

1 **Title:** Influence of Incorrect Documentation of Initial Cardiac Rhythm in Survivors of Out of
2 Hospital Cardiac Arrest

3
4 **Authors and Affiliations:** Sant Kumar, MD^a; Max Hockstein, MD^b; Alexander I. Papolos^{bc};
5 Mithun Devraj, MD^d; Nauman Khalid, MD^e; Michael J. Lipinski, MD, PhD^f; Benjamin B.
6 Kenigsberg^{bc}

7
8 ^aMedStar Georgetown University Hospital, Washington, DC; ^bDepartment of Critical Care,
9 MedStar Washington Hospital Center, Washington, DC; ^cDivision of Cardiology, MedStar
10 Washington Hospital Center, Washington, DC; ^dThe George Washington University Heart &
11 Vascular Institute, Washington, DC; ^eSt. Francis Medical Center, Monroe, LA ^fCardiovascular
12 Associates of Charlottesville, Charlottesville, VA

13
14 **Corresponding Author:**

15 Benjamin B. Kenigsberg, MD FACC
16 Department of Critical Care and Division of Cardiology
17 MedStar Washington Hospital Center
18 110 Irving Street NW, Washington, DC 20010
19 Benjamin.B.Kenigsberg@medstar.net

20
21 **Short Title:** Influence of Discordant Documentation on Catheterization

22
23 **Word Count:** 4306

24
25
26

27 **ABSTRACT**

28 **Background:** In-hospital management of out-of-hospital cardiac arrest (OHCA) is heavily
29 influenced by the initial rhythm (shockable vs. non-shockable). The prevalence of discordance
30 between initial rhythm determination reported by emergency medical services (EMS) versus
31 hospital teams is not well described. It is unclear whether such documentation discrepancies in
32 OHCA influence inpatient clinical care including subsequent left heart catheterization (LHC).
33 We hypothesized that discordance between EMS and hospital team documentation of OHCA
34 initial rhythm was common and associated with differences in LHC frequency.

35 **Methods:** This was a retrospective, single-center study. OHCA patients from the Cardiac Arrest
36 Registry to Enhance Survival (CARES) hospital database were linked by demographic and arrest
37 history to OHCA patients identified by inpatient hospital billing codes from 2009 to 2017.
38 Patients who expired within 24 hours of hospital presentation were excluded. Hospital
39 documentation of OHCA initial rhythm and occurrence of LHC were manually reviewed. The
40 relationship between EMS versus hospital team documentation of OHCA initial rhythm and
41 occurrence of LHC were assessed by relative risk ratios with 95% confidence intervals.

42 **Results:** Out of 164 patients for analysis, 140 (85.4%) had concordant EMS and hospital
43 documentation of OHCA initial rhythm. For OHCA with an EMS-documented shockable
44 rhythm, the relative risk of LHC when hospital-documented concordant shockable vs. discordant
45 non-shockable rhythm was 2.12 (95% RR CI: 0.76-5.93). For OHCA with an EMS-documented
46 non-shockable rhythm, the relative risk of LHC when hospital-documented concordant non-
47 shockable vs discordant shockable rhythm was 0.19 (95% CI: 0.05-0.69).

48 **Conclusions:** In patients with OHCA, discrepancy between EMS and hospital team
49 documentation of the initial arrest rhythm is prevalent. This discrepancy may influence the
50 incidence of LHC. Further research is needed to understand the clinical impact of discrepancies
51 in rhythm communication between EMS and hospital teams.

52

53 **Keywords:** Cardiac arrest; Shockable rhythm; Non-shockable rhythm; Catheterization

54

55

56 **Abbreviations:**

57 OHCA, Out of hospital cardiac arrest

58 CA, Coronary angiography

59 EMS, Emergency medical services

60 CARES, Cardiac Arrest Registry to Enhance Survival

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80 INTRODUCTION

81 Initial cardiac rhythm strongly influences outcome after out of hospital cardiac arrest
82 (OHCA). OHCA due to asystole or pulseless electrical activity, also referred to as non-shockable
83 rhythms, is associated with decreased survival. This is attributed, in part, to more frequent non-
84 cardiac etiologies to the arrest.[1],[2] Alternatively, OHCA due to ventricular tachycardia or
85 ventricular fibrillation, also referred to as shockable rhythms given the required intervention with
86 defibrillation, is associated with higher survival and a greater incidence of intervenable cardiac
87 arrest etiologies such as an acute coronary ischemia.[3] As a result, many patients who
88 experience OHCA, particularly from shockable rhythms, are referred for coronary
89 angiography.[3]

90 However, OHCA events occur in an unpredictable manner and in unpredictable locations,
91 and thus, direct assessment of the initial cardiac rhythm may be unavailable to the hospital-based
92 medical team.[4] Emergency medical services (EMS) are typically the first medical responders
93 to an OHCA and have directly assessed the initial cardiac rhythm, occasionally from an
94 automated external defibrillator (AED). The accuracy of communication of OHCA initial
95 rhythm from EMS to hospital teams is unknown. Additionally, it is also unknown whether
96 discrepancies in OHCA initial rhythm documentation between EMS and hospital records are
97 associated with different frequencies of coronary angiography.

98 The aim of this study was to assess the frequency of concordance and discordance
99 between EMS and hospital team documentation of initial cardiac rhythm in OHCA. We
100 additionally sought to characterize associated clinical management differences in the disparate
101 groups.

102

103 METHODS

104 Source of Data and Study Patients

105 This was a retrospective, single-center study in which we abstracted data from our
106 electronic health record using billing codes for cardiac arrest from March 2009 to March 2017.
107 Abstracted data included demographics, initial OHCA rhythm from admission documentation,
108 and incidence of invasive cardiac procedures (including left heart catheterization, right heart

109 catheterization and percutaneous coronary intervention). Right heart catheterization, or
110 pulmonary artery catheter placement, was to assess cardiogenic shock. Patients were then
111 associated with their entries in the Cardiac Arrest Registry to Enhance Survival (CARES)
112 registry based on age, date of presentation, and gender. The CARES registry is an online-based
113 data management system in which participating 911 centers, first responders, emergency medical
114 services (EMS) and hospitals enter local data to develop standard outcome measures for OHCA
115 and to improve quality of care. The CARES database lists six options for the initial rhythm
116 recorded by paramedics: "ventricular fibrillation," "ventricular tachycardia," "unknown
117 shockable rhythm," "asystole," "idioventricular/PEA," and "unknown unshockable rhythm." [5]
118 This determination by the paramedics was utilized to identify the EMS documented binary
119 shockable (ventricular fibrillation, ventricular tachycardia and unknown shockable rhythm) and
120 non-shockable (asystole, idioventricular/PEA and unknown unshockable rhythm) rhythm
121 cohorts. When a cross-referenced record was not clear based on basic demographic data alone,
122 available OHCA arrest details including location of the arrest were manually reviewed based on
123 date of OHCA. To ensure consistent admission documentation was available, patients who
124 expired within 24 hours of hospital presentation were excluded from analysis (**Figure 1**). When
125 the hospital team recorded that patients had both shockable and non-shockable rhythms, we
126 classified the initial rhythm as shockable. Additionally, the initial hospital ECG of each patient
127 was manually reviewed by a study physician for evidence of ischemia; however, the initial
128 rhythm strip from the arrest was not available for retrospective review and rhythm verification.

129 While our institutional practice has evolved over time with developing data, we generally
130 adhere to the current Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions (SCAI)
131 recommendations for managing patients with OHCA. [6] Specifically, our typical approach
132 involves immediate LHC with coronary angiography and primary percutaneous coronary
133 intervention (PCI) as indicated for patients with either intact neurological function or comatose
134 patients with favorable features for good neurological recovery, who have ST-segment elevation
135 myocardial infarction (STEMI) on their initial ECG or evident ischemia mediated cardiogenic
136 shock after the return of spontaneous circulation (ROSC). We consider LHC urgently for patients
137 with shockable initial OHCA rhythms and/or non-ST-segment elevation myocardial infarctions
138 (NSTEMI), although over time have generally prioritized awaiting neurological recovery before
139 proceeding with LHC. We consider LHC on a case-by-case basis in patients with OHCA and

140 non-shockable rhythms, considering post ROSC ECG, cardiac biomarkers, clinical status and
141 medical histories.[6] The study protocol was approved by the IRB at MedStar Washington
142 Hospital Center.

143 **Outcome Definitions**

144 *Concordant Documentation*

145 If hospital documentation of the initial cardiac rhythm in patients with OHCA matched
146 the rhythm documented by EMS, we defined this as “concordant.” For example, if a patient with
147 OHCA was noted to have a shockable rhythm (ventricular tachycardia, ventricular fibrillation or
148 unknown shockable rhythm) by EMS, and the hospital team noted the initial out of hospital
149 arrest rhythm to be shockable (e.g. ventricular tachycardia or ventricular fibrillation) in its
150 documentation as well, then we defined this as concordant documentation (**Figure 1**).

151 *Discordant Documentation*

152 If hospital documentation of the initial cardiac rhythm in patients with OHCA did not
153 match the rhythm documented by EMS, we defined this as “discordant.” For example, if a
154 patient with OHCA was noted to have an initial shockable rhythm by EMS, and the hospital
155 team noted the initial hospital rhythm to be non-shockable (e.g. asystole or pulseless electrical
156 activity), then we defined this as discordant documentation (**Figure 1**).

157 **Statistical Analysis**

158 Descriptive statistics included the comparison of baseline characteristics between patients
159 whose initial OHCA rhythm was documented by emergency medical services as shockable or
160 non-shockable and by the hospital team as shockable or non-shockable. For outcome analyses,
161 we examined concordance and discordance between EMS and in-hospital documentation of
162 initial OHCA rhythm and the subsequent association with cardiac procedure incidence by
163 calculating relative risk ratios. To investigate the impact of the initial ECG on hospital arrival,
164 we computed the relative risk ratios for patients who received left or right heart catheterization,
165 depending on whether they had ischemic changes on the hospital arrival ECG. We analyzed the
166 data for both concordant and discordant documentation. Data analyses were performed with the
167 use of RStudio version 4.2.1 (RStudio: Integrated Development for R. RStudio, PBC, Boston,
168 MA URL <http://www.rstudio.com/>).

169

170 **RESULTS**

171 **Baseline Characteristics**

172 Out of 1051 CARES patients, 798 (75.9%) were associated and cross-referenced with
173 hospital patient records. Within 24 hours of hospital arrival, 631 patients expired, leaving 167
174 patients for analysis. Of these 167 patients only 3 of these patients did not have hospital
175 documentation about the initial OHCA rhythm, leaving 164 for final analysis (20.6% of the
176 cross-referenced registry) for analysis (**Figure 1**). Baseline characteristics for these patients are
177 displayed in **Table 1**. These patients had a mean age of 62.7 years. Of these 164 patients, 73
178 (44.5%) were female and 123 (75.0%) were African American. The utilization of an automated
179 external defibrillator and a mechanical CPR support device as per EMS entry into the CARES
180 registry are listed in **Table 3**.

181 **Baseline Characteristics and Outcomes by Initially Documented EMS Rhythm**

182 Out of 164 patients included in our analysis, 46 (28.0%) patients' initial cardiac rhythm
183 was documented as shockable by EMS, while 118 (72.0%) patients' initial cardiac rhythm was
184 documented as non-shockable by EMS. Baseline characteristics for these patients are shown in
185 **Table 2**. Of those patients whose initial cardiac rhythm was documented as shockable by EMS,
186 21 (45.7%) patients underwent left heart catheterization, and 11 (23.9%) patients underwent right
187 heart catheterization. Of patients whose initial cardiac rhythm was documented as non-shockable
188 by EMS, 8 (6.8%) patients underwent left heart catheterization, and 4 (3.4%) patients underwent
189 right heart catheterization.

190 **Influence of Concordance and Discordance on Outcomes by Initially Documented EMS** 191 **Rhythm**

192 The initial cardiac rhythm of 34 (20.7% of total analysis cohort) patients was
193 concordantly documented as shockable by both EMS and the hospital team. However, for 12
194 (7.3% of total analysis cohort) patients, EMS documented the initial cardiac rhythm as
195 shockable, while the hospital team documented the initial cardiac rhythm as non-shockable
196 (**Table 1**). Thus, 26.1% of patients documented as having a shockable OHCA initial rhythm by

197 EMS were discordantly documented as having a non-shockable OHCA initial rhythm in the
198 inpatient documentation.

199 For patients whose initial cardiac rhythm was documented as shockable by EMS, the
200 relative risk of left heart catheterization was 2.12 (95% RR CI: 0.76-5.93) when comparing
201 hospital-documented shockable OHCA initial rhythm (i.e., “concordant”) versus hospital
202 documented non-shockable OHCA initial rhythm (i.e., “discordant”) (**Figure 1**). Similarly, the
203 relative risk of right heart catheterization was 1.59 (95% CI: 0.40-6.33) between the shockable
204 OHCA concordant and discordant groups. (**Table 4**).

205 The initial cardiac rhythm of 106 (64.6% of total analysis cohort) patients was
206 concordantly documented as non-shockable by both EMS and the hospital team. However, for 12
207 (7.3% of total analysis cohort) patients, EMS documented the initial cardiac rhythm as non-
208 shockable, while the hospital team documented the initial cardiac rhythm as shockable (**Table 1**).
209 Thus, 10.2% of patients documented as having a non-shockable OHCA initial rhythm by EMS
210 were discordantly documented as having a shockable OHCA initial rhythm in the inpatient
211 documentation.

212 For those patients whose initial cardiac rhythm was documented as non-shockable by
213 EMS, the relative risk of left heart catheterization was 0.19 (95% CI: 0.05-0.69) when comparing
214 hospital-documented non-shockable OHCA initial rhythm (i.e. “concordant”) and hospital
215 documented shockable OHCA initial rhythm (i.e. “discordant”) (**Figure 1**). The relative risk of
216 right heart catheterization was 0.34 (95% CI: 0.04-3.01) between the non-shockable OHCA
217 concordant and discordant groups (**Table 4**).

218 Finally, patients with ischemic changes on their arrival hospital ECG had a 2.48 (95% CI:
219 1.20-5.12) times higher risk of undergoing left heart catheterization compared to those without
220 such changes. These findings are summarized in **Table 5**.

221

222 **DISCUSSION**

223 To our knowledge, we report the first analysis of the frequency and potential impact of
224 discrepancies regarding the documentation of OHCA initial cardiac rhythm between EMS and
225 the hospital team. In our analysis, 14.6% of OHCA patients surviving at least 24 hours after

226 hospital presentation had discordance in the documentation of the initial cardiac arrest rhythm.
227 While the reasons for the documentation discrepancy cannot be determined from our analysis,
228 the presence of any communication gap between medical providers in the chain of survival may
229 affect patient management and represents an opportunity for future work. We identified a
230 potential association between initial cardiac rhythm discordance between EMS and hospital
231 documentation with the relative frequency of invasive cardiac procedures after OHCA. The
232 frequency of LHC was highest when there was agreement of a shockable rhythm and lowest
233 when there was agreement of a non-shockable rhythm (52.9% and 4.7%, respectively). The
234 frequency of LHC when there was hospital discordance in rhythm determination in cases of EMS
235 determined shockable and non-shockable rhythm was numerically intermediate (25% and 25%,
236 respectively) between the concordant results. In our primary analysis, these differences were
237 only statistically significant for the EMS determined non-shockable rhythm patients. In both the
238 EMS shockable and non-shockable OHCA cohorts, hospital documentation of a shockable
239 OHCA initial rhythm was associated with a numerically higher relative risk of LHC. Such an
240 association is clinically plausible as the inpatient clinical management after OHCA often relies
241 on the initial cardiac rhythm.

242 Over the past several years survival rates for patients who experience OHCA have
243 improved.[7] This progress in OHCA survival is multifactorial, but may be attributed to a
244 combination of improvement in cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) quality, early recognition
245 of cardiac arrest, and the use of automated external defibrillators.[8],[9] Despite improvement in
246 outcomes for patients who sustain OHCA, mortality remains high especially those who are
247 reported to have non-shockable rhythms, with survival rates as low as 7%.[10],[11] Various
248 hypotheses have been proposed for the morbidity and mortality associated with OHCA.

249 There are important regional variations in outcomes for patients with OHCA, [12],[13]
250 in part attributed to care practice differences both during the pre-hospital and in-hospital phases
251 of management.[12] The rate of rhythm disagreement in our study (14.6%) was noticeably
252 higher compared to a population from the North Holland province of the Netherlands studied by
253 Homma et al (4%), likely predominantly due to regional differences in first responder and EMS
254 systems.[15], In the Homma et al study, EMS paramedics routinely send manual defibrillator
255 ECG tracings to the study centers or, instead, when an AED was used the study personnel
256 directly sent AED information to hospital teams if a shockable rhythm was detected.[16] This

257 alerted physicians in that study region to the importance of AED information for patient
258 outcomes in cases of OHCA. Neither of these robust data transmission practices exist for OHCA
259 response in the Washington D.C. metropolitan population we studied. Additionally, regarding
260 the pre-hospital setting, poorly economically resourced and more rural areas have been
261 associated with worse outcomes in patients with OHCA.[14]

262 Regarding the in-hospital management regional variation, decision to proceed with
263 coronary angiography is influenced by time from collapse to return of spontaneous circulation
264 (ROSC) and other such predictive features for neurological recovery at some centers and not
265 others.[6] Within medical centers, different specialists including anesthesiologists, cardiologists,
266 emergency physicians, and intensivists may coordinate care of these patients leading to
267 significant practice heterogeneity.[12] In addition to these factors, other areas of inconsistency
268 such as the accuracy of documentation need to be identified and improved to further enhance
269 outcomes.[17],[18] A solution to consider is electronically transferring the OHCA ECG directly
270 to the hospital, making the prehospital ECG available in the patient's electronic health records.
271 Our report showed that there is important variation in the initial cardiac rhythm documentation,
272 which emphasizes the need for accurate documentation and clear communication among
273 different medical providers.

274 Improvements in communication practices during the transition of care from EMS to
275 hospital teams, and among different hospital teams, is essential for better management of patients
276 with OHCA.

277

278 **LIMITATIONS**

279 There are numerous limitations to our study. Our cohort is both small and from a single
280 institution, limiting the external validity of our findings. While the relative risk of documentation
281 discrepancy on LHC incidence was significant for the EMS non-shockable rhythm cohort, the
282 relative risk was not significant for the EMS shockable rhythm cohort. This difference may be
283 due to small sample size given the wide confidence intervals in the smaller shockable rhythm
284 cohort. Additionally, we were unable to associate all local OHCA patients from the CARES
285 registry with hospital records using billing codes, and thus cannot exclude a significant impact of
286 selection bias in our analysis cohort. However, if we were to assume that all 253 unmatched

287 CARES registry patients either had concordant or discordant initial cardiac rhythm
288 documentation, respectively, and had a similar rate of initial survival after hospital presentation
289 (20.9%), the potential range for documentation concordance would be between 88.9% and 64.5%
290 instead of the 85.46% in our analysis. Despite such exclusions, the demonstrated discrepancies
291 suggest that discordance between EMS and hospital documentation remains prevalent. In
292 addition, while the presence versus absence of ischemic ECG changes on initial hospital arrival
293 ECG did associate with receiving left heart catheterization, the degree of the association was
294 similar to initial rhythm concordance versus discordance. Another important limitation of our
295 analysis is that we cannot independently verify the prehospital rhythm determination as pre-
296 hospital rhythm strips were unavailable for review in our electronic medical record. However,
297 available AED utilization data does support EMS documentation accuracy as only 1 (0.85%)
298 patient in the EMS-documented non-shockable rhythm group with an AED applied received
299 defibrillation and, similarly, all patients in the EMS-documented shockable rhythm group with
300 an AED applied received defibrillation (Table 3).

301 Lastly, we acknowledge that various communities have varying approaches to and
302 available resources for handling OHCA. Our study was conducted specifically focusing on
303 individuals in our local community who had ready access to coronary angiography as determined
304 to be clinically indicated.

305 **CONCLUSION**

306 Discrepancies between EMS and hospital documentation regarding initial rhythm in out
307 of hospital cardiac arrest is common. Such discrepancies may be associated with the relative risk
308 of performance of invasive cardiac procedures for patients after OHCA. Dedicated investigation
309 is required to understand how to improve both communication and documentation by medical
310 staff managing OHCA patients.

311

312

313

314

315 **Funding:** This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public,
316 commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

317

318 **Disclosures:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

319

320

321

322

323

324

325

326

327

328

329

330

331

332

333

334

335

336

337

338

339

340

341 **REFERENCES**

342

- 343 [1] T. Väyrynen, M. Kuisma, T. Määttä, and J. Boyd, “Medical futility in asystolic out-of-
344 hospital cardiac arrest,” *Acta Anaesthesiologica Scandinavica*, vol. 52, no. 1, pp. 81–87,
345 2008, doi: 10.1111/j.1399-6576.2007.01461.x.
- 346 [2] J. Engdahl, A. Bång, J. Lindqvist, and J. Herlitz, “Factors affecting short- and long-term
347 prognosis among 1069 patients with out-of-hospital cardiac arrest and pulseless electrical
348 activity,” *Resuscitation*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 17–25, Oct. 2001, doi: 10.1016/S0300-
349 9572(01)00377-X.
- 350 [3] S. Desch *et al.*, “Angiography after Out-of-Hospital Cardiac Arrest without ST-Segment
351 Elevation,” *New England Journal of Medicine*, vol. 0, no. 0, p. null, Aug. 2021, doi:
352 10.1056/NEJMoa2101909.
- 353 [4] K. B. Kern, “Optimal Treatment of Patients Surviving Out-of-Hospital Cardiac Arrest,”
354 *JACC: Cardiovascular Interventions*, vol. 5, no. 6, pp. 597–605, Jun. 2012, doi:
355 10.1016/j.jcin.2012.01.017.
- 356 [5] B. McNally, A. Stokes, A. Crouch, and A. L. Kellermann, “CARES: Cardiac Arrest Registry
357 to Enhance Survival,” *Annals of Emergency Medicine*, vol. 54, no. 5, pp. 674–683.e2, Nov.
358 2009, doi: 10.1016/j.annemergmed.2009.03.018.
- 359 [6] A. Lotfi *et al.*, “SCAI expert consensus statement on out of hospital cardiac arrest,”
360 *Catheterization and Cardiovascular Interventions*, vol. 96, no. 4, pp. 844–861, 2020, doi:
361 10.1002/ccd.28990.
- 362 [7] S. Yan *et al.*, “The global survival rate among adult out-of-hospital cardiac arrest patients
363 who received cardiopulmonary resuscitation: a systematic review and meta-analysis,” *Crit
364 Care*, vol. 24, no. 1, p. 61, Feb. 2020, doi: 10.1186/s13054-020-2773-2.
- 365 [8] “Hüpfel: Chest-compression-only versus standard cardiopulm... - Google Scholar.”
366 [https://scholar.google.com/scholar_lookup?title=Chest-compression-
367 only%20versus%20standard%20cardiopulmonary%20resuscitation%3A%20a%20meta-
368 analysis&journal=Lancet&doi=10.1016%2FS0140-6736%2810%2961454-
369 7&volume=376&issue=9752&pages=1552-
370 1557&publication_year=2010&author=Hupfl%2CM&author=Selig%2CHF&author=Nagele
371 %20CP](https://scholar.google.com/scholar_lookup?title=Chest-compression-only%20versus%20standard%20cardiopulmonary%20resuscitation%3A%20a%20meta-analysis&journal=Lancet&doi=10.1016%2FS0140-6736%2810%2961454-7&volume=376&issue=9752&pages=1552-1557&publication_year=2010&author=Hupfl%2CM&author=Selig%2CHF&author=Nagele%20CP) (accessed Jan. 14, 2023).
- 372 [9] “Bystander Efforts and 1-Year Outcomes in Out-of-Hospital Cardiac Arrest | NEJM.”
373 <https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMoa1601891> (accessed Jan. 14, 2023).
- 374 [10] E. Andrew, Z. Nehme, M. Lijovic, S. Bernard, and K. Smith, “Outcomes following out-
375 of-hospital cardiac arrest with an initial cardiac rhythm of asystole or pulseless electrical
376 activity in Victoria, Australia,” *Resuscitation*, vol. 85, no. 11, pp. 1633–1639, Nov. 2014,
377 doi: 10.1016/j.resuscitation.2014.07.015.
- 378 [11] S. Saarinen, A. Kämäräinen, T. Silfvast, A. Yli-Hankala, and I. Virkkunen, “Pulseless
379 electrical activity and successful out-of-hospital resuscitation – long-term survival and
380 quality of life: an observational cohort study,” *Scand J Trauma Resusc Emerg Med*, vol. 20,
381 no. 1, p. 74, Oct. 2012, doi: 10.1186/1757-7241-20-74.

- 382 [12] A. Proclemer *et al.*, “Current practice in out-of-hospital cardiac arrest management: a
383 european heart rhythm association EP network survey,” *EP Europace*, vol. 14, no. 8, pp.
384 1195–1198, Aug. 2012, doi: 10.1093/europace/eus232.
- 385 [13] D. Zive *et al.*, “Variation in out-of-hospital cardiac arrest resuscitation and transport
386 practices in the Resuscitation Outcomes Consortium: ROC Epistry–Cardiac Arrest,”
387 *Resuscitation*, vol. 82, no. 3, pp. 277–284, Mar. 2011, doi:
388 10.1016/j.resuscitation.2010.10.022.
- 389 [14] S. Masterson, C. Teljeur, J. Cullinan, A. W. Murphy, C. Deasy, and A. Vellinga, “Out-of-
390 hospital cardiac arrest in the home: Can area characteristics identify at-risk communities in
391 the Republic of Ireland?,” *International Journal of Health Geographics*, vol. 17, no. 1, p. 6,
392 Feb. 2018, doi: 10.1186/s12942-018-0126-z.
- 393 [15] P. C. M. Homma *et al.*, “Transfer of essential AED information to treating hospital
394 (TREAT),” *Resuscitation*, vol. 149, pp. 47–52, Apr. 2020, doi:
395 10.1016/j.resuscitation.2020.01.033.
- 396 [16] R. A. Waalewijn, R. de Vos, and R. W. Koster, “Out-of-hospital cardiac arrests in
397 Amsterdam and its surrounding areas: results from the Amsterdam resuscitation study
398 (ARREST) in Utstein style.,” *Resuscitation*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 157–167, Sep. 1998, doi:
399 10.1016/S0300-9572(98)00102-6.
- 400 [17] C. Hauw-Berlemont *et al.*, “Emergency vs Delayed Coronary Angiogram in Survivors of
401 Out-of-Hospital Cardiac Arrest: Results of the Randomized, Multicentric EMERGE Trial,”
402 *JAMA Cardiology*, vol. 7, no. 7, pp. 700–707, Jul. 2022, doi: 10.1001/jamacardio.2022.1416.
- 403 [18] K. B. Kern *et al.*, “Randomized Pilot Clinical Trial of Early Coronary Angiography
404 Versus No Early Coronary Angiography After Cardiac Arrest Without ST-Segment
405 Elevation: The PEARL Study,” *Circulation*, vol. 142, no. 21, pp. 2002–2012, Nov. 2020,
406 doi: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.120.049569.

407

408

409

410

411

412

413

414

415

416

417

418 **Table 1.** Baseline characteristics of overall cohort

| | Overall (N=164) | EMS Documented Shockable Rhythm Concordant with Hospital Documentation (N=34) | EMS Documented Shockable Rhythm Discordant with Hospital Documentation (N=12) | EMS Documented Non-Shockable Rhythm Concordant with Hospital Documentation (N=106) | EMS Documented Non-Shockable Rhythm Discordant with Hospital Documentation (N=12) |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Age, Mean (SD) | 62.7 (±15.4) | 61.3 (±15.1) | 61.3 (±15.2) | 62.3 (±15.4) | 64.1 (±15.1) |
| Gender, n (%) | | | | | |
| Female | 73 (44.5) | 13 (38.2) | 3 (25) | 50 (47.2) | 7 |
| Race/Ethnicity, n (%) | | | | | |
| Black/African American | 123 (75.0) | 24 (70.6) | 8 (66.7) | 78 (73.6) | 11 (91.7) |
| White | 10 (6.1) | 4 (11.8) | 1 (8.3) | 5 (4.7) | 1 (8.3) |
| Hispanic/Latino | 4 (2.4) | 1 (2.9) | 0 (0) | 3 (2.8) | 0 (0) |
| Asian | 4 (2.4) | 2 (5.9) | 0 (0) | 1 (0.9) | 0 (0) |
| American Indian/Alaskan | 1 (0.61) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (0.9) | 0 (0) |
| Unknown | 22 (13.4) | 3 (8.8) | 3 (25) | 18 (17.0) | 0 (0) |
| Medical History, n (%) | | | | | |
| Hypertension | 49 (29.9) | 9 (26.5) | 2 (16.7) | 35 (33.0) | 4 (33.3) |
| Diabetes | 29 (17.7) | 2 (5.9) | 1 (8.3) | 19 (17.9) | 7 (58.3) |
| Heart Disease | 23 (14.0) | 6 (17.6) | 0 (0) | 16 (15.1) | 1 (8.3) |
| Renal Disease | 14 (8.5) | 1 (2.9) | 2 (16.7) | 9 (8.5) | 2 (16.7) |
| Respiratory Disorder | 14 (8.5) | 3 (8.8) | 0 (0) | 10 (9.4) | 1 (8.3) |
| Cancer | 5 (3.0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 5 (4.7) | 0 (0) |
| Unknown | 74 (45.1) | 17 (50) | 7 (58.3) | 46 (43.4) | 7 (58.3) |
| Cardiac Procedures, n (%) | | | | | |
| Left Heart Catheterization | 29 (17.7) | 18 (52.9) | 3 (25.0) | 5 (4.7) | 3 (25.0) |
| Right Heart Catheterization | 15 (9.1) | 9 (26.5) | 2 (16.7) | 3 (2.8) | 1 (8.3) |
| Percutaneous Coronary Intervention | 11 (6.7) | 11 (32.4) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) |

419

420

421 **Table 2.** Baseline characteristics by initially documented emergency medical services (EMS)
 422 rhythm

| | EMS Documented Shockable Rhythm (N=46) | EMS Documented Non-Shockable Rhythm (N=118) | 423 424 |
|------------------------------------|--|---|------------|
| Age, Mean (SD) | 61.2 (±15.0) | 62.63 (±15.51) | 425 |
| Gender, n (%) | | | 426 |
| Female | 16 (34.8) | 57 (48.31) | |
| Race/Ethnicity, n (%) | | | 427 |
| Black/African American | 32 (69.57) | 91 (77.12) | 428 |
| White | 4 (8.70) | 6 (5.08) | |
| Hispanic/Latino | 1 (2.17) | 3 (2.54) | 429 |
| Asian | 3 (6.52) | 1 (0.85) | 430 |
| American Indian/Alaskan | 0 (0) | 1 (0.85) | |
| Unknown | 6 (13.04) | 16 (13.56) | 431 |
| Medical History, n (%) | | | 432 |
| Hypertension | 11 (23.91) | 39 (33.05) | 433 |
| Diabetes | 3 (6.52) | 26 (22.03) | |
| Heart Disease | 6 (13.04) | 17 (14.41) | 434 |
| Renal Disease | 3 (6.52) | 11 (9.32) | 435 |
| Respiratory Disorder | 3 (6.52) | 11 (9.32) | |
| Cancer | 0 (0) | 5 (4.24) | 436 |
| Unknown | 15 (32.61) | 39 (33.05) | 437 |
| Cardiac Procedures, n (%) | | | 438 |
| Left Heart Catheterization | 21 (45.65) | 8 (6.78) | 439 |
| Right Heart Catheterization | 11 (23.91) | 4 (3.39) | 440 |
| Percutaneous Coronary Intervention | 11 (23.91) | 0 (0) | 441 |

Table 3. Out-of-hospital cardiac arrest resuscitation traits

442 n characteristics by initially documented emergency medical services (EMS) rhythm

| | EMS Documented Shockable Rhythm (N=46) | EMS Documented Non-Shockable Rhythm (N=118) |
|---|--|---|
| Out-of-hospital cardiac arrest resuscitation traits, n (%) | | |
| AED was not applied | 26 (56.52) | 92 (77.97) |
| AED was applied without defibrillation | 0 (0) | 25 (21.19) |

| | | | |
|---|------------|------------|-----|
| AED was applied with defibrillation | 20 (43.48) | 1 (0.85) | 443 |
| Use of a mechanical CPR support device | 7 (15.22) | 44 (37.29) | 444 |
| CPR initiated by individual other than EMS personnel | 20 (43.48) | 52 (44.07) | 445 |
| Arrest Unwitnessed | 14 (30.43) | 45 (38.14) | 446 |
| Electrocardiogram (ECG), n (%) | | | 447 |
| 12 Lead ECG was obtained by EMS | 20 (43.48) | 43 (36.44) | 448 |
| STEMI is present on ECG obtained by EMS | 3 (6.52) | 5 (4.24) | 449 |
| Ischemic changes present on initial ECG obtained by hospital team* | 28 (60.87) | 49 (41.53) | 450 |
| AED=automated external defibrillator; CPR=cardiopulmonary resuscitation; EMS=emergency medical services; STEMI=ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction | | | 451 |
| *Ischemic changes were defined as ST segment elevations, ST segment depressions, or T wave inversions | | | 452 |

Table 4.

454 Influence of concordance and discordance on relative risk of cardiac procedures by initially
 455 documented emergency medical services (EMS) rhythm

| | Initial EMS shockable rhythm comparing hospital concordance vs. discordance | Initial EMS non-shockable rhythm comparing hospital concordance vs. discordance |
|--|---|---|
| Left Heart Catheterization Relative Risk Ratio (CI) | 2.12 (0.76-5.93) | 0.19 (0.05-0.69) |
| Right Heart Catheterization Relative Risk Ratio (CI) | 1.59 (0.40-6.33) | 0.34 (0.04-3.01) |

456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461

462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471

472 **Table 5.** Influence of concordance and discordance on relative risk of cardiac procedures by
473 presence of ischemic changes on initial ECG obtained by the hospital team, regardless of initial
474 documented EMS rhythm

| | Ischemic changes present on initial ECG obtained by hospital team (N=77) |
|---|---|
| Left Heart Catheterization Relative Risk Ratio (95% CI) | 2.48 (1.20-5.12) |
| Right Heart Catheterization Relative Risk Ratio (95% CI) | 1.28 (0.49-3.36) |
| Percutaneous Coronary Intervention (95% CI) | 11.17 (1.46-85.25) |

475
476
477
478
479

480

481

482

483

484

485

486

487

488

489

490 **Figure 1.** Assembly of cohort and impact of incorrect documentation of initial cardiac rhythm,

491 stratified by initially documented EMS rhythm




Figure 1. Flow chart displaying assembly of cohort and potential impact of discordance between EMS and hospital documentation of initial cardiac rhythm. Abbreviations: EMS = emergency medical services; RRR = relative risk ratio; CI = confidence interval; LHC = Left heart catheterization

492

493 **Figure Legend.** Flow chart displaying assembly of cohort and potential impact of discordance

494 between EMS and hospital documentation of initial cardiac rhythm, stratified by EMS

495 documentation of initial cardiac rhythm. Abbreviations: EMS = emergency medical serves; RRR

496 = relative risk ratio; CI = confidence interval; LHC = Left heart catheterization

497