

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. Instead of resuming CCO-CPR with ACO-CPR-induced ventilations to support circulation after defibrillation, it can be further postulated that continuous ACO-CPR would be a more effective method of cardiac assist. Rhythmic abdominal compressions alone, which was termed abdominal counterpulsation, was originally developed as a method of cardiac assist to support circulation after successful resuscitation until the patient could be put on a balloon pump [14-15].

Eric M. Rottenberg, AAS

2060 North High Street. Apt 119, Columbus, Ohio, 43201, United States E-mail address: rottenberg.1@osu.edu.

1 May 2017

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajem.2017.06.002

References

- Baumberg I, et al. The timing of chest compressions and artificial ventilation: a reappraisal. Am J Emerg Med 2017. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajem.2017.04.018.
- [2] Pargett M, Geddes LA, Otlewski MP, Rundell AE, Rhythmic abdominal compression CPR ventilates without supplemental breaths and provides effective blood circulation. Resuscitation 2008;79:460–7.
- [3] Kammeyer RM, Pargett MS, Rundell AE. Comparison of CPR outcome predictors between rhythmic abdominal compression and continuous chest compression CPR techniques. Emerg Med J 2014;31:394–400.
- [4] Rottenberg EM, Heard J, Hamlin R, Sun BC, Awad H. Abdominal only CPR during cardiac arrest for a patient with an LVAD during resternotomy: a case report. J Cardiothorac Surg 2011;6:91.
- [5] Xanthos T, Bassiakou E, Dontas I, Pantazopoulos I, Lelovas P, Kouskouni E, et al. Abdominal compressions do not achieve similar survival rates compared with chest compressions: an experimental study. Am J Emerg Med 2011;29:665–9.
- [6] Geddes LA, Rundell A, Lottes A, Kemeny A, Otlewski M. A new cardiopulmonary resuscitation method using only rhythmic abdominal compression: a preliminary report. Am J Emerg Med 2007;25:786–90.
- [7] Babbs CF. Biophysics of cardiopulmonary resuscitation with periodic z-axis acceleration or abdominal compression at aortic resonant frequencies. Resuscitation 2006; 69:455–69.
- [8] Rottenberg EM. Two-thirds receive no bystander cardiopulmonary resuscitation: could head rotation be the solution? Am J Emerg Med 2016;3410:2011–3.
- [9] Safiruddin F, Koutsourelakis I, de Vries N. Analysis of the influence of head rotation during drug-induced sleep endoscopy in obstructive sleep apnea. Laryngoscope 2014;124:2195–9.
- [10] Brady W, Berlat JA. Hands-on defibrillation during active chest compressions: eliminating another interruption. Am J Emerg Med 2016;3411:2172–6.
- [11] Li Y, Yu T, Ristagno G, Chung SP, Bisera J, Quan W, et al. The optimal phasic relationship between synchronized shock and mechanical chest compressions. Resuscitation 2010;816:724–9.
- [12] Sirna SJ, Ferguson DW, Charbonnier F, Kerber RE. Factors affecting transthoracic impedance during electrical cardioversion. Am J Cardiol 1988;6216:1048–52.
- [13] Chamberlain D, Frenneaux M, Steen S, Smith A. Why do chest compressions aid delayed defibrillation? Resuscitation 2008;771:10–5.
- [14] Coletti RH, Kaskel PS, Bregman D. Abdominal counterpulsation: effects on canine coronary and carotid blood flow. Circulation 1983;68(3 Pt. 2):II226–31.
- [15] Coletti RH, Kaskel PS, Cohen SR, Bregman D. Abdominal counterpulsation (AC)—a new concept in circulatory assistance. Trans Am Soc Artif Intern Organs 1982;28:563–6.

Are height and weight estimates in ED patients reliable for setting the ventilator?



Dear Editor,

We congratulate Goyal et al. with their recent paper on the association between body mass index (BMI) and inappropriately sized tidal volumes in adult intubated and ventilated emergency department (ED) patients [1]. A staggering 20% of patients received ventilation with inappropriately large tidal volumes, and after adjusting for age and gender, patients in all three obesity categories had higher odds of receiving inappropriately large tidal volumes compared with patients with a normal BMI.

Goyal et al. chose to call a tidal volume 'appropriate' when it did not exceed 10 cm³/kg ideal body weight (IBW). Given that a tidal volume of 8 cm³/kg IBW is currently seen as 'protective' in patients with non-injured lungs, we suggest the authors recalculating the percentages and odds using this cutoff value. In doing so, the authors allow better comparisons with ventilation practices in operation rooms [2] and in

intensive care units [3]. As we are uncertain whether using a too large tidal volume also translates into a higher incidence of acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) in ED patients, the authors could also report the incidence of ARDS in their cohort as well.

One essential comment is that one should be careful calculating IBW based on estimated height and weight values. As this was a retrospective study, we assume that height and weight were not collected as precisely as it would have been done in a prospective study –usually these values are more 'guesstimates', and we recently showed that using 'guesstimates' results in inappropriate calculations of the IBW. Of note, this challenge is particularly important for extreme values, namely in underweight and overweight patients [4].

Despite all these comments, we very much applaud increasing interest in the way mechanical ventilators are set in the ED [5,6], were peculiar working conditions and the acuteness of illness could bring the clinician to be less cautious in setting the ventilator and to focus more on other, more stringent, tasks. More studies are warranted to understand the potential role of protective ventilation in this setting.

Sabrine N.T. Hemmes

Department of Anesthesiology, Academic Medical Center, Amsterdam, The Netherlands Department of Intensive Care, Academic Medical Center, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Lorenzo Ball

Department of Surgical Sciences and Integrated Diagnostics, University of Genoa, Genoa, Italy

Ary Serpa Neto Dept. of Intensive Care Medicine, Hospital Israelita Albert Einstein, São Paulo, Brazil

Marcelo Gama de Abreu

Pulmonary Engineering Group, Department of Anesthesiology and Intensive Care Medicine, University Hospital Carl Gustav Carus, Dresden, Germany

Pulmonary Engineering Group, Department of Anesthesiology and Intensive Care Medicine, Technische Universität Dresden, Dresden, Germany

Paolo Pelosi

Department of Surgical Sciences and Integrated Diagnostics, University of Genoa, Genoa, Italy

Marcus J. Schultz

Department of Intensive Care, Academic Medical Center, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Mahidol–Oxford Research Unit (MORU), Faculty of Tropical Medicine, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand

Corresponding author at: Mahidol–Oxford Research Unit (MORU), Faculty of Tropical Medicine, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand. E-mail address: m.j.schultz@amc.uva.nl.

24 April 2017

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajem.2017.06.003

References

- [1] Goyal M, Bhat R, Graf SK, Dubin JS, Bhooshan A, Tefera E, et al. Body mass index is associated with inappropriate tidal volumes in adults intubated in the ED. Am J Emerg Med 2016;34:1682–3.
- [2] Jaber S, Coisel Y, Chanques G, Futier E, Constantin JM, Michelet P, et al. A multicentre observational study of intra-operative ventilatory management during general anaesthesia: tidal volumes and relation to body weight. Anaesthesia 2012;67:999–1008.
- [3] Neto AS, Barbas CS, Simonis FD, Artigas-Raventos A, Canet J, Determann RM, et al. Epidemiological characteristics, practice of ventilation, and clinical outcome in patients at risk of acute respiratory distress syndrome in intensive care units from 16 countries

(PROVENT): an international, multicentre, prospective study. Lancet Respir Med 2016;4:882–93.

- [4] Determann RM, Wolthuis EK, Spronk PE, Kuiper MA, Korevaar JC, Vroom MB, et al. Reliability of height and weight estimates in patients acutely admitted to intensive care units. Crit Care Nurse 2007;27:48–55 [quiz 56].
- [5] Fuller BM, Mohr NM. Limiting acute respiratory distress syndrome in the emergency department: a survey of US academic emergency medicine physicians. Eur J Emerg Med 2014;21:387–8.
- [6] Fuller BM, Mohr NM, Hotchkiss RS, Kollef MH. Reducing the burden of acute respiratory distress syndrome: the case for early intervention and the potential role of the emergency department. Shock 2014;41:378–87.

Body mass index is associated with inappropriate tidal volumes in adults intubated in the emergency department *,**,***



Thank you for the opportunity to re-evaluate our work and offer our commentary. Defining an "appropriate" tidal volume (TV) was challenging because of the paucity of existing data. We chose 10 cm³/kg IBW based on a recent meta-analysis by Neto and colleagues where the authors demonstrated that larger TVs were associated with worse clinical outcomes when compared to smaller TVs in patients without acute respiratory distress syndrome [1]. Of the 20 included studies, the most common TV in the conventional, or larger, TV group was 10 ml/kg (9 of 20 studies). The mean conventional TV was 10.6 ml/kg.

Despite our choice to use $10 \text{ cm}^3/\text{kg}$ IBW, we agree with the notion that $8 \text{ cm}^3/\text{kg}$ IBW may be more appropriate and, therefore, re-calculated adjusted odds ratios (Table 1) as well as overall rate of inappropriate ventilator settings. With the revised definition, the overall rate of inappropriately high set TV was 63.4% (95% CI 59.0%, 67.5%). This suggests that nearly $\frac{2}{3}$ of the patients intubated in our department during the study period were ventilated with an inappropriately high tidal volume.

We agree that reporting the incidence of ARDS is an important clinical outcome; however, our database does not include datapoints required to diagnose ARDS. Similarly, as you mentioned given the retrospective design, height and weight were taken from the electronic medical record (EMR) or driver's license (if not recorded in the EMR). When possible, patients at our hospital have their height and weight measured. There is no documentation in the EMR whether the recorded values are estimates or measurements.

Table 1

Logistic regression of the categorical outcome variable "inappropriate tidal volume $>8~{\rm cm}^3/{\rm kg}$ " on BMI categories, after adjusting for potential confounding factors age and gender.

Odds of receiving inappropriate tidal volume	
Comparison	Odds ratio (95% CI)
Underweight vs normal	0.44(0.18, 1.10)
Overweight vs normal	1.64(0.99, 2.70)
Class I obesity vs normal	2.37(1.23, 4.57)
Class II obesity vs normal	1.84(0.81, 4.21)
Class III obesity vs normal	12.7(2.82, 57.12)

☆ The data were presented at the Society for Academic Emergency Medicine Annual Meeting on May 17, 2013 in Atlanta, GA.

☆☆ This work was supported by a Graduate Medical Education Grant from MedStar Washington Hospital Center.

Munish Goyal, MD Department of Emergency Medicine, MedStar Washington Hospital Center, Washington, DC, United States Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, Department of Internal Medicine, MedStar Washington Hospital Center, Washington, DC, United States Department of Emergency Medicine, Georgetown University School of Medicine, Washington, DC, United States

Jeffrey S. Dubin, MD, MBA William J. Frohna, MD Department of Emergency Medicine, MedStar Washington Hospital Center, Washington, DC, United States Department of Emergency Medicine, Georgetown University School of Medicine, Washington, DC, United States *Corresponding author at: Department of Emergency Medicine, MedStar Washington Hospital Center, 110 Irving St NW, 20010 Washington, DC, United States. E-mail address: rahul.g.bhat@medstar.net (R. Bhat).

Shannon K. Graf, MD, MS Department of Emergency Medicine, MedStar Union Memorial Hospital, Baltimore, MD, United States

Anu Bhooshan, MD Department of Emergency Medicine, MedStar Washington Hospital Center, Washington, DC, United States

Eshetu Tefera, MS Department of Biostatistics and Bioinformatics, MedStar Health Research Institute, Hyattsville, MD, United States

29 May 2017

Rahul Bhat, MD*

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajem.2017.06.005

Reference

 Neto Ary Serpa, et al. Association between use of lung-protective ventilation with lower tidal volumes and clinical outcomes among patients without acute respiratory distress syndrome: a meta-analysis. JAMA 2012;308(16):1651–9.

Medication errors with push dose pressors in the emergency department and intensive care units *,*



Dear Reader,

Utilization of push dose pressors (PDP, low doses of phenylephrine or epinephrine administered IV push) during care of emergency medicine (EM) patients is increasingly popular in EM free open access medical education (FOAMed) [1,2] with resultant increased use in emergency department (ED) and intensive care unit (ICU) settings for peri-/post-intubation hypotension [3]. Due to prominence of this topic in FOAMed, indications are expanding to include bridge to continuous infusion vasopressors, medication related hypotension during procedural sedation and anaphylaxis.

This indication creep has potential detrimental effects, which are rarely discussed. Concerns we have identified are:

^{***} In accordance with ICJME guidelines, the authors report no conflicts of interest. **** MG and RB conceived the study, designed the trial and provided data monitoring and oversight. AB led data extraction and managed the data. SKG obtained research funding, provided statistical advice, and drafted the manuscript. ET analyzed the data. MG and RB performed substantial revisions. All authors subsequently contributed substantially to its revision. MG takes responsibility for the paper as a whole.

[☆] Source of support: None.

^{**} Prior presentations: None.