Supplemental Online Content

Samsky MD, Morrow DA, Proudfoot AG, Hochman JS, Thiele H, Rao SV. Cardiogenic Shock After Acute Myocardial Infarction. *JAMA*. Published online November 9, 2021. doi:10.1001/jama.2021.18323

eFigure. Management of Cardiogenic Shock Associated With Acute Myocardial Infarction

This supplemental material has been provided by the authors to give readers additional information about their work.

SIZE OF TREATMENT EFFECT

		CLASS I Benefit >>> Risk Procedure/Treatment SHOULD be performed/ administered	CLASS IIa Benefit >> Risk Additional studies with focused objectives needed IT IS REASONABLE to per- form procedure/administer treatment	CLASS IIb Benefit ≥ Risk Additional studies with broad objectives needed; additional registry data would be helpful Procedure/Treatment MAY BE CONSIDERED	CLASS III No Benefit or CLASS III Harm Procedure/ Test Treatment COR III: Not No benefit No Proven Benefit COR III: Excess Cost W/o Benefit Harmful to Patients or Harmful
CERTAINTY (PRECISION) OF TREATMENT EFFECT	LEVEL A Multiple populations evaluated* Data derived from multiple randomized clinical trials or meta-analyses	 Recommendation that procedure or treatment is useful/effective Sufficient evidence from multiple randomized trials or meta-analyses 	 Recommendation in favor of treatment or procedure being useful/effective Some conflicting evidence from multiple randomized trials or meta-analyses 	 Recommendation's usefulness/efficacy less well established Greater conflicting evidence from multiple randomized trials or meta-analyses 	 Recommendation that procedure or treatment is not useful/effective and may be harmful Sufficient evidence from multiple randomized trials or meta-analyses
VINTY (PRECISION) O	LEVEL B Limited populations evaluated* Data derived from a single randomized trial or nonrandomized studies	 Recommendation that procedure or treatment is useful/effective Evidence from single randomized trial or nonrandomized studies 	 Recommendation in favor of treatment or procedure being useful/effective Some conflicting evidence from single randomized trial or nonrandomized studies 	 Recommendation's usefulness/efficacy less well established Greater conflicting evidence from single randomized trial or nonrandomized studies 	 Recommendation that procedure or treatment is not useful/effective and may be harmful Evidence from single randomized trial or nonrandomized studies
ESTIMATE OF CERTA	LEVEL C Very limited populations evaluated* Only consensus opinion of experts, case studies, or standard of care	 Recommendation that procedure or treatment is useful/effective Only expert opinion, case studies, or standard of care 	 Recommendation in favor of treatment or procedure being useful/effective Only diverging expert opinion, case studies, or standard of care 	 Recommendation's usefulness/efficacy less well established Only diverging expert opinion, case studies, or standard of care 	 Recommendation that procedure or treatment is not useful/effective and may be harmful Only expert opinion, case studies, or standard of care
	Suggested phrases for writing recommendations	should is recommended is indicated is useful/effective/beneficial	is reasonable can be useful/effective/beneficial is probably recommended or indicated	may/might be considered may/might be reasonable usefulness/effectiveness is unknown/unclear/uncertain or not well established	COR III: No Benefit is not recommended is not indicated should not be COR III: Harm potentially harmful causes harm associated with
	Comparative effectiveness phrases [†]	treatment/strategy A is recommended/indicated in preference to treatment B treatment A should be chosen over treatment B	treatment/strategy A is probably recommended/indicated in preference to treatment B it is reasonable to choose treatment A over treatment B		performed/ excess morbid- administered/ ity/mortality other should not be is not useful/ performed/ beneficial/ administered/ effective other