Question

Should amiodarone vs lidocaine be used for children with shock refractory VF/pVT

PROBLEM: Shock refractory ventricular

fibrillation/pulseless ventricular

tachycardia (VF/pVT)

OPTION: Amiodarone plus standard care

COMPARISON: Lidocaine plus standard care

MAIN Survival to discharge with good OUTCOMES: neurologic outcome/ survival to

discharge (Critical outcomes)

ROSC (important outcome)

SETTING: OHCA/IHCA

PERSPECTIVE: Patient perspective

BACKGROUND: In 2015, amiodarone or lidocaine were

recommended for pediatric cardiac arrest with refractory or recurrent VF/pVT based on one in-hospital study (Valdes) No data are available to guide recommendations for pediatric out-of-hospital arrest. Amiodarone has been recommended as the anti-arrhythmic of choice for VF in adults, largely based on two studies - Kudenchuk 1999 (amiodarone vs placebo) and Dorian 2002 (amiodarone vs lidocaine) – reporting improved survival to hospital admission, but no improvement in

hospital discharge.

Assessment

	JUDGEMENT	RESEARCH EVIDENCE	ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS
PROBLEM	Is the problem a priority? O No O Probably no X Probably yes O Yes O Varies O Don't know	52% IHCA patients receive anti- arrhythmic drug(s) (Valdes) There are no data to estimate the percentage who receive anti-arrhythmic drugs during OHCA	There is potential for increasing number of lives saved lives saved.
DESIRABLE EFFECTS	How substantial are the desirable anticipated effects? o Trivial o Small X Moderate o Large Varies oDon't know	There is a low frequency of VF/pVT in children and the number with recurrent or refractory is likely lower. However, if drug administration results in successful resuscitation, then the number of lives saved will increase.	
UNDESIRABLE EFFECTS	How substantial are the undesirable anticipated effects? Large Moderate X Small Trivial Varies Don't know	Frequency of adverse events has not been documented in children.	Hypotension and bradycardia have been observed in the non-arrest pediatric population given amiodarone. Hypotension is more frequent in the adult population receiving amiodarone preparations with Polysorbate 80

				Kudenchuk, 1999) If the aqueous preparation is administered, hypotension is less frequent. Other adverse events include thrombophlebitis and need for temporary external pacing. Seizures may be observed in patients who develop toxic lidocaine levels.
	CERIAINIYOF	What is the overall certainty of the evidence of effects? X Very low Low Moderate High No included studies	Very low for both amiodarone and lidocaine.	
	VALUES	Is there important uncertainty about or variability in how much people value the main outcomes? • Important uncertainty or variability • Possibly important uncertainty or variability • Probably no important uncertainty or variability X No important uncertainty or variability	No important uncertainty or variability.	Most people would agree on ROSC, survival to hospital discharge, survival with good neurologic at hospital discharge. Longer term outcomes, HRQoL not addressed in available studies
L	BALANCE OF EFFECTS	Does the balance between desirable and undesirable effects favor the intervention or the comparison? • Favors the comparison • Probably favors the comparison X Does not favor either the intervention or the comparison • Probably favors the intervention • Probably favors the intervention • Favors the intervention • Varies • Don't know	Odds ratio favors lidocaine compared to amiodarone or no anti-arrhythmic drug but statistically significant only for ROSC and not for critical outcomes of hospital discharge or hospital discharge with good neurologic outcome.	

OF RESOURCES REQUIRED	How large are the resource requirements (costs)? Large costs Moderate costs Negligible costs and savings Moderate savings Large savings Varies X Don't know What is the certainty of the evidence of	No formal cost-effectiveness studies have been performed. Both drugs are in wide use in-hospital, and it is unknown how widely they are used during pediatric OHCA. Additional resource requirements include ICU costs for non-survivors and neurologically damaged patients requiring long-term care. There are potential costs to major changes in guidelines including implementation and re-training. No studies identified.	Will vary across ILCOR Councils – for local determination. Already used in many settings.
CERTAINTY OF EVIDENCE C	resource requirements (costs)? O Very low Dow Moderate High X No included studies		
COST EFFECTIVENESS	Does the cost-effectiveness of the intervention favor the intervention or the comparison? • Favors the comparison • Probably favors the comparison • Does not favor either the intervention or the comparison • Probably favors the intervention • Favors the intervention • Varies X No included studies	No studies identified.	Not formally studied
EQUITY	What would be the impact on health equity? Output Reduced Probably reduced X Probably no impact Probably increased Increased Varies Don't know	Uncertain as no relevant studies were identified. Probably no impact.	
ACCEPTABILITY	Is the intervention acceptable to key stakeholders? O No Probably no X Probably yes Yes	In wide use currently	

		∨ VariesO Don't know		
Ì		Is the intervention feasible to implement?	In wide use for in-hospital cardiac arrest.	
	FEASIBILITY	NoProbably noX Probably yesYes		
i i	FE	∨ Varies∨ Don't know		

Summary of judgements

	JUDGEMENT						IMPLICATION S	
PROBLEM	No	Probably no	Probably yes	Yes		Varie s	Don't know	
DESIRABLE EFFECTS	Trivial	Small	Moderate	Large		Varie s	Don't know	
UNDESIRABLE EFFECTS	Large	Moderate	Small	Trivial		Varie s	Don't know	
CERTAINTY OF EVIDENCE	Very low	Low		High			No include d studies	
VALUES	Important uncertainty or variability	Possibly important uncertainty or variability	Probably no important uncertainty or variability	No important uncertainty or variability				
BALANCE OF EFFECTS	Favors the compariso n	Probably favors the compariso n	Does not favor either the interventio n or the compariso n	Probably favors the interventio n	Favors the interventio n	Varie s	Don't know	
RESOURCES REQUIRED	Large costs	Moderate costs	Negligible costs and savings	Moderate savings	Large savings	Varie s	Don't know	

	JUDGEMENT							IMPLICATION S
CERTAINTY OF EVIDENCE OF REQUIRED RESOURCES	Very low	Low	Moderate	High			No include d studies	
COST EFFECTIVENES S	Favors the compariso n	Probably favors the compariso n	Does not favor either the interventio n or the compariso n	Probably favors the interventio n	Favors the interventio n	Varie s	No include d studies	
EQUITY	Reduced	Probably reduced	Probably no impact	Probably increased	Increased	Varie s	Don't know	
ACCEPTABILITY	No	Probably no	Probably yes	Yes		Varie s	Don't know	
FEASIBILITY	No	Probably no	Probably yes	Yes		Varie s	Don't know	

Conclusions

We suggest a miodarone or lidocaine be used in the treatment of pediatric shock-refractory VF/pVT (weak recommendation, very low quality evidence).