

Since January 2020 Elsevier has created a COVID-19 resource centre with free information in English and Mandarin on the novel coronavirus COVID-19. The COVID-19 resource centre is hosted on Elsevier Connect, the company's public news and information website.

Elsevier hereby grants permission to make all its COVID-19-related research that is available on the COVID-19 resource centre - including this research content - immediately available in PubMed Central and other publicly funded repositories, such as the WHO COVID database with rights for unrestricted research re-use and analyses in any form or by any means with acknowledgement of the original source. These permissions are granted for free by Elsevier for as long as the COVID-19 resource centre remains active.

Determinants of longterm outcomes in patients with COVID-19 supported with ECMO

Authors' reply

We thank Christophe Guervilly and colleagues for their interest in and appreciation of our prospective, multicentre study on the use of extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO) in patients with COVID-19 in Europe and adjacent countries.¹

The EuroECMO-COVID study was meant to provide, from the very beginning of the pandemic, very basic and relevant data about pre-ECMO, on-ECMO, and post-ECMO variables, and outcomes including a 6-month follow-up; potentially important information was missing in the vast majority of research and reporting experiences in this setting. The guidelines for ECMO in patients with COVID-19, published at the beginning of the pandemic, provided general rules about indications, ECMO management, and ventilator settings.2 We expected most centres to follow these recommendations, particularly with regard to lungprotective ventilation. We were aware that requesting additional data, beyond the chosen dataset.1 would have hampered the finalisation of the entire study. We argue that patients undergoing ECMO were those with the most severe forms of respiratory insufficiency, and also those with a short duration of mechanical ventilation before ECMO start, as shown by our final findings (median pre-ECMO ventilation time of 4 days).1 Our study objectives did not focus on ventilator settings, but rather on ECMO application and management, as well as related outcomes. Many other parameters that were not collected could have affected the patient outcome (eg, echocardiographic data showing cardiac impairment, particularly right ventricular dysfunction, which played an important part in the ultimate survivorship patient outcome). We acknowledge that additional information might have been useful for further clinical research analysis.

Prone positioning was indeed considered in our dataset. Of the 995 proned patients, only 111 (11%) did not continue with prone positioning after ECMO initiation, whereas 884 (89%) continued with proning management. Furthermore, 35 patients who did not undergo prone positioning before ECMO were proned during ECMO. However, the absence of prone positiong during ECMO was not found to be a risk factor for mortality (hazard ratio 1.062, 95% CI 0.875-1.289) and this finding led us to maintain only proning before ECMO in the statistical model. Although some studies have confirmed the benefit of prone positioning in patients with COVID-19,3 such an advantage was not confirmed in a study by the EuroPronECMO Investigators,4 or by a meta-analysis⁵ or a propensitymatched study;6 prone positioning even appeared to have a detrimental effect in one investigation.7 We agree with Guervilly and colleagues that this aspect of care remains a matter for further investigation.

Finally, Guervilly and colleagues emphasise the finding of symptoms of anxiety, depression, and posttraumatic stress disorder 1 year after ECMO in patients with COVID-19. These findings agree with ours, and it was these long-term impairments that prompted the EuroECMO-COVID investigators to provide not only in-hospital information, but also post-discharge outcome data, albeit limited to the first 6 months after ECMO implant. Our findings underline the urgent need for close, regular follow-up of these patients to address not only respiratory complications, but also neuropsychological and cardiocirculatory sequelae.

Author declarations remain the same as in the original Article.

*Roberto Lorusso, Maria Elena De Piero, Silvia Mariani, Michele Di Mauro roberto.lorusso@mumc.nl

Department of Cardio-Thoracic Surgery, Heart and Vascular Centre, Maastricht University Medical Centre, Maastricht, Netherlands (RL, MEDP, SM, MDM); Cardiovascular Research Institute Maastricht, Maastricht, Netherlands (RL, MEDP, SM, MDM)

- Lorusso R, De Piero ME, Mariani S, et al. In-hospital and 6-month outcomes in patients with COVID-19 supported with extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (EuroECMO-COVID): a multicentre, prospective observational study. Lancet Respir Med 2023; 11:151–62.
- Shekar K, Badulak J, Peek G, et al. Extracorporeal Life Support Organization COVID-19 Interim Guidelines. A consensus document from an international group of interdisciplinary extracorporeal membrane oxygenator providers. ASAIO J 2020; 66: 707-21.
- Zaaqoq AM, Barnett AG, Griffee MJ, et al. Beneficial effect of prone positioning during venovenous extracorporeal membrane oxygenation for coronavirus disease 2019. Crit Care Med 2022; 50: 275-85.
- 4 Giani M, Rezoagli E, Guervilly C, et al. Prone positioning during venovenous extracorporeal membrane oxygenation for acute respiratory distress syndrome: a pooled individual patient data analysis. Crit Care 2022; 26: 9
- Poon WH, Ramanathan K, Ling RR, et al. Prone positioning during venovenous extracorporeal membrane oxygenation for acute respiratory distress syndrome: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Crit Care 2021; 25: 292.
- 6 Massart N, Guervilly C, Mansour A, et al. Impact of prone positioning in COVID-19 patients on extracorporeal membrane oxygenation. Crit Care Med 2023; 51: 36–46.
- 7 Ong SL, Tantawy H, Assi R, Chichra A, Treggiari MM. Combined use of ECMO, prone positioning and APRV in the management of severe COVID-19 patients. Clin Med Insights Circ Respir Pulm Med 2022; 16: 11795484221134451.



Published Online April 5, 2023 https://doi.org/10.1016/ S2213-2600(23)00134-0



If you would like to respond to an article published in The Lancet Respiratory Medicine, please submit your correspondence online at: https://www.editorialmanager. com/THELANCETRM