump during extracorporeal life support in patients with acute myocardial infarction
21 complicated by cardiogenic shock. *BMC Anesthesiol* 2014;14:27.
- 22 [21] Lin L-Y, Liao C-W, Wang C-H, Chi N-H, Yu H-Y, Chou N-K, et al. Effects of Additional Intra-aortic
23 Balloon Counter-Pulsation Therapy to Cardiogenic Shock Patients Supported by Extra-corporeal
24 Membranous Oxygenation. *Sci Rep* 2016;6. doi:10.1038/srep23838.
- 25 [22] Jouan J, Grinda J-M, Bricourt M-O, Cholley B, Fabiani J-N. Successful left ventricular
26 decompression following peripheral extracorporeal membrane oxygenation by percutaneous
27 placement of a micro-axial flow pump. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2010;29:135–136.
- 28 [23] Cheng A, Swartz MF, Massey HT. Impella to Unload the Left Ventricle During Peripheral
29 Extracorporeal Membrane Oxygenation: *ASAIO J* 2013;59:533–6.
30 doi:10.1097/MAT.0b013e31829f0e52.
- 31 [24] Kawashima D, Gojo S, Nishimura T, Itoda Y, Kitahori K, Motomura N, et al. Left Ventricular
32 Mechanical Support with Impella Provides More Ventricular Unloading in Heart Failure Than
33 Extracorporeal Membrane Oxygenation: *ASAIO J* 2011;57:169–76.
34 doi:10.1097/MAT.0b013e31820e121c.
- 35 [25] Weymann A, Schmack B, Sabashnikov A, Bowles CT, Raake P, Arif R, et al. Central
36 extracorporeal life support with left ventricular decompression for the treatment of refractory
37 cardiogenic shock and lung failure. *J Cardiothorac Surg* 2014;9:60. doi:10.1186/1749-8090-9-60.
- 38 [26] Pappalardo F, Schulte C, Pieri M, Schrage B, Contri R, Soeffker G, et al. Concomitant
39 implantation of Impella[®] on top of veno-arterial extracorporeal membrane oxygenation may
40 improve survival of patients with cardiogenic shock: Impella[®] improves survival in cardiogenic
41 shock. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2017;19:404–12. doi:10.1002/ehhf.668.
- 42 [27] Tepper S, Masood MF, Baltazar Garcia M, Pisani M, Ewald GA, Lasala JM, et al. Left Ventricular
43 Unloading by Impella Device Versus Surgical Vent During Extracorporeal Life Support. *Ann*
44 *Thorac Surg* 2017. doi:10.1016/j.athoracsur.2016.12.049.
- 45 [28] Soleimani B, Pae W. Management of left ventricular distension during peripheral
46 extracorporeal membrane oxygenation for cardiogenic shock. *Perfusion* 2012;27:326–31.
47 doi:10.1177/0267659112443722.
- 48 [29] Kitamura M, Shibuya M, Kurihara H, Akimoto T, Endo M, Koyanagi H. Effective Cross-Circulation
49 Technique of Venoarterial Bypass for Differential Hypoxia Condition. *Artif Organs* 1997;21:786–
50 788.

- 1 [30] Choi J, Kim S, Kim Y, Kim S-Y, Kim K-S, Joo S-J, et al. Application of veno-arterial-venous
2 extracorporeal membrane oxygenation in differential hypoxia. *Multidiscip Respir Med*
3 2014;9:55. doi:10.1186/2049-6958-9-55.
- 4 [31] Extracorporeal Life Support Organization (ELSO). ELSO Guidelines for Adult Cardiac Failure v1.3
5 2013. <https://www.else.org/resources/guidelines.aspx>.
- 6 [32] Napp LC, Kühn C, Hoeper MM, Vogel-Claussen J, Haverich A, Schäfer A, et al. Cannulation
7 strategies for percutaneous extracorporeal membrane oxygenation in adults. *Clin Res Cardiol*
8 2016;105:283–96. doi:10.1007/s00392-015-0941-1.
- 9 [33] Saeed D, Stosik H, Islamovic M, Albert A, Kamiya H, Maxhera B, et al. Femoro-Femoral Versus
10 Atrio-Aortic Extracorporeal Membrane Oxygenation: Selecting the Ideal Cannulation Technique:
11 Central Versus Peripheral ECMO Cannulation. *Artif Organs* 2014;38:549–55.
12 doi:10.1111/aor.12245.
- 13 [34] Park M, Mendes PV, Hirota AS, Santos EV dos, Costa ELV, Azevedo LCP. Blood flow/pump
14 rotation ratio as an artificial lung performance monitoring tool during extracorporeal
15 respiratory support using centrifugal pumps. *Rev Bras Ter Intensiva* 2015;27. doi:10.5935/0103-
16 507X.20150030.
- 17 [35] Fuhrman BP, Hernan LJ, Rotta AT, Heard C, Rosenkranz ER. Pathophysiology of cardiac
18 extracorporeal membrane oxygenation. *Artif Organs* 1999;23:966–969.
- 19 [36] Otterspoor L, Smit F, van Laar T, Kesecioglu J, van Dijk D. Prolonged use of extracorporeal
20 membrane oxygenation combined with prone positioning in patients with acute respiratory
21 distress syndrome and invasive Aspergillosis. *Perfusion* 2012;27:335–7.
22 doi:10.1177/0267659112442098.
- 23 [37] Kimmoun A, Roche S, Bridey C, Vanhuyse F, Fay R, Girerd N, et al. Prolonged prone positioning
24 under VV-ECMO is safe and improves oxygenation and respiratory compliance. *Ann Intensive*
25 *Care* 2015;5. doi:10.1186/s13613-015-0078-4.
- 26 [38] Kipping V, Weber-Carstens S, Lojewski C, Feldmann P, Rydlewski A, Boemke W, et al. Prone
27 position during ECMO is safe and improves oxygenation. *Int J Artif Organs* 2013;36:821–32.
28 doi:10.5301/ijao.5000254.
- 29 [39] Schmidt M, Pellegrino V, Combes A, Scheinkestel C, Cooper D, Hodgson C. Mechanical
30 ventilation during extracorporeal membrane oxygenation. *Crit Care* 2014;18:203.
31 doi:10.1186/cc13702.
- 32 [40] Aubron C, Cheng AC, Pilcher D, Leong T, Magrin G, Cooper DJ, et al. Factors associated with
33 outcomes of patients on extracorporeal membrane oxygenation support: a 5-year cohort study.
34 *Crit Care* 2013;17:R73.
- 35 [41] Lidegran MK, Mosskin M, Ringertz HG, Frenckner BP, Lindén VB. Cranial CT for Diagnosis of
36 Intracranial Complications in Adult and Pediatric Patients During ECMO: Clinical Benefits in
37 Diagnosis and Treatment. *Acad Radiol* 2007;14:62–71. doi:10.1016/j.acra.2006.10.004.
- 38 [42] Hemmila MR, Rowe SA, Boules TN, Miskulin J, McGillicuddy JW, Schuerer DJ, et al.
39 Extracorporeal Life Support for Severe Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome in Adults: *Trans*
40 *Meet Am Surg Assoc* 2004;CXXII:193–205. doi:10.1097/01.sla.0000141159.90676.2d.
- 41 [43] Mateen FJ. Neurological Injury in Adults Treated With Extracorporeal Membrane Oxygenation.
42 *Arch Neurol* 2011;68:1543. doi:10.1001/archneurol.2011.209.
- 43 [44] Cheng R, Hachamovitch R, Kittleson M, Patel J, Arabia F, Moriguchi J, et al. Complications of
44 Extracorporeal Membrane Oxygenation for Treatment of Cardiogenic Shock and Cardiac Arrest:
45 A Meta-Analysis of 1,866 Adult Patients. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2014;97:610–6.
46 doi:10.1016/j.athoracsur.2013.09.008.
- 47 [45] Xie A, Phan K, Yi-Chin Tsai M, Yan TD, Forrest P. Venoarterial Extracorporeal Membrane
48 Oxygenation for Cardiogenic Shock and Cardiac Arrest: A Meta-Analysis. *J Cardiothorac Vasc*
49 *Anesth* 2015;29:637–45. doi:10.1053/j.jvca.2014.09.005.
- 50 [46] Avalli L, Maggioni E, Formica F, Redaelli G, Migliari M, Scanziani M, et al. Favourable survival of
51 in-hospital compared to out-of-hospital refractory cardiac arrest patients treated with

- 1 extracorporeal membrane oxygenation: An Italian tertiary care centre experience.
2 Resuscitation 2012;83:579–83. doi:10.1016/j.resuscitation.2011.10.013.
- 3 [47] Chou T-H, Fang C-C, Yen Z-S, Lee C-C, Chen Y-S, Ko W-J, et al. An observational study of
4 extracorporeal CPR for in-hospital cardiac arrest secondary to myocardial infarction. Emerg
5 Med J 2014;31:441–7. doi:10.1136/emered-2012-202173.
- 6 [48] Lin J-W, Wang M-J, Yu H-Y, Wang C-H, Chang W-T, Jerng J-S, et al. Comparing the survival
7 between extracorporeal rescue and conventional resuscitation in adult in-hospital cardiac
8 arrests: Propensity analysis of three-year data. Resuscitation 2010;81:796–803.
9 doi:10.1016/j.resuscitation.2010.03.002.
- 10 [49] Park SB, Yang JH, Park TK, Cho YH, Sung K, Chung CR, et al. Developing a risk prediction model
11 for survival to discharge in cardiac arrest patients who undergo extracorporeal membrane
12 oxygenation. Int J Cardiol 2014;177:1031–5. doi:10.1016/j.ijcard.2014.09.124.
- 13 [50] Schopka S, Philipp A, Lunz D, Camboni D, Zacher R, Rupprecht L, et al. Single-Center Experience
14 With Extracorporeal Life Support in 103 Nonpostcardiotomy Patients: EXTRACORPOREAL LIFE
15 SUPPORT. Artif Organs 2013;37:150–6. doi:10.1111/j.1525-1594.2012.01544.x.
- 16 [51] Choi DS, Kim T, Ro YS, Ahn KO, Lee EJ, Hwang SS, et al. Extracorporeal life support and survival
17 after out-of-hospital cardiac arrest in a nationwide registry: A propensity score-matched
18 analysis. Resuscitation 2016;99:26–32. doi:10.1016/j.resuscitation.2015.11.013.
- 19 [52] Lamhaut L, Hutin A, Puymirat E, Jouan J, Raphalen J-H, Jouffroy R, et al. A Pre-Hospital
20 Extracorporeal Cardio Pulmonary Resuscitation (ECPR) strategy for treatment of refractory out
21 hospital cardiac arrest: An observational study and propensity analysis. Resuscitation 2017.
22 doi:10.1016/j.resuscitation.2017.04.014.
- 23 [53] Sawamoto K, Bird SB, Katayama Y, Maekawa K, Uemura S, Tanno K, et al. Outcome from severe
24 accidental hypothermia with cardiac arrest resuscitated with extracorporeal cardiopulmonary
25 resuscitation. Am J Emerg Med 2014;32:320–4. doi:10.1016/j.ajem.2013.12.023.
- 26 [54] de Lange DW, Sikma MA, Meulenbelt J. Extracorporeal membrane oxygenation in the
27 treatment of poisoned patients. Clin Toxicol 2013;51:385–93.
28 doi:10.3109/15563650.2013.800876.
- 29 [55] Walpoth BH, Walpoth-Aslan BN, Mattle HP, Radanov BP, Schroth G, Schaeffler L, et al. Outcome
30 of survivors of accidental deep hypothermia and circulatory arrest treated with extracorporeal
31 blood warming. N Engl J Med 1997;337:1500–1505.
- 32 [56] Maggio P, Hemmila M, Haft J, Bartlett R. Extracorporeal Life Support for Massive Pulmonary
33 Embolism: J Trauma Inj Infect Crit Care 2007;62:570–6. doi:10.1097/TA.0b013e318031cd0c.
- 34 [57] Recommandations sur les indications de l'assistance circulatoire dans le traitement des arrêts
35 cardiaques réfractaires. Ann Fr Anesth Réanimation 2009;28:182–6.
36 doi:10.1016/j.annfar.2008.12.011.
- 37 [58] Peberdy MA, Callaway CW, Neumar RW, Geocadin RG, Zimmerman JL, Donnino M, et al. Part 9:
38 Post-Cardiac Arrest Care: 2010 American Heart Association Guidelines for Cardiopulmonary
39 Resuscitation and Emergency Cardiovascular Care. Circulation 2010;122:S768–86.
40 doi:10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.110.971002.
- 41 [59] de Chambrun MP, Bréchet N, Lebreton G, Schmidt M, Hekimian G, Demondion P, et al.
42 Venoarterial extracorporeal membrane oxygenation for refractory cardiogenic shock post-
43 cardiac arrest. Intensive Care Med 2016. doi:10.1007/s00134-016-4541-y.
- 44 [60] Bougouin W, Aissaoui N, Combes A, Deye N, Lamhaut L, Jost D, et al. Post-cardiac arrest shock
45 treated with veno-arterial extracorporeal membrane oxygenation. Resuscitation 2017;110:126–
46 32. doi:10.1016/j.resuscitation.2016.11.005.
- 47 [61] O'Gara PT, Kushner FG, Ascheim DD, Casey DE, Chung MK, de Lemos JA, et al. 2013 ACCF/AHA
48 Guideline for the Management of ST-Elevation Myocardial Infarction: A Report of the American
49 College of Cardiology Foundation/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice
50 Guidelines. Circulation 2013;127:e362–425. doi:10.1161/CIR.0b013e3182742cf6.
- 51 [62] Authors/Task Force Members, McMurray JJV, Adamopoulos S, Anker SD, Auricchio A, Böhm M,
52 et al. ESC Guidelines for the diagnosis and treatment of acute and chronic heart failure 2012:

- 1 The Task Force for the Diagnosis and Treatment of Acute and Chronic Heart Failure 2012 of the
2 European Society of Cardiology. Developed in collaborati. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2012;14:803–69.
3 doi:10.1093/eurjhf/hfs105.
- 4 [63] Chen J-S, Ko W-J, Yu H-Y, Lai L-P, Huang S-C, Chi N-H, et al. Analysis of the outcome for patients
5 experiencing myocardial infarction and cardiopulmonary resuscitation refractory to
6 conventional therapies necessitating extracorporeal life support rescue*: *Crit Care Med*
7 2006;34:950–7. doi:10.1097/01.CCM.0000206103.35460.1F.
- 8 [64] Fujimoto K, Kawahito K, Yamaguchi A, Sakuragawa H, Tsuboi J, Yuri K, et al. Percutaneous
9 extracorporeal life support for treatment of fatal mechanical complications associated with
10 acute myocardial infarction. *Artif Organs* 2001;25:1000–3.
- 11 [65] Sheu J-J, Tsai T-H, Lee F-Y, Fang H-Y, Sun C-K, Leu S, et al. Early extracorporeal membrane
12 oxygenator-assisted primary percutaneous coronary intervention improved 30-day clinical
13 outcomes in patients with ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction complicated with
14 profound cardiogenic shock: *Crit Care Med* 2010;38:1810–7.
15 doi:10.1097/CCM.0b013e3181e8acf7.
- 16 [66] Muller G, Flecher E, Lebreton G, Luyt C-E, Trouillet J-L, Bréchet N, et al. The ENCOURAGE
17 mortality risk score and analysis of long-term outcomes after VA-ECMO for acute myocardial
18 infarction with cardiogenic shock. *Intensive Care Med* 2016;42:370–8. doi:10.1007/s00134-016-
19 4223-9.
- 20 [67] Rajagopal SK, Almond CS, Laussen PC, Rycus PT, Wypij D, Thiagarajan RR. Extracorporeal
21 membrane oxygenation for the support of infants, children, and young adults with acute
22 myocarditis: A review of the Extracorporeal Life Support Organization registry*: *Crit Care Med*
23 2010;38:382–7. doi:10.1097/CCM.0b013e3181bc8293.
- 24 [68] Maejima Y, Yasu T, Kubo N, Kawahito K, Omura N, Katsuki T, et al. Long-term prognosis of
25 fulminant myocarditis rescued by percutaneous cardiopulmonary support device. *Circ J*
26 2004;68:829–833.
- 27 [69] Vieillard-Baron A. Septic cardiomyopathy. *Ann Intensive Care* 2011;1:1.
- 28 [70] Huang C-T, Tsai Y-J, Tsai P-R, Ko W-J. Extracorporeal membrane oxygenation resuscitation in
29 adult patients with refractory septic shock. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 2013;146:1041–6.
30 doi:10.1016/j.jtcvs.2012.08.022.
- 31 [71] Park TK, Yang JH, Jeon K, Choi S-H, Choi J-H, Gwon H-C, et al. Extracorporeal membrane
32 oxygenation for refractory septic shock in adults. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg* 2015;47:e68–74.
33 doi:10.1093/ejcts/ezu462.
- 34 [72] Rastan AJ, Dege A, Mohr M, Doll N, Falk V, Walther T, et al. Early and late outcomes of 517
35 consecutive adult patients treated with extracorporeal membrane oxygenation for refractory
36 postcardiotomy cardiogenic shock. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 2010;139:302–311.e1.
37 doi:10.1016/j.jtcvs.2009.10.043.
- 38 [73] Stehlik J, Edwards LB, Kucheryavaya AY, Benden C, Christie JD, Dobbels F, et al. The Registry of
39 the International Society for Heart and Lung Transplantation: Twenty-eighth Adult Heart
40 Transplant Report—2011. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2011;30:1078–94.
41 doi:10.1016/j.healun.2011.08.003.
- 42 [74] Christie JD, Edwards LB, Kucheryavaya AY, Benden C, Dipchand AI, Dobbels F, et al. The Registry
43 of the International Society for Heart and Lung Transplantation: 29th Adult Lung and Heart-
44 Lung Transplant Report—2012. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2012;31:1073–86.
45 doi:10.1016/j.healun.2012.08.004.
- 46 [75] Yusen RD, Christie JD, Edwards LB, Kucheryavaya AY, Benden C, Dipchand AI, et al. The Registry
47 of the International Society for Heart and Lung Transplantation: Thirtieth Adult Lung and Heart-
48 Lung Transplant Report—2013; Focus Theme: Age. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2013;32:965–78.
49 doi:10.1016/j.healun.2013.08.007.
- 50 [76] Hartwig MG, Walczak R, Lin SS, Davis RD. Improved Survival but Marginal Allograft Function in
51 Patients Treated With Extracorporeal Membrane Oxygenation After Lung Transplantation. *Ann*
52 *Thorac Surg* 2012;93:366–71. doi:10.1016/j.athoracsur.2011.05.017.

- 1 [77] Mihaljevic T, Jarrett CM, Gonzalez-Stawinski G, Smedira NG, Nowicki ER, Thuita L, et al.
2 Mechanical circulatory support after heart transplantation. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg* 2011.
3 doi:10.1016/j.ejcts.2011.04.017.
- 4 [78] Lima EB, Cunha CR da, Barzilai VS, Ulhoa MB, Barros MR de, Moraes CS, et al. Experience of
5 ECMO in Primary Graft Dysfunction after Orthotopic Heart Transplantation. *Arq Bras Cardiol*
6 2015. doi:10.5935/abc.20150082.
- 7 [79] Pagani FD, Lynch W, Swaniker F, Dyke DB, Bartlett R, Koelling T, et al. Extracorporeal life
8 support to left ventricular assist device bridge to heart transplant a strategy to optimize survival
9 and resource utilization. *Circulation* 1999;100:II-206.
- 10 [80] Chung JC-Y, Tsai P-R, Chou N-K, Chi N-H, Wang S-S, Ko W-J. Extracorporeal membrane
11 oxygenation bridge to adult heart transplantation: ECMO bridge to heart transplantation. *Clin*
12 *Transplant* 2009;24:375-80. doi:10.1111/j.1399-0012.2009.01084.x.
- 13 [81] Marasco SF, Lo C, Murphy D, Summerhayes R, Quayle M, Zimmet A, et al. Extracorporeal Life
14 Support Bridge to Ventricular Assist Device: The Double Bridge Strategy: Thoughts and
15 Progress. *Artif Organs* 2015:n/a-n/a. doi:10.1111/aor.12496.
- 16 [82] Kirklin JK, Naftel DC, Pagani FD, Kormos RL, Stevenson LW, Blume ED, et al. Sixth INTERMACS
17 annual report: A 10,000-patient database. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2014;33:555-64.
18 doi:10.1016/j.healun.2014.04.010.
- 19 [83] Barge-Caballero E, Paniagua-Martín MJ, Marzoa-Rivas R, Campo-Pérez R, Rodríguez-Fernández
20 JÁ, Pérez-Pérez A, et al. Usefulness of the INTERMACS Scale for predicting outcomes after
21 urgent heart transplantation. *Rev Esp Cardiol Engl Ed* 2011;64:193-200.
- 22 [84] Stevenson LW, Pagani FD, Young JB, Jessup M, Miller L, Kormos RL, et al. INTERMACS Profiles of
23 Advanced Heart Failure: The Current Picture. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2009;28:535-41.
24 doi:10.1016/j.healun.2009.02.015.
- 25 [85] Chassot P-G, Bettex D, Boegli Y, Delabays A, Ferrarri E, Iglesias J-F, et al. Anesthésie et
26 insuffisance ventriculaire. *Précis Anesth. En Chir. Card.*, vol. 12, 2015.
- 27 [86] Aissaoui N, El-Banayosy A, Combes A. How to wean a patient from veno-arterial extracorporeal
28 membrane oxygenation. *Intensive Care Med* 2015;41:902-5. doi:10.1007/s00134-015-3663-y.
- 29 [87] Aissaoui N, Luyt C-E, Leprince P, Trouillet J-L, Léger P, Pavie A, et al. Predictors of successful
30 extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO) weaning after assistance for refractory
31 cardiogenic shock. *Intensive Care Med* 2011;37:1738-45. doi:10.1007/s00134-011-2358-2.
- 32 [88] Chen Y-S, Chao A, Yu H-Y, Ko W-J, Wu I-H, Chen RJ-C, et al. Analysis and results of prolonged
33 resuscitation in cardiac arrest patients rescued by extracorporeal membrane oxygenation. *J Am*
34 *Coll Cardiol* 2003;41:197-203.
- 35 [89] Sung K, Lee YT, Park PW, Park K-H, Jun T-G, Yang J-H, et al. Improved survival after cardiac
36 arrest using emergent autoprime percutaneous cardiopulmonary support. *Ann Thorac Surg*
37 2006;82:651-6. doi:10.1016/j.athoracsur.2006.03.017.
- 38 [90] Ruttman E, Weissenbacher A, Ulmer H, Müller L, Höfer D, Kilo J, et al. Prolonged
39 extracorporeal membrane oxygenation-assisted support provides improved survival in
40 hypothermic patients with cardiocirculatory arrest. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 2007;134:594-
41 600. doi:10.1016/j.jtcvs.2007.03.049.
- 42 [91] Chen Y-S, Yu H-Y, Huang S-C, Lin J-W, Chi N-H, Wang C-H, et al. Extracorporeal membrane
43 oxygenation support can extend the duration of cardiopulmonary resuscitation*: *Crit Care Med*
44 2008;36:2529-35. doi:10.1097/CCM.0b013e318183f491.
- 45 [92] Le Guen M, Nicolas-Robin A, Carreira S, Raux M, Leprince P, Riou B, et al. Extracorporeal life
46 support following out-of-hospital refractory cardiac arrest. *Crit Care* 2011;15:R29.
- 47 [93] Liu Y, Cheng YT, Chang JC, Chao SF, Chang BS. Extracorporeal membrane oxygenation to
48 support prolonged conventional cardiopulmonary resuscitation in adults with cardiac arrest
49 from acute myocardial infarction at a very low-volume centre. *Interact Cardiovasc Thorac Surg*
50 2011;12:389-93. doi:10.1510/icvts.2010.256388.
- 51 [94] Shin TG, Choi J-H, Jo IJ, Sim MS, Song HG, Jeong YK, et al. Extracorporeal cardiopulmonary
52 resuscitation in patients with inhospital cardiac arrest: A comparison with conventional

- 1 cardiopulmonary resuscitation*: Crit Care Med 2011;39:1–7.
2 doi:10.1097/CCM.0b013e3181feb339.
- 3 [95] Haneya A, Philipp A, Diez C, Schopka S, Bein T, Zimmermann M, et al. A 5-year experience with
4 cardiopulmonary resuscitation using extracorporeal life support in non-postcardiotomy
5 patients with cardiac arrest. Resuscitation 2012;83:1331–7.
6 doi:10.1016/j.resuscitation.2012.07.009.
- 7 [96] Wu M-Y, Lee M-Y, Lin C-C, Chang Y-S, Tsai F-C, Lin P-J. Resuscitation of non-postcardiotomy
8 cardiogenic shock or cardiac arrest with extracorporeal life support: The role of bridging to
9 intervention. Resuscitation 2012;83:976–81. doi:10.1016/j.resuscitation.2012.01.010.
- 10 [97] Leick J, Liebetrau C, Szardien S, Fischer-Rasokat U, Willmer M, van Linden A, et al. Door-to-
11 implantation time of extracorporeal life support systems predicts mortality in patients with out-
12 of-hospital cardiac arrest. Clin Res Cardiol 2013;102:661–9. doi:10.1007/s00392-013-0580-3.
- 13 [98] Maekawa K, Tanno K, Hase M, Mori K, Asai Y. Extracorporeal Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation for
14 Patients With Out-of-Hospital Cardiac Arrest of Cardiac Origin: A Propensity-Matched Study and
15 Predictor Analysis*. Crit Care Med 2013;41:1186–96. doi:10.1097/CCM.0b013e31827ca4c8.
- 16 [99] Johnson NJ, Acker M, Hsu CH, Desai N, Vallabhajosyula P, Lazar S, et al. Extracorporeal life
17 support as rescue strategy for out-of-hospital and emergency department cardiac arrest.
18 Resuscitation 2014;85:1527–32. doi:10.1016/j.resuscitation.2014.08.028.
- 19 [100] Kim SJ, Jung JS, Park JH, Park JS, Hong YS, Lee SW. An optimal transition time to extracorporeal
20 cardiopulmonary resuscitation for predicting good neurological outcome in patients with out-
21 of-hospital cardiac arrest: a propensity-matched study. Crit Care 2014;18:535.
- 22 [101] Sakamoto T, Morimura N, Nagao K, Asai Y, Yokota H, Nara S, et al. Extracorporeal
23 cardiopulmonary resuscitation versus conventional cardiopulmonary resuscitation in adults
24 with out-of-hospital cardiac arrest: A prospective observational study. Resuscitation
25 2014;85:762–8. doi:10.1016/j.resuscitation.2014.01.031.
- 26 [102] Wang C-H, Chou N-K, Becker LB, Lin J-W, Yu H-Y, Chi N-H, et al. Improved outcome of
27 extracorporeal cardiopulmonary resuscitation for out-of-hospital cardiac arrest – A comparison
28 with that for extracorporeal rescue for in-hospital cardiac arrest. Resuscitation 2014;85:1219–
29 24. doi:10.1016/j.resuscitation.2014.06.022.
- 30 [103] Han S, Kim H, Choi H, Hong G, Lee W, Lee S, et al. Predictors of survival following extracorporeal
31 cardiopulmonary resuscitation in patients with acute myocardial infarction-complicated
32 refractory cardiac arrest in the emergency department: a retrospective study. J Cardiothorac
33 Surg 2015;10:23. doi:10.1186/s13019-015-0212-2.
- 34 [104] Huang C-T, Tsai Y-J, Tsai P-R, Ko W-J. Extracorporeal membrane oxygenation resuscitation in
35 adult patients with refractory septic shock. J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg 2013;146:1041–6.
36 doi:10.1016/j.jtcvs.2012.08.022.

37

38

1 **Fundings**

2 This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public,
3 commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

4