



Published in final edited form as:

*Resuscitation*. 2015 June ; 91: 73–75. doi:10.1016/j.resuscitation.2015.03.021.

## Ethics in the Use of Extracorporeal Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation in Adults

Kevin R. Riggs, MD, MPH<sup>1,2</sup>, Lance B. Becker, MD<sup>3</sup>, and Jeremy Sugarman, MD, MPH, MA<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Division of General Internal Medicine, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, Maryland <sup>2</sup>Johns Hopkins Berman Institute of Bioethics, Baltimore, Maryland <sup>3</sup>Center for Resuscitation Science, Department of Emergency Medicine, University of Pennsylvania Perelman School of Medicine, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

### Abstract

Extracorporeal cardiopulmonary resuscitation (ECPR) promises to be an important advance in the treatment of cardiac arrest. However, ECPR involves ethical challenges that should be addressed as it diffuses into practice. Benefits and risks are uncertain, so the evidence base needs to be further developed, at least through outcomes registries and potentially with randomized trials. To inform decision making, patients' preferences regarding ECPR should be obtained, both from the general population and from inpatients at risk for cardiac arrest. Fair and transparent appropriate use criteria should be developed and could be informed by economic analyses.

---

Despite remarkable advances in cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) and post-resuscitative care, overall survival from cardiac arrest remains poor.<sup>1,2</sup> Using veno-arterial extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO) for cardiac arrest refractory to conventional CPR (known as ECPR) promises to enhance outcomes. By supporting systemic circulation, ECPR can provide time for recovery from underlying insults causing arrest (e.g., electrolyte abnormalities or hypothermia) or interventions to correct those causes (e.g., cardiac revascularization). When there is particularly devastating heart damage, ECPR can be a bridge to treatment with cardiac transplantation or a left ventricular assist device.

Despite these potential benefits, ECPR is not standard of care throughout most of the world. However, ECMO use in general is increasing rapidly,<sup>3</sup> and given the promising results being

---

© 2015 Published by Elsevier Ireland Ltd.

Correspondence: Kevin R. Riggs, MD, MPH, 2024 E. Monument Street, Room 2-604B, Baltimore, Maryland, 21287, kriggs3@jhmi.edu, Telephone: (443) 287-8517, Fax: (410) 955-0476.

#### Conflict of Interest Statement

Dr. Riggs has no potential conflicts of interest to declare. Dr. Sugarman serves as the Ethics Officer for the NIH Resuscitation Outcomes Consortium. Dr. Becker serves on the Data Safety Monitoring Committee and Protocol Review Committee of the NIH Resuscitation Outcomes Consortium.

**Publisher's Disclaimer:** This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

reported for ECPR,<sup>4-8</sup> it is probable that use of ECPR will increase. In fact, recent international CPR guidelines recommend consideration of ECPR in certain situations.<sup>9,10</sup> Clinicians and hospitals may believe that there is little downside to adopting ECPR, reasoning that patients who have failed conventional CPR have very little to lose. However, ECPR involves ethical challenges that should be addressed as the technology diffuses into practice. These challenges include its uncertain risk-benefit profile, the inability to obtain express informed consent in most cases, high costs, and ensuring fair access. While these challenges are arguably present to varying degrees with other resuscitation techniques and technologies, they deserve close attention in regard to ECPR. In this article, we describe these challenges and offer recommendations on how to begin addressing them.

## Ethical Challenges

### Benefits and Risks

Current information on the clinical benefits and harms of ECPR comes from observational studies; data from randomized controlled trials are not available. If there were no potential clinical downsides to providing ECPR, moderate quality evidence suggesting benefit might be sufficient to justify providing it to patients who otherwise face a grave prognosis. However, ECPR is associated with potential harms. For example, in one study ECPR was associated with higher survival with good neurologic outcome at six months compared to conventional CPR, but was also associated with higher rates of coma or vegetative state.<sup>5</sup> Thus, ECPR may increase the chances that patients experience outcomes that could be considered by some to be “worse than death”.<sup>11</sup> ECPR can also lead to the so-called “bridge to nowhere” – a situation where the patient is awake on ECMO but not a candidate for transplant and not likely to recover, essentially trapped in the intensive care unit because of their dependence on ongoing life support.<sup>12</sup> Additionally, averting death temporarily with ECPR may foreclose the possibility of a “good death.”<sup>13</sup> Families rarely need to be consulted when declaring death following unsuccessful conventional CPR; however, they will necessarily be more involved when death involves “turning off” ECMO. While some may view even a short period of additional survival as valuable (e.g., to provide an opportunity to “say goodbye”), families of patients who die in intensive care units often suffer anxiety, depression, and post-traumatic stress.<sup>14</sup>

### Acceptability and Difficulty in Obtaining Explicit Consent

As with many other potentially life-saving therapies delivered to patients in emergent settings, it is often not possible to obtain informed consent prior to initiating ECPR, although proxy consent sometimes may be obtained. Accordingly, treatment typically proceeds by presuming consent, the notion that patients would have agreed to the treatment if they had been given the opportunity.<sup>15</sup> While it is generally accepted that consent can be presumed for conventional CPR,<sup>16</sup> it is uncertain whether this presumption should extend to ECPR because potential patients who would hypothetically consent to CPR may find the risks of ECPR unacceptable. Nevertheless, a lower rate of acceptability would not necessarily preclude being able to ethically provide ECPR without explicit consent, because the alternative of not providing ECPR to anyone would prevent those who would have consented from potentially benefitting.

While presuming consent for resuscitation is reasonable, especially for patients who suffer cardiac arrest outside of the hospital or in the emergency department prior to any discussion of their preferences, the justification for presuming consent is less compelling for patients who suffer cardiac arrest in the hospital. Ethics guidelines have long recommended that resuscitation preferences be discussed with patients who are at heightened risk of cardiac or respiratory failure.<sup>16</sup> Therefore, discussing the possible use of ECPR with patients ahead of time (i.e., as part of a routine “code” discussion following hospital admission) would significantly mitigate the ethical concern raised by lack of explicit consent if ECPR is needed.

### **Appropriate Use Criteria**

In current practice, the decision to provide ECPR is made on a “case-by-case” basis, either by initial responders and those in the emergency department for patients with out-of-hospital cardiac arrest or by hospital care teams for patients with in-hospital cardiac arrest, which could lead to the potential for discrimination. However, it may be difficult to devise fair criteria for provision of ECPR. Prospective studies to date have used inclusion criteria aimed at targeting those who are likely to benefit, some specifically citing avoidance of initiating futile aggressive care.<sup>4</sup> In some studies, for example, ECPR has not been offered to individuals who arrived to the hospital more than 45 minutes after their cardiac arrest,<sup>5</sup> or who are more than 70 years old.<sup>17</sup> However, survival has been reported in patients where ECPR was started after more than 150 minutes of conventional CPR,<sup>17</sup> so in practice a strict futility argument based solely on time since arrest is unlikely to be valid. Further, at least in the US, age is generally not used as a basis for not offering potentially beneficial therapies, so age cutoffs may be controversial in such settings.

In addition, not all emergency departments are currently capable of providing ECPR due to lack of equipment and relevant expertise. Arguably, ECPR will be more likely to be beneficial in settings where there is sufficient expertise and the ability to provide appropriate follow-up care.

### **Cost**

Cost-effectiveness analyses have not been conducted on ECPR. However, there are substantial costs associated with making ECPR available due to the cost of equipment and training. There are also substantial downstream costs incurred in caring for survivors of cardiac arrest. When survivors are neurologically compromised, care can cost hundreds of thousands of dollars per patient.<sup>18</sup> Thus, the use of ECPR raises concern about the appropriate use of scarce health resources.

### **Towards Addressing the Ethical Challenges**

Given the ethical challenges in the provision of ECPR, there are important steps that policy makers, hospital administrators, professional groups, researchers, and clinicians can take to ensure that this potentially life-saving technology is provided responsibly.

As an emerging technology with unproven benefit and the potential for serious harm, stakeholders should commit to continuing to develop the evidence base for ECPR. In



4. Massetti M, Tasle M, Le Page O, et al. Back from irreversibility: extracorporeal life support for prolonged cardiac arrest. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2005; 79:178–83. discussion 83–4. [PubMed: 15620939]
5. Sakamoto T, Morimura N, Nagao K, et al. Extracorporeal cardiopulmonary resuscitation versus conventional cardiopulmonary resuscitation in adults with out-of-hospital cardiac arrest: A prospective observational study. *Resuscitation.* 2014; 85:762–8. [PubMed: 24530251]
6. Chen YS, Lin JW, Yu HY, et al. Cardiopulmonary resuscitation with assisted extracorporeal life-support versus conventional cardiopulmonary resuscitation in adults with inhospital cardiac arrest: an observational study and propensity analysis. *Lancet.* 2008; 372:554–61. [PubMed: 18603291]
7. Maekawa K, Tanno K, Hase M, Mori K, Asai Y. Extracorporeal cardiopulmonary resuscitation for patients with out-of-hospital cardiac arrest of cardiac origin: a propensity-matched study and predictor analysis. *Crit Care Med.* 2013; 41:1186–96. [PubMed: 23388518]
8. Dworschak M. Is extracorporeal cardiopulmonary resuscitation for out-of-hospital cardiac arrest superior compared with conventional resuscitation? *Crit Care Med.* 2013; 41:1365–6. [PubMed: 23591215]
9. Cave DM, Gazmuri RJ, Otto CW, et al. Part 7: CPR techniques and devices: 2010 American Heart Association Guidelines for Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation and Emergency Cardiovascular Care. *Circulation.* 2010; 122:S720–8. [PubMed: 20956223]
10. Nolan JP, Soar J, Zideman DA, et al. European Resuscitation Council Guidelines for Resuscitation 2010 Section 1. Executive summary Resuscitation. 2010; 81:1219–76.
11. Pearlman RA, Cain KC, Patrick DL, et al. Insights pertaining to patient assessments of states worse than death. *J Clin Ethics.* 1993; 4:33–41. [PubMed: 8490217]
12. Abrams DC, Prager K, Blinderman CD, Burkart KM, Brodie D. Ethical dilemmas encountered with the use of extracorporeal membrane oxygenation in adults. *Chest.* 2014; 145:876–82. [PubMed: 24687709]
13. Steinhauser KE, Christakis NA, Clipp EC, McNeilly M, McIntyre L, Tulsky JA. Factors considered important at the end of life by patients, family, physicians, and other care providers. *JAMA.* 2000; 284:2476–82. [PubMed: 11074777]
14. Anderson WG, Arnold RM, Angus DC, Bryce CL. Posttraumatic stress and complicated grief in family members of patients in the intensive care unit. *J Gen Intern Med.* 2008; 23:1871–6. [PubMed: 18780129]
15. Burns JP, Edwards J, Johnson J, Cassem NH, Truog RD. Do-not-resuscitate order after 25 years. *Crit Care Med.* 2003; 31:1543–50. [PubMed: 12771631]
16. Guidelines for the appropriate use of do-not-resuscitate orders. *JAMA.* 1991; 265:1868–71. [PubMed: 2005737]
17. Le Guen M, Nicolas-Robin A, Carreira S, et al. Extracorporeal life support following out-of-hospital refractory cardiac arrest. *Crit Care.* 2011; 15:R29. [PubMed: 21244674]
18. Graf J, Muhlhoff C, Doig GS, et al. Health care costs, long-term survival, and quality of life following intensive care unit admission after cardiac arrest. *Crit Care.* 2008; 12:R92. [PubMed: 18638367]
19. Protection of human subjects; informed consent--FDA. Final rule. *Fed Regist.* 1996; 61:51498–533. [PubMed: 10161558]