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A B S T R A C T

Aim: Survival rates after out-of-hospital-cardiac-arrest (OHCA) differ widely between EMS systems. Since hypertonic saline appears to improve long-term outcome after OHCA, some local EMS systems have included it in their treatment protocols for OHCA. Our first aim was to give a quality review of one of these protocols. Our second aim was to assess whether short-term survival improves when hypertonic saline is used in resuscitation after OHCA.

Methods: Matched pairs were identified for the independent “return of spontaneous circulation (ROSC) after cardiac arrest” (RACA) score variables and for use of ACD-CPR, adrenaline, and amiodarone from the German Resuscitation Registry (GRR) for January 2000 to March 2011. Patients received either 2 ml kg⁻¹ hypertonic saline with hydroxyethyl starch (7.2% NaCl with 6% hydroxyethyl starch 200,000/0.5, HyperHAES® (HHS)) infused intravenously within 10 min during CPR according to local treatment protocols or standard of care CPR (NON-HHS). The primary endpoint was admission to hospital rate (with spontaneous circulation); secondary endpoint was ROSC rate in relation to RACA score.

Results: 322 matched pairs were defined for 14 variables. Predicted ROSC-rate using RACA-score was similar in HHS (44.63%) and NON-HHS (43.63%; p = 0.440). In contrast, 190 (59.0%) HHS patients achieved ROSC compared with only 136 NON-HHS patients (42.2%; χ²: p < 0.0001). Short-term survival measured as rate of “admission to hospital with spontaneous circulation” was achieved in 169 HHS patients (52.5%) versus 108 NON-HHS patients (33.5%) (OR 2.19; 95%CI: 1.592–3.009; χ²: p < 0.0001).

Conclusion: Locally implemented treatment protocols using hypertonic saline/HES after OHCA are safe and effective. Also, we verified that short-term survival rates were better in patients receiving HHS.

© 2014 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ireland Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-SA license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/).
1. Introduction

Out-of-hospital-cardiac-arrest (OHCA) is a major problem in all industrialized countries with an incidence of more than 100 victims per 100,000 inhabitants per year. The incidence of treated OHCA is about 50 per 100,000 inhabitants per year but differs between emergency medical services (EMS) systems. The number of live patients admitted to hospital ranges from 5 to 30 per 100,000 inhabitants each year.\(^1,3-4\) These widely varying survival rates after OHCA between EMS systems\(^1,3-4\) could be improved by implementing high quality basic life support\(^5,6\), adrenaline\(^7,8\) or amiodarone\(^9,10\) during resuscitation and use of therapeutic hypothermia\(^11,12\), percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI)\(^13,14\) and standard operating procedures in the post-resuscitation phase.\(^15\)

High quality basic life support to reperfuse the heart is the first step for cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) success. It has to be emphasized, however, that myocardial blood flow (MBF) is limited even when thoracic compressions are optimized. Therefore pharmacological measures, which potentially will further increase MBF during CPR, are needed. One of these measures is the use of adrenaline. Two randomized clinical trials (RCTs) demonstrated that adrenaline alone\(^16\) or combined with other intravenous drugs\(^17\) significantly increases short-term survival after OHCA. Experimental studies have shown that adrenaline increases MBF during CPR by vasoconstriction.\(^18\) But other pathophysiological changes limiting reperfusion like endothelial cell swelling, perivascular oedema, rolling and sticking of leukocytes, and haemoconcentration\(^19,20\) are not addressed by adrenaline. Experimental studies demonstrated that pharmacological therapy using 2 ml kg\(^{-1}\) body weight hypertonic saline (7.2%) (HS) reduces these changes in several animal shock models.\(^21-24\) Such studies have also shown that treatment with HS after CA improves microcirculatory reperfusion of the brain and heart\(^22,25-28\) and short-term survival,\(^26-28\) reduces protein-S100 and troponin release after CPR,\(^29\) and improves neurological recovery after forebrain ischaemia.\(^30\)

Based on these findings we undertook a randomized clinical trial (RCT) using 2 ml kg\(^{-1}\) body weight HS/hydroxyethyl starch (HES) or HES alone during CPR after OHCA.\(^31,32\) In 200 patients, we failed to demonstrate that administration of HS improves admission to hospital or hospital discharge rate. But in contrast, more OHCA patients were discharged with good neurological recovery after pharmacological treatment with hypertonic saline/HES.\(^33-35\) Unfortunately, the relatively small number of 100 patients receiving hypertonic saline/HES limits the impact of this RCT.

EMS systems in Germany employ specially trained emergency physicians for Advanced Life Support (ALS). Based on experimental studies and our RCT,\(^32\) local treatment protocols for the use of hypertonic saline in OHCA treatment were developed first in the EMS systems of Bonn and Göppingen. According to these protocols, hypertonic saline with HES is given during CPR if the emergency physician prescribes this solution for an individual.

The first aim of the present study was to provide a quality review of the implemented local treatment protocol in Göppingen, which includes hypertonic saline/HES during CPR. Our second important aim was to assess whether short-term survival after OHCA is improved when hypertonic saline/HES is given. For this main objective we used a matched-pairs-analysis using data in the German Resuscitation Registry (GRR).\(^13,34\)

2. Methods

This is a retrospective case–control study performed in accordance with the Helsinki Declaration and was approved by the ethics committee of the regional medical board of registration (Landesärztekammer Baden-Württemberg 29.01.13).

Data for this study were taken from the GRR, which was developed by the “Deutsche Gesellschaft für Anästhesiologie und Intensivmedizin”. This registry covers 17 million inhabitants with more than 27,000 patients after OHCA and more than 550 patients receiving hypertonic saline/HES as a result of local treatment protocols. This registry is constructed in accordance with the Utstein style.\(^33,35\) Time of cardiac arrest (CA) – defined as the cessation of cardiac mechanical activity\(^35\) – is recorded in the database. If the beginning of CA is not witnessed, presumed time of CA is documented. If rescuers on the scene do not consider trauma, submersion, drug overdose, asphyxia or exsanguination as cause of CA, a cardiac aetiology is adopted.

The matched-pair analysis was approved by the scientific advisory board of the GRR (Ref no: GRR 01/2013). Subjects in the HHS group received 2 ml kg\(^{-1}\) estimated bodyweight of hypertonic saline with hydroxyethyl starch (HHS) (7.2% NaCl with 6% hydroxyethyl starch 200,000/0.5, Hyper HAES\(^8\), Fresenius KABI, 61346 Bad Homburg, Germany). This solution was infused intravenously in a 10-min interval during CPR before ROSC occurred. In patients found in VF/VT the solution was given after the first shocks failed and in patients with asystole/EMD hypertonic saline/HES was given after the first dose of i.v. epinephrine. Cases were excluded from the analysis if they met one or more of the following criteria:

- Age < 18 years
- Traumatic CA/exsanguination
- Incomplete dataset for matching criteria or outcome

Subjects in the NON-HHS group did not receive HHS. All patients were treated according to the European Resuscitation Guidelines 2000 or 2005 because the sample period spanned implementation times for both (January 2000 through March 2011). According to the above defined inclusion and exclusion criteria, 11,125 subjects were identified in the GRR (Fig. 1).

3. Emergency medical services (EMS) system of Göppingen and the locally implemented treatment protocol

A detailed description of the EMS system of Göppingen was given by Neukamm et al.\(^36\) The EMS system covers both urban and rural areas, serves 192,000 inhabitants, and has a service area of 354 km\(^2\). The first vehicle reached 77.9% of the patients within 8 min after alert. The BLS-D crew members are trained to perform thorax compressions using an “active compression decompression device” combined with an “impedance threshold device”.\(^37,38\)

Adrenaline, atropine and amiodarone were given according to the guidelines. HHS is infused intravenously in 10 min during CPR before ROSC if the emergency physician prescribes this solution for the individual. In patients found in VF/VT the solution was given after the first shocks failed and in patients with asystole/EMD hypertonic saline/HES was given after the first dose of i.v. epinephrine. The EMS system of Göppingen implemented this protocol in 2003 and has delivered CPR Data to the GRR since June 2006.

3.1. ROSC after CA (RACA) score

The RACA-score was developed to predict short-term survival after OHCA.\(^34\) It was defined using a multivariate logistic regression model, with “ever ROSC” as the short-term outcome variable. The probability of “ever ROSC” was calculated using the formula \(1/(1 + e^{-x})\), where \(x\) is the sum of the following independent factors that have a significant positive or negative impact on the probability of “ever ROSC”:

- Age > 80 years (-0.2);
3.2. Statistical analysis

Matched pairs were built first on the basis of the RACA-score variables (variables 1–11) and, second, on therapeutic measures having shown their impact on short term survival in RCTs (variables 12–14):

- asystole (−1.1) or pulseless electric activity (PEA; −0.8) as first rhythm;
- bystander CPR (+0.2);
- location of arrest at a medical institution (+0.5), doctor's office (+1.2), public place (+0.3), or nursing home (−0.3);
- male gender (−0.2);
- presumed aetiology of hypoxia (+0.7), intoxication (+0.5), or trauma (−0.6);
- time to the arrival of professionals (−0.04 per min); and
- witnessed by laypeople (+0.6) or by professionals (+0.5).

Fig. 1. Flowchart for extracting the 322 matched pairs out of 11,744 patients in the German Resuscitation Registry (within the study period from January 2000 to March 2011). The 322 patients of the HHS-group received CPR according to the ERC-guidelines and an infusion of 2 ml kg⁻¹ body weight of hypertonic saline with hydroxyethyl starch in a 10-min interval during CPR; the NON-HHS-group received standard treatment.
4. Results

Our first aim was to provide a quality review of the implemented local treatment protocol in Göppingen EMS system. This OHCA protocol combines the concepts of high quality CPR, adrenaline, and HHS during CPR. Using this approach it achieved remarkably high survival rates in 704 patients between June 2006 and March 2013. The CPR incidence reached 55.3 per 100,000 inhabitants per year. Adrenaline and HHS were given to 80.5% and 36.1% of the patients, respectively. ACD-ITV CPR was performed in only 37.5% due to delivery difficulties of the ITV devices during that period. For all 704 patients, the predicted ROSC rate was 39.4% using RACA-score, 2,3 but we achieved a significantly higher ROSC rate of 48.8% (CI 44.3–53.3%); the hospital admittance rate with spontaneous circulation reached 47.3%. Of the 704 patients, 15.8% were discharged from hospital. The hospital discharge rate for OHCA patients with CPC 1 and CPC 2 was remarkable 13.1%. In the subgroup of patients with VF/VT and cardiac aetiology we counted 153 patients. Of these patients 72.1% were admitted to hospital with spontaneous circulation, 35.1% could be discharged from hospital and 31.8% could be discharged with CPC 1 or 2.

For our second aim of assessing whether short-term survival after OHCA is improved when hypertonic saline/HES is given, our analysis included 644 patients, 322 matching pairs. There were not any statistical differences between the HHS-group and the NON-HHS-group within the 14 matching variables listed above (Table 1).

The median age of the patients was 67.81 ± 13.72 years in the HHS-group and 66.63 ± 15.54 years in the NON-HHS-group (p = 0.304). In both groups 72% of patients were male and 28% were female. Cardiac origin of arrest was presumed in 78.6% of both groups. Time until arrival on scene of the first team was similar with 4.78 ± 5.08 min in the HHS-group and 5.03 ± 5.19 min in the NON-HHS-group (p = 0.258). Collapse was witnessed in 60.6% of both groups. Location of arrest was “nursing home” in 3.4% and “public” or “doctor’s office” in 10.2% in both groups. First rhythm was shockable in 32.3% and bystander-CPR was performed in 30.1% of both groups.

No statistical differences were found between the HHS- and NON-HHS-groups in drug administration for drugs with known impact on short-term survival. Adrenaline was given to 95.3% of the patients in both groups with a mean dosage of 8.74 ± 5.75 mg in the HHS-group and 9.01 ± 6.50 mg in the NON-HHS-group (p = 0.587). Amiodarone was given to 35.4% of the patients of each group. When it was administered, the dosage in the groups was the comparable (HHS-group = 294.30 ± 91.39 mg; NON-HHS-group = 298.25 ± 95.92; p = 0.751).

For drugs without impact on short term survival the following results were found. Vasopressin was given to 15.2% of the patients in the HHS-group and 3.4% in the NON-HHS-group (p < 0.001), but the mean dosage was comparable when given (HHS-group = 40.41 ± 9.57 I.E.; NON-HHS-group = 34.64 ± 12.67 I.E.; p = 0.094). Atropine was given to 32.3% of the patients in both groups with similar dosages (HHS-group = 2.62 ± 0.81 mg; NON-HHS-group = 2.70 ± 1.53 mg; p = 0.612) (Table 2).

Only the HHS-group received hypertonic saline/HES. The mean volume administered in the HHS-group was 215.11 ± 48.17 ml. Colloids were administered in 5.3% and 7.1% of the patients in the HHS- and NON-HHS-groups, respectively (p = 0.327). The HHS-group received slightly higher volumes of colloids than the NON-HHS-group although the difference did not reach statistical significance (HHS-group = 500.35 ± 337.29 ml; NON-HHS-group = 331.30 ± 216.68 ml; p = 0.061).

Fig. 2. The predicted RACA-ROSC rate (%) is represented by the horizontal lines; achieved ROSC rate is shown by the diamonds (±confidence interval). Patients of the HHS-group received an infusion of 2 ml kg⁻¹ body weight of hypertonic saline with hydroxyethyl starch in a 10-min interval during CPR.

Fig. 3. (Top panel) ROSC rate (%) of HHS- and NON-HHS-group; n = 322 in each group. Patients of the HHS-group received an infusion of 2 ml kg⁻¹ body weight of hypertonic saline with hydroxyethyl starch in a 10-min interval during CPR. (Bottom panel) Admission to hospital with spontaneous circulation rate (%) of HHS- and NON-HHS-group; n = 322 in each group. Patients of the HHS-group received an infusion of 2 ml kg⁻¹ body weight of hypertonic saline with hydroxyethyl starch in a 10-min interval during CPR (admission-rate: HHS-group: 52.5%; NON-HHS-group: 33.5%; OR 2.19; CI 95% 1.592–3.009; χ²: p < 0.0001).
Crystalloids were administered in 83.9% and 80.4% of the patients in the HHS- and NON-HHS-group, respectively (p = 0.258). The HHS-group received slightly higher volumes of crystalloids than the NON-HHS-group (HHS-group = 718.36 ± 619.69 ml; NON-HHS-group = 603.11 ± 321.96 ml; p = 0.007).

4.1. CPR success rates

Predicted ROSC-rate calculated by RACA-score was not different between groups (HHS-group = 44.63%; NON-HHS-group = 43.63%; p = 0.440). The achieved ROSC rate in the NON-HHS-group was not different from predicted value (NON-HHS predicted = 43.63%; achieved = 42.2%, 95%CI: 36.8–47.6%). In contrast, HHS treatment significantly increased the achieved ROSC rate (HHS predicted = 44.63%; achieved = 59.0%, 95%CI: 53.6–64.4%) (Fig. 2).

In the HHS-group 190 patients achieved ROSC compared with only 136 patients in the NON-HHS group (achieved ROSC-rate: HHS-group = 59.0%; NON-HHS-group = 42.2%; OR 1.97; 95%CI: 1.439–2.693; χ²: p < 0.0001) (Fig. 3, top panel).

In addition the “admission to hospital rate” was significantly higher in the HHS-group. Admission to hospital with spontaneous circulation was achieved in 169 HHS patients and only 108 NON-HHS patients (HHS-group = 52.5%; NON-HHS-group = 33.5%; OR 2.19; 95%CI: 1.592–3.009; χ²: p < 0.0001) (Fig. 3, bottom panel).

For better understanding when and how hypertonic saline/HES solution in CPR might work, we analysed all subgroups – defined by the matching criteria – of the 644 patients our case-control study. These subgroups were drawn from the 322 pairs by excluding those pairs which did not fit to the subgroup criterion. For these subgroups we calculate RACA-ROSC rate, and rate of patients “admitted to hospital with spontaneous circulation” (Table 3 and Fig. 4). In all of these subgroups predicted ROSC-rate by RACA-score were comparable between patients receiving HHS or not, but in all subgroups “admission to hospital rate” were higher in patients receiving HHS. In terms of “hospital admission rate with spontaneous circulation”, these differences were significant for the following subgroups: gender female (YES, NO), age of patients > 80 years (YES, NO), cardiac origin (YES, NO), collapse witnessed (YES, NO), bystander-CPR performed (YES, NO), first ECG-rhythm shockable (YES, NO), time interval until arrival of first EMS vehicle ≤ 5 min and 6–10 min (YES, NO), time interval until arrival of first EMS vehicle ≥ 10 min (NO), ACD-CPR performed (NO), administration of adrenaline (YES), administration of amiodarone (YES, NO).

In conclusion the effect of HHS could be detected over all 644 patients and in all subgroups. But HHS might not be as effective if time interval until arrival of first EMS vehicle was too long (>11 min), location of arrest was “nursing home”, administration of adrenaline was not necessary and if ACD-CPR was performed.

5. Discussion

The present study demonstrated that the locally implemented treatment protocol in Göppingen using i.a. hypertonic saline/HES after OHCA is very effective, because achieved ROSC-rate is higher than predicted and 92 out of 704 patients survived with good neurological recovery. In Göppingen the rate of survivors with CPC1 + 2 reached 13.1% or 7.2 per 100,000 inhabitants per year. This survival rate is much more higher than recently reported from the “Resuscitation Outcome Consortium”, USA39,40 (survival: 6–8%, no incidence reported) and from Denmark (2010: 3.7 survivors per 100,000 inhabitants per year).41

Second, we verified that short-term survival rates were higher in patients listed in the GRR as receiving HHS. In fact, the matched-pairs analysis in 644 patients demonstrated that the administration of 2 ml kg⁻¹ body weight HHS during CPR significantly increased “hospital admittance rate with ROSC” from 33.5% to 52.5% although predicted ROSC-rate was similar in both groups. These results are consistent with previous experimental studies26,27 and, in
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**Table 1** Matching criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>HHS-group</th>
<th>NON-HHS-group</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex male (%)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age &gt;80 years (%)</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiac origin (%)</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collapse witnessed (%)</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bystander-CPR (%)</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First rhythm shockable (%)</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACD-CPR (%)</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location rest home of the elderly (%)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location public/doctor’s office (%)</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time interval from collapse ≤5 min (%)</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time interval from collapse 6–10 min (%)</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time interval from collapse &gt;10 min (%)</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment with amiodarone (%)</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>95.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment with adrenaline (%)</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p-Value calculated by χ²-test. Patients of the HHS-group received an infusion of 2 ml kg⁻¹ body weight of hypertonic saline with hydroxyethyl starch in a 10-min interval during CPR.
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**Table 2** Drugs administered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>HHS-group</th>
<th>NON-HHS-group</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adrenalin (mg)</td>
<td>8.87 ± 6.13</td>
<td>8.74 ± 5.75</td>
<td>9.01 ± 6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasopressin (U)</td>
<td>39.35 ± 10.33</td>
<td>40.41 ± 9.57</td>
<td>34.64 ± 12.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atropin (mg)</td>
<td>2.66 ± 1.22</td>
<td>2.62 ± 0.81</td>
<td>2.70 ± 1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrombolysis (mg)</td>
<td>3997.50 ± 4073.54</td>
<td>3358.13 ± 4047.73</td>
<td>4353.32 ± 4124.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodium bicarbonate (ml)</td>
<td>99.25 ± 86.02</td>
<td>87.86 ± 42.08</td>
<td>113.25 ± 118.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amiodarone (mg)</td>
<td>296.27 ± 93.50</td>
<td>294.30 ± 91.39</td>
<td>298.25 ± 95.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lidocain (mg)</td>
<td>108.33 ± 28.87</td>
<td>100.00 ± 0</td>
<td>114.29 ± 37.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHS (ml)</td>
<td>215.11 ± 48.17</td>
<td>Not used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean ± standard deviation; p-value calculated by t-tests. Patients of the HHS-group received an infusion of 2 ml kg⁻¹ body weight of hypertonic saline with hydroxyethyl starch in a 10-min interval during CPR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup analysis</th>
<th>Predicted ROCD score by RCHA score</th>
<th>Rate of hospital admission with spontaneous circulation (%)</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Non-HIS group</th>
<th>HIS</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Non-HHS group</th>
<th>HIS</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.53</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>46.53</td>
<td>45.46</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>45.56</td>
<td>45.41</td>
<td>0.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.27</td>
<td>0.459</td>
<td>46.27</td>
<td>45.24</td>
<td>0.459</td>
<td>45.30</td>
<td>45.20</td>
<td>0.459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.91</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>46.91</td>
<td>45.68</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>45.94</td>
<td>45.69</td>
<td>0.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age &lt; 80 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.94</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>46.94</td>
<td>45.70</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>45.97</td>
<td>45.71</td>
<td>0.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.53</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>46.53</td>
<td>45.46</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>45.56</td>
<td>45.41</td>
<td>0.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age &gt; 80 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.56</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>46.56</td>
<td>45.44</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>45.59</td>
<td>45.43</td>
<td>0.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.53</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>46.53</td>
<td>45.46</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>45.56</td>
<td>45.41</td>
<td>0.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI &lt; 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.77</td>
<td>0.457</td>
<td>46.77</td>
<td>45.60</td>
<td>0.457</td>
<td>45.80</td>
<td>45.63</td>
<td>0.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.53</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>46.53</td>
<td>45.46</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>45.56</td>
<td>45.41</td>
<td>0.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI &gt; 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.40</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>46.40</td>
<td>45.24</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>45.43</td>
<td>45.20</td>
<td>0.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46.65</td>
<td>0.459</td>
<td>47.65</td>
<td>46.45</td>
<td>0.459</td>
<td>46.70</td>
<td>46.49</td>
<td>0.459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time interval until arrival of first EMS = 11 min - Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.92</td>
<td>0.452</td>
<td>46.92</td>
<td>45.71</td>
<td>0.452</td>
<td>45.97</td>
<td>45.71</td>
<td>0.452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time interval until arrival of first EMS &gt; 11 min - No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46.56</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>47.56</td>
<td>46.44</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>46.59</td>
<td>46.43</td>
<td>0.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of arrest: public doctor’s office - Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.80</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>46.80</td>
<td>45.63</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>45.83</td>
<td>45.64</td>
<td>0.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of arrest: hospital - No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.53</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>46.53</td>
<td>45.41</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>45.56</td>
<td>45.41</td>
<td>0.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First ECG rhythm: shockable - Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.14</td>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>46.14</td>
<td>45.46</td>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>45.17</td>
<td>45.46</td>
<td>0.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First ECG rhythm: nonshockable - No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.91</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>46.91</td>
<td>45.71</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>45.97</td>
<td>45.71</td>
<td>0.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collapsed witnessed - Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.80</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>46.80</td>
<td>45.63</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>45.83</td>
<td>45.64</td>
<td>0.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collapsed witnessed - No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.53</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>46.53</td>
<td>45.41</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>45.56</td>
<td>45.41</td>
<td>0.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By-stander-CPR performed - Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.91</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>46.91</td>
<td>45.71</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>45.97</td>
<td>45.71</td>
<td>0.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By-stander-CPR performed - No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.53</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>46.53</td>
<td>45.41</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>45.56</td>
<td>45.41</td>
<td>0.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiac origin: YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.53</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>46.53</td>
<td>45.41</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>45.56</td>
<td>45.41</td>
<td>0.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiac origin: NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.40</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>46.40</td>
<td>45.24</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>45.43</td>
<td>45.20</td>
<td>0.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time interval until arrival of first EMS vehicle &gt; 5 min - NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.91</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>46.91</td>
<td>45.71</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>45.97</td>
<td>45.71</td>
<td>0.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time interval until arrival of first EMS vehicle ≤ 5 min - Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.53</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>46.53</td>
<td>45.41</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>45.56</td>
<td>45.41</td>
<td>0.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of arrest: “nursing home” - NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.91</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>46.91</td>
<td>45.71</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>45.97</td>
<td>45.71</td>
<td>0.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of arrest: “nursing home” - YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.53</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>46.53</td>
<td>45.41</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>45.56</td>
<td>45.41</td>
<td>0.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First public doctor’s call - YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.53</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>46.53</td>
<td>45.41</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>45.56</td>
<td>45.41</td>
<td>0.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First public doctor’s call - NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.40</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>46.40</td>
<td>45.24</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>45.43</td>
<td>45.20</td>
<td>0.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of patients ≤ 80 years - YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.91</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>46.91</td>
<td>45.71</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>45.97</td>
<td>45.71</td>
<td>0.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of patients &gt; 80 years - NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.53</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>46.53</td>
<td>45.41</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>45.56</td>
<td>45.41</td>
<td>0.463</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p-value calculated by Chi square test or t-test. Patients of the HIS group received an infusion of 2 mg/kg - body weight of hypertonic saline with hydrocortisone, stach in a 10-min interval during CPR.
part, with our RCT,31,32 which demonstrated an improvement in neurological outcome at discharge from hospital. In that RCT administration of HHS increased the number of patients with “good cerebral performance or only moderate cerebral disability at discharge” from 5% to 13% ($\chi^2$: $p < 0.05$; OR 2.9; 95%CI: 1.004–8.5).32

While the current study did not address any mechanisms that might be involved in the improved short-term survival after HHS treatment in OHCA patients, results from previous studies offer possible explanations. In experimental studies22,26–28,42 and in the RCT32 HHS application during CPR led to an increase of serum sodium concentration; this osmotic gradient was shown to reduce endothelial cell swelling and increase capillary diameter in shock models, caused by a fluid shift from intracellular to intravascular space.26 Also, in several experimental studies of CA using different techniques to assess organ blood flow, the administration of hypertonic saline improved myocardial and cerebral blood flow during CPR.22,25–28 In these studies it was demonstrated that improved myocardial reperfusion increases short term survival.26–28 A final possibility is that, the better neurological recovery with application of hypertonic saline after CA and forebrain ischaemia30,32 could be the result of a reduced no-reflow-phenomenon22,43 and an increased reperfusion of the brain in the first hours after CPR25,28,42 as was indicated by a reduced protein-S100 release after CPR.29

The application of 2 ml kg$^{-1}$ body weight HHS increases serum sodium level for a short period.32 This leads to fluid shift from the endothelium and the perivascular cells to the intravascular compartment and improves microcirculatory blood flow. However, administration of hypertonic saline/HES during CPR does not cause a pronounced volume expansion and haemodilution32 so this could not be the key mechanism of improved short-term survival with small volume resuscitation during CPR.

A higher dosage of 4 ml kg$^{-1}$ body weight – that is recommended for haemorrhagic shock – was not more effective than 2 ml kg$^{-1}$ body weight after experimental CA.26 We therefore recommend 2 ml kg$^{-1}$ body weight hypertonic saline/HES for treatment of OHCA.

Emergency physicians in Germany are well trained i.a. in endotracheal intubation and establishing i.v. access. In the current study, hypertonic saline/HES was administered early in the CPR algorithm during chest compressions, a short time after establishing an i.v. access. This was also the situation in our earlier RCT pertaining to the Bonn EMS system; infusion of hypertonic saline/HES was started 14.8 ± 6.9 min after collapse and ALS-measures began 12.0 ± 6.6 min after collapse.32

In the presented data adrenaline was given to 95.3% of both the HHS and NON-HHS groups in a mean dosage of 8.87 mg. Adrenaline administration has been shown to increase short-term survival in previous RCTs. In the study by Olasveengen et al. “hospital admission rate” after OHCA significantly increased from 20.6% to 31.8% (OR 1.8; 95%CI: 1.322–2.462) in patients receiving intravenously administered drugs, mainly adrenaline. Jacobs et al.8 demonstrated that adrenaline administered during CPR significantly increases hospital admittance rate from 13.0% to 25.4% (OR 2.3; 95%CI: 1.4–3.6). In the current matched pairs analysis we reported that including the administration of HHS during CPR to subjects already receiving adrenaline significantly increased hospital admittance rate from 33.5% to 52.5% ($\chi^2$: $p < 0.0001$; OR 2.19; 95%CI: 1.592–3.009). Looking at these data, one is tempted to conclude that adrenaline and hypertonic saline/HES have an additive positive impact on short-term survival after OHCA. Further studies need to be completed before such a conclusion can be made, however. In addition, we must highlight that pharmacological treatment with adrenaline and – most likely – hypertonic saline/HES is only effective when “basic life support” is performed at a high level of quality.24
Negative side effects of small volume resuscitation after CA of cardiac origin were not observed and seem unlikely since we saw a higher admission rate in the current matched pairs study and the higher survival rates with good neurological recovery after hypertonic saline/HES in our previous RCT. In fact some clinical studies demonstrate that the infusion of even a large volume of cold saline solution (up to 30 ml kg⁻¹ body weight) for the induction of hypothermia after CPR is safe and feasible suggesting that small volume resuscitation has a negligible effect. Nevertheless, safety aspects of the administration of hypertonic saline/HES after CPR from OHCA should be closely followed.

5.1. Limitations

First, this is a case–control study and not a randomized clinical trial. We therefore cannot exclude that influencing factors which are not documented in the GRR or we did not know will have influenced the results. But the method we used – a matched pairs study based on the RACA-score – will have minimize the risk of an important selection bias. This argument is supported by our finding, that the predicted ROSC rate – calculated by the RACA score – did not differ significantly between the two groups (HHS-group = 44.63%; NON-HHS-group = 43.63%, p = 0.440).

Second, the patients of both groups were matched using all influencing factors that were quantified in the logistic regression analysis for the definition of the RACA-score. In addition, the patients were matched for those therapeutic measures with statistically significant impact on short-term survival, i.e., ACD-CPR, adrenaline and amiodarone. However, in Germany the measurement of CPR quality after OHCA is not routinely used. For that reason, it is possible that patients receiving HHS get better CPR than patients in the NON-HHS group. To avoid this influence we matched our patients for the use of ACD-CPR, which was equally distributed to both groups and therefore ACD-CPR cannot explain the better survival rates in the HHS-group.

Third, due to our long review period, patients were resuscitated according to two different guidelines (2000 and 2005). The number of patients within the time periods was equally distributed in both groups and recent studies showed no difference in outcome if patients were treated according to different guidelines. But due to the fact, that our sample period ended in March 2011 we do not know the effect of hypertonic saline/HES infusion during CPR when the 2010 ERC guidelines were implemented.

Fourth, rate of vasopressin application and amount of crystalloid infusion differed between the HHS and NON-HHS group significantly. However, since neither vasopressin nor crystalloid infusion influence short-term survival, it is unlikely that this affected our results.

5.2. Conclusions

In conclusion, our method of a “matched pairs analysis” of subjects retrieved from the GRR controlled most of the obviously known predictors of outcome after CPR. For this reason ROSC-rate predicted by the RACA-score did not differ between the HHS- and NON-HHS-group. Our study clearly demonstrated that patients receiving hypertonic saline/HES while being resuscitated achieved significantly higher “ROSC” and “hospital admission rates” compared with those being resuscitated conventionally. To the best of our knowledge the administration of hypertonic saline/HES during CPR is an easy, feasible, and safe measure to improve short-term survival after CA of non-traumatic aetiology. It could be a new pharmacological approach to improve microcirculatory reperfusion of the heart and brain during CPR. Further clinical trials are recommended to verify the effect of this measure on long-term survival

with good neurological recovery as demonstrated in the RCT by Breil et al. in 2012.
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