Appendix: Supplementary material [posted as supplied by author]

Figure A. Standardized differences for patients with known versus unknown defibrillation time

intervals

All absolute standardized differences were under 10%. The maximum difference was in time from CPA event to first shock (9.69%). The next largest differences were in initial cardiac arrest rhythm (9.5%). Most of the absolute differences were under 5%.

Propensity Modeling Analysis

We estimated the propensity to have a longer time interval between the first two defibrillation attempts using a binary logistic regression model. We used a non-parsimonious model that included 39 patient level covariates and a random effect for hospitals. The covariates included were: patient demographics (sex, race, age); patient pre-existing conditions (heart failure this admission, previous heart failure, myocardial infarction this admission, previous myocardial infarction, arrhythmia, hypotension, respiratory insufficiency, hepatic insufficiency, metabolic or electrolyte abnormality, diabetes mellitus, baseline depression in CNS function, acute stroke, pneumonia, septicemia, major trauma, metastatic cancer, renal insufficiency, none of the above); intervention already in place during defibrillation (assisted or mechanical ventilation, invasive airway device, chest tube, monitoring with an arterial line, vasodilator drugs, intravenous vasopressor medication, dialysis, intra-aortic balloon pump, pulmonary artery catheter); and characteristics of the arrest (illness category, initial cardiac arrest rhythm, event locations, witnessed, event time (day, night, weekend), hospital-wide response activated, assessed with AED), time from event to first shock, and calendar year. Due to variation across hospitals in the proportion of patients receiving defibrillation after longer time intervals, we compared 3 different propensity models for balancing covariates – a marginal model, fixed effect model, and random effect model.²⁰ The fixed effect model resulted in the best balance of all covariates and was selected for our analysis.

From the propensity score model, we calculated the stabilized inverse probability weight. Balance in the patient covariates was evaluated using standardized differences of the covariates between the long and short defibrillation interval groups (Figure B). After weighting, the standardized differences were much smaller. The maximum standardized difference after weighting was 7%, with the majority under 2.5%, much smaller than the commonly accepted adequate balance of 10% for absolute standardized difference.²¹ The outcome model included the main effect for the defibrillation time interval, weighted by the stabilized inverse probability weight. The sandwich estimator of the variance was used in estimating the standard error of the

estimated main effect, to account for clustering of patients within hospitals and for modified Poisson estimation of relative risk.

We conducted a survival analysis of time from in-hospital cardiac arrest to death, censored at discharge or 30 days (whichever came first). In this analysis, 120 patients were missing values for the time of the censoring event (death or discharge) and were excluded from the analysis. The adjusted Kaplan-Meier curves weighted on the inverse probability of treatment weights (IPTW) of the propensity score are shown below (Figure C; log-rank P=0.17). Using a Cox model with IPTW, we observed a hazard ratio of 1.07 (95% Confidence Interval $0.98, 1.17; P = 0.17$.

Figure B. Standardized differences of patient-level covariates before and after propensity weighting

Figure C. Temporal Trends in Defibrillation Intervals Categorized by Minute

Figure D. Proportion of Patients Excluded Over Time

Figure E. Adjusted Kaplan-Meier Curve

Table A. Specification of covariates used in multivariate analyses

