# **Identification of Early Risk Factors for Mortality in Pediatric Veno-Arterial Extra Corporeal**

# **Membrane Oxygenation: The Patient Matters**

- 3 Bennett Weinerman,  $MD^{*1,2}$ , Soon Bin Kwon, Ph $D^{1,3*}$ , Tammam Alalqum, BS<sup>1,3</sup>, Daniel Nametz, BS<sup>1,3</sup>,
- 4 Murad Megjhani, PhD<sup>1,3</sup>, Eunice Clark, MSN, RN, FNP-C<sup>4</sup>, Caleb Varner<sup>5</sup>, Eva W. Cheung, MD<sup>1</sup>, Soojin
- 5 Park,  $MD^{1,3,6,7}$
- 
- <sup>1</sup> Program for Hospital and Intensive Care Informatics, Department of Neurology, Columbia University
- Vagelos College of Physicians and Surgeons, New York, USA
- 9 <sup>2</sup> Department of Pediatrics, Division of Critical Care & Hospital Medicine, Columbia University Vagelos
- College of Physicians and Surgeons and NewYork-Presbyterian Morgan Stanley Children's Hospital,
- New York, USA
- <sup>3</sup> Department of Neurology, Columbia University Vagelos College of Physicians and Surgeons, New York, USA
- <sup>4</sup> Department of Nursing, NewYork-Presbyterian Morgan Stanley Children's Hospital, New York, USA
- <sup>5</sup> Department of Perfusion, NewYork-Presbyterian Morgan Stanley Children's Hospital, New York, USA
- 16 <sup>6</sup> New York-Presbyterian Hospital, Columbia University Irving Medical Center, New York, USA
- 17 <sup>7</sup> Department of Biomedical Informatics, Columba University, New York, USA
- 
- \* Co-First Authors
- 
- **Corresponding Author:**
- Soojin Park MD
- sp3291@cumc.columbia.edu
- 24 West  $168<sup>th</sup>$  Street
- New York, NY 10032
- (212) 305-7236 phone
- (212) 305-2792 fax
- 
- Soon Bin Kwon: Sk4984@cumc.columbia.edu
- Tammam Alaqum: Ta2767@cumc.columbia.edu
- Daniel Nametz: Dcn2123@cumc.columbia.edu
- Murad Megjhani: Mm5025@cumc.columbia.edu
- Eunice Clark: Euc9002@nyp.org
- Caleb Varner: cv2541@cumc.columbia.edu
- Eva Cheung: Ec2335@cumc.columbia.edu
- Soojin Park: Sp3291@cumc.columbia.edu
- 
- Word Count: 2,739
- 
- **Disclosures:**
- Soojin Park is supported by the National Institutes of Health (1R01NS131606, 1R01NS129760). Murad
- Megjhani is supported by the America Heart Association (20Post35210653).

# **ABSTRACT:**

- **Objective:** Pediatric Veno-Arterial Extra Corporeal Membrane Oxygenation (VA ECMO) is a life saving
- technology associated with high mortality. A successful VA ECMO course requires attention to multiple
- aspects of patient care, including ECMO and patient parameters. Early, potentially modifiable, risk factors
- associated with patient mortality should be analyzed and adjusted for when assessing VA ECMO risk
- profiles.
- **Method:** Retrospective single center experience of pediatric patients requiring VA ECMO from January
- 2021 to October 2023. Laboratory and ECMO flow parameters were extracted from the patients record
- and analyzed. Risk factors were analyzed using a Cox proportion hazard regression
- **Main Results:** There were 45 patients studied. Overall survival was 51%. Upon uncorrected analysis
- there were no significant differences between the patients who survived and those who died. Utilizing a
- Cox proportion hazard regression, platelet count, fibrinogen level and creatine level were significant risk
- factors within the first twenty-four hours of a patient's ECMO course.
- **Significance:** Although we did not find a significant difference among ECMO flow parameters in this
- study, this work highlights that granular ECMO flow data can be incorporated to risk analysis profiles and
- potential modeling in pediatric VA ECMO. This study demonstrated, that when controlling for ECMO
- flow parameters, kidney dysfunction and clotting regulation remain key risk factors for pediatric VA
- ECMO mortality.
- 

## **Introduction**

- Extra Corporeal Membrane Oxygenation (ECMO) was first introduced as a viable medical therapy in the 1970s in the setting of severe acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) (1). Since that time, ECMO has undergone major refinement, leading to increased utilization and improved outcomes. Veno-Arterial
- ECMO (VA-ECMO) treats patients who are often on the brink of viable physiology, and thus are at
- extremely high risk of mortality. VA ECMO is increasingly implemented in pediatric patients, with
- mortality improving over the past decades with current literature citing a mortality around 40-60% (2-7).
- 
- Decisions regarding goals of care are often clouded by the inability of the clinical team to provide
- accurate prognostic information. Accurate risk factors for poor outcomes allow the clinical team to have
- more informed conversations with care givers. Studies have tried to predict which patients will have
- better outcomes after implementation of ECMO support. Several adult studies have leveraged machine
- learning algorithms (8-10); however, these models largely rely on registry data(11). Many pediatric
- ECMO research studies have found that age, gender, the development of renal or hepatic dysfunction
- were associated with mortality. Other groups who have included more diverse pediatric patient

populations have found that lactate, pH (both before and after cannulation), as well as, renal dysfunction,

- including use of continuous renal replacement, and active cannulation during cardiopulmonary
- resuscitation (eCPR) are associated with mortality(4-6, 12, 13). Other variables, such as single-ventricle
- physiology, location of patient cannulation and length of ECMO run are often, but not always, sited as
- significant risk factors(6, 12). Novel non-invasive metrics, like echocardiographic studies have also been
- 83 associated with pediatric ECMO survival (3). Notably, these studies do not rigorously analyze the ECMO
- 84 derived flow parameters for each patient.
- 
- 86 A successful VA-ECMO run requires attention to detail from multifaceted team members. There are
- multiple technical as well as patient and ECMO physiologic variables that must be continuously adjusted
- for optimal outcomes. This retrospective observational cohort study investigated routinely collected
- laboratory data, as well as ECMO flow data within the first 24 hours of the ECMO run to determine
- whether to elucidate early risk factors for patient mortality once on VA ECMO. Our aim was to focus on
- early metrics with a goal of minimizing confounding variables.
- 

# **Methods**

### *Study Population*

 This is a retrospective observational cohort study at a single academic institution with both a neonatal and pediatric cardiac intensive care unit. Pediatric patients who were treated with VA ECMO between January 2021 and October 2023 were included. Location of cannulation included operating room, PICU, Neonatal Intensive Care Unit (NICU) and in other hospital locations (i.e. cardiac catheterization lab) were recorded. The underlying indication for the patient's decompensation, necessitating the need for VA ECMO, was extracted from their medical records based on progress notes. Patients were excluded from analysis based on the following criteria: (1) ECMO run lasting less than 24 hours; (2) multiple ECMO runs; (3) single-ventricle anatomy; (4) missing data due to cannulation location or incomplete data. The Columbia University IRB committee approved this research study (Protocol # AAAU5398). Research was conducted in accordance with the principles embodied in the Declaration of Helsinki and in accordance with local statutory requirements. This study was a non-treatment, retrospective, observational review of physiologic and ECMO data that was obtained as part of routine standard of care, and the IRB approved a waiver of informed consent.

#### *ECMO Circuit*

Our institution performs 40-50 VA ECMO runs per year. ECMO cannulation was performed by a member

- of the Pediatric Cardiothoracic Surgery or Pediatric General Surgery Team. Central or peripheral
- cannulation was at the discretion of the surgical team based on the timing of the most recent sternotomy.

- ECMO support was provided by the Cardiohelp ECMO system from Getinge (Göteborg, Sweden), with
- either a 5.0 oxygenator for patients <19kg or the 7.0 oxygenator for children >19kg. A perfusionist
- adjusted the ECMO settings in consultation with the clinical team. Our hospital does not have a protocol
- or pathway for weaning ECMO support. Anti-coagulation was adjusted per institution protocol based on
- 116 bleeding and non-bleeding conditions.
- *Data Collection*
- Physiologic data was collected by the bedside monitor as part of routine standard of care. ECMO flow
- data was retrospectively extracted from the Spectrum module (Gloucester, UK) at a sampling frequency
- of 0.016Hz or 1 sample per minute. The first 24-hours of data after ECMO cannulation were included for
- analysis. The start of the ECMO run was defined as the time that ECMO parameters were output from the
- Spectrum data file. This date and time stamp was corroborated with our internal ECMO database to
- ensure validity. ECMO Flow data consisted of Arterial Flow, Delta Pressure, Fractional Delivery of
- Oxygen (FDO2), Arterial Pressure, Venous Pressure, Cardiac Index (CI), Revolutions Per Minute (RPM),
- SaO2, SpO2, SvO2, and Sweep. Laboratory data included Hemoglobin, Hematocrit, Platelet Count,
- 126 Arterial pH, Arterial partial pressure of carbon dioxide (paCO<sub>2</sub>), arterial bicarbonate (HCO<sub>3</sub>), Creatinine,
- Fibrinogen, Aspartate Aminotransferase (AST), Alanine Aminotransferase (ALT), and plasma free
- hemoglobin.
- *Statistical Analysis*

 All data analyses were performed using MATLAB 2020a (MathWorks, Massachusetts). For each patient, the average value was calculated over the 24-hour period of the ECMO run for each variable. For each group (i.e. Deceased or Survived), an average was calculated. Students' *t*-test with a significance level of  $\leq$ 0.05 was performed to compare the difference between the two groups. For demographic and baseline characteristics between the two groups, continuous variables were compared using a non-paired Student's *t*-test, assuming heterogenous variance. Categorical variables were compared using Fisher's exact test, or 136 Chi-squared test when appropriate with a significance level of  $\leq 0.05$ . Cox proportion hazard regression was performed to identify risk factors for 180-day mortality. Among the variables with high correlation, 138 only one variable was included to reduce bias introduced to the analysis. For example, for AST and ALT, only AST was used. Similarly, only hematocrit was incorporated into the model from the choice of 140 hemoglobin or hematocrit. While it is recognized that  $pH$ ,  $pCO<sub>2</sub>$  and sweep are all interconnected, given 141 their clinical significance, all three variables were included in the model. Similarly, RPM and CI were both included in the regression given their clinical implications.

- **Results**
- There were 106 patients who were cannulated to VA-ECMO between January 2021 and October 2023.
- Nine patients had multiple ECMO runs, and the 22 patients who had single ventricle anatomy were

- removed from analysis. Seven, nine and fourteen patients had an ECMO run <24 hours, were cannulated
- at an outside hospital and subsequently transferred to our institution or had missing data respectively, and
- were removed from analysis. Of the remaining 45 patients 23 (51%) survived and 22 (49%) died. Twelve
- (27%) patients were cannulated in the setting of respiratory indications, twenty-three (51%) were
- cannulated for primarily cardiac indications and ten (22%) were cannulated in the setting of eCPR (**Table**
- **1**).
- The study included 23 (51%) females. The patients' ages ranged from birth (0 days) to 22 years old with
- an average of 4.5 years old (54 months). The average patient's weight prior to cannulation was 16.9kg.
- The average ECMO run was 182.78 hours. There was no significant difference in patient demographic
- data comparing those who survived, versus those who died (**Table 1**).
- Twenty-three patients were cannulated while in the PICU (51.1%). Fourteen patients were cannulated in
- the NICU (31.1%). Six patients (13.3%) were cannulated in the operating room and two patients (4.4%)
- were cannulated in the cardiac catheterization lab.
- The most common diagnoses were pulmonary hypertension (8 patients), Valvular disease (5 patients),
- Heart transplant complications (4 patients), congenital diaphragmatic hernia (4 patients), dilated
- cardiomyopathy (3 patients), restrictive cardiomyopathy (3 patients), infection (2 patients), Tetralogy of
- Fallot (2 patients) and Hypoplastic Left Heart (2 patients). For a complete breakdown of the entire cohort
- please see *supplementary table 1*.
- Lab values and ECMO flow data were averaged over the first 24-hour period of the ECMO run per
- patient and then averaged for each cohort (survived or deceased). For the laboratory values within the first
- 24 hours of the ECMO run, the average ALT (Units/Liter) was 543.7 in those who survived compared to
- 455.9 in those who died (*p* = 0.77). The average fibrinogen (mg/dL) was 192.1 versus 151.11 (*p* = 0.053)
- between the survivors and the deceased respectively. The average hematocrit (%) among the survivors
- 169 was 32.0 versus 31.2 in the deceased patients ( $p=0.56$ ). The average platelet count ( $\times 10^3/\mu$ L) was 111.5
- 170 and 104.4 ( $p = 0.68$ ) in the patients who survived versus those who died. Among survivors the average
- 171 creatinine (mg/dL) was 0.67 versus 1.01 ( $p = 0.067$ ) in those who died. The average pH and paCO<sub>2</sub>
- (mmHg) was 7.34 and 41.7 in the survivors compared to 7.36 and 42.5 in those who died respectively,
- with corresponding *p* values of 0.56 and 0.64. The average lactate level (mmoL/L) was 3.68 in survivors
- 174 and 4.16 ( $p = 0.66$ ) in those patients who died (**Table 2**)
- 175 For the ECMO flow values the average CI  $(L/min/m<sup>2</sup>)$  was 1.94 in survivors versus 2.13 in those who
- 176 died ( $p = 0.073$ ). The corresponding average RPMs were 2708.2 compared to 2854.1 ( $p = 0.21$ ) in those
- patients who survived and those who died. The average ECMO sweep was 0.96 in the patients who
- 178 survived compared to 1.0 ( $p = 0.87$ ) in those who lived. The FDO2 of the ECMO circuit averaged 59.7
- 179 for patients who survived compared to  $60.6$  ( $p = 088$ ) for patients who died. (**Figure 1**).

A Cox regression was run using the same variables above. The 180-day survival analysis is shown in

- **Table 3**. After running the Cox survival analysis only three values were significant. For fibrinogen, the
- 182 Cox coefficient was -0.015, with a hazard ratio of 0.99 and a p value of 0.004. The corresponding 95<sup>th</sup>
- percentile hazard ratio confidence interval ranged from 0.98 to 1.00. For creatinine the Cox coefficient
- 184 was 1.14 with a hazard ratio of 3.12 and a  $p$  value of 0.022. The 95<sup>th</sup> percentile hazard ratio confidence
- interval ranged from 1.18 to 8.27 for Creatinine. The Cox coefficient for Platelet count was 0.011, with a
- 186 hazard ratio of 1.01 and a  $p$  value of 0.04. The 95<sup>th</sup> percentile hazard ratio confidence interval ranged from
- 1.00 to 1.02.
- **Discussion**
- Among patients requiring a singular run of VA ECMO we found a survival rate of 51%. This survival rate
- is consistent with previously cited pediatric studies and congruent with data published by the ELSO
- network (14-17). Our analysis was comprised of pediatric patients recovering after cardiac surgery as well
- as patients admitted for other medical indications who subsequently required VA ECMO, including those
- patients who required eCPR.
- Within the first 24 hours of VA ECMO cannulation, we did not find any laboratory or ECMO parameter
- that were significantly different among those patients who survived versus those who died. Upon using a
- 196 180-day Cox regression, we found that fibrinogen ( $p = 0.004$ ), creatinine ( $p = 0.02$ ) and platelet count (*p*
- 197  $= 0.04$ ) were significant risk factors associated with mortality within the first 24 hours of a patients
- ECMO run.
- Renal dysfunction and/or requiring continuous renal replacement therapy (CRRT) while on ECMO has
- been reported as a significant risk factor for mortality (16, 18) . Additionally, decreased urine output,
- likely a measure of both end organ perfusion and ongoing nephrogenic insult has been cited as a risk
- factor for pediatric VA ECMO mortality (15). Authors have gone on to stratify the degree of renal
- dysfunction, based on the Kidney Disease Improving Global Outcome (KDIGO) definition, and its impact
- on in-hospital mortality for patients requiring VA ECMO (17). Our findings suggest that the risk
- associated with kidney disease is evident within the first 24 hours of a patients ECMO course; even while
- controlling for the impact of other ECMO parameters.
- Additionally, a patient's hematologic risk profile has been associated with mortality (19). We found that
- platelet and fibrinogen levels are risk factors for patient survival. Interestingly, our data suggests that
- higher fibrinogen levels may be slightly protective, evident by a hazard ratio less than 1. Conversely, a
- higher platelet count was associated with a marginal increased risk of mortality. It is important to note the
- complexity of the clotting cascade, and how both fibrinogen and platelet are impacted by systemic
- inflammation, bleeding and the ECMO circuit itself. Our findings further highlight how critical
- appropriate anti-coagulation is when managing pediatric VA ECMO (20-22).

- We hoped to eliminate some confounding factors by focusing on the first 24 hours of a patient's ECMO
- course, where ideally the ECMO oxygenator and tubing is relatively devoid of significant fibrin
- deposition (19). However, we cannot account for the microscopic changes that occur at the blood-
- oxygenator membrane(23-25), or the inflammatory changes that occur due to the presence of the ECMO
- cannulations themselves (26). Unfortunately, within the first 24 hours of a patients ECMO run, we did not
- have enough data to comment on the role of plasma free hemoglobin, or other clotting factors.
- 220 Additionally, our institution only uses centrifugal ECMO circuits, and the implication on roller versus
- centrifugal systems is not addressed in our study.
- Laboratory evidence of poor organ perfusion is frequently cited as being risk factors for patient mortality
- while on ECMO. In our regression, we did not find hepatic enzymes (ALT), lactate or pH to be significant
- (15, 17, 27). As we only looked at data within the first 24 hours, it is likely that some of these markers
- would have become significant given a longer sampling window. We were unable to include the partial
- 226 pressure of oxygen  $(paO<sub>2</sub>)$  as a laboratory parameter, given the uncertainty surrounding this lab value.
- 227 Given the retrospective nature of this study we were not able to determine if the  $paO<sub>2</sub>$  values were taken
- 228 from the patient or the ECMO circuit, and thus were not analyzed.
- To our knowledge this is the first pediatric study to examine relatively high frequency ECMO variables in
- conjunction with patient laboratory markers. Given the complexity of ECMO, we believe it is imperative
- for retrospective studies to incorporate the impact that the ECMO circuit and ECMO parameters have on
- the patient's survival; however, in our study, ECMO circuit parameters were not significant risk factors
- within the first 24 hours. It seems clear to the practicing clinician, that the odds of survival are much
- 234 different for a child requiring a CI of 3.5 L/min/m<sup>2</sup> versus 1.5 L/min/m<sup>2</sup>, or a sweep of 10 L/min versus a
- sweep of 0.3 L/min, yet these variables were not significant during the first 24 hours of a patient's ECMO
- 236 course. This study further demonstrates that ECMO flow parameters can be captured and should be
- controlled for, in any risk analysis. Additionally, we selected laboratory and ECMO parameters that are
- frequently cited as being risk factors for patient outcomes. We decided to focus on the first 24 hours of a
- patient's ECMO run, hoping to elucidate early modifiable risk factors that may change a patients'
- outcome, while limiting other confounding variables.
- This was a retrospective study of pediatric patients requiring VA ECMO and thus has limitations. We
- included patients who were cannulated both centrally and peripherally, thus this study includes a
- heterogeneous population. Furthermore, our institution does not have strict criteria as to which patients
- get cannulated onto ECMO, thus there is even more heterogeneity based on the
- anesthesiologist/intensivist and the surgeon involved in the cannulation. Our sample size is relatively
- large for a single center; however, more patients would better elucidate the significance of each risk

- factor. Additionally, we did not incorporate physiologic parameters in this analysis (i.e. heart rate, mean
- arterial pressure etc.), which we hope to do in subsequent studies.
- **Conclusion**
- Over a 3-year period we analyzed 45 pediatric patients who were cannulated onto VA-ECMO with a 51%
- survival rate. While there were no overt significant differences between the two groups, using a Cox
- regression including key ECMO parameters, we found that creatinine, fibrinogen and platelet count are
- key risk factors for patient mortality within the first 24 hours of a patient's ECMO run. Our data provide
- evidence that maximal effort should be spent optimizing the patient, as none of the ECMO parameters
- were significant risk factors for patient mortality.
- The use of mechanical circulatory support is a complex and nuanced science that has provided lifesaving
- therapy to a heterogenous population. For accurate and impactful prediction, it is necessary to capture as
- many aspects of these patients' care as possible, including ECMO support parameters. We hope that with
- more multifaceted, granular clinical data, we will be better able to arm the clinical team with accurate and
- predictive information.
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 

## 281 **Tables and Figures**

# 282 **Table 1:**



283 **Table 1:** Demographic information for patients analyzed on Veno-Arterial Extracorporeal Membrane

284 Oxygenation. (PICU = Pediatric Intensive Care Unit, NICU = Neonatal Intensive Care Unit, OR =

285 Operating Room, Cath Lab = Cardiac Catheterization Laboratory, ECMO = Extracorporeal Membrane

286 Oxygenation, pHTN = Pulmonary Hypertension, OHT = Orthotopic Heart Transplant, CDH = Congenital

287 Diaphragmatic Hernia, DCM = Dilated Cardiomyopathy, RCM = Restrictive Cardiomyopathy, HLH = 288 Hemophagocytic Lymphohistiocytosis)

289

290

291

292

# 294 **Table 2**:



**295 Table 2:** Averaged values and standard deviation for each patient cohort, survived versus deceased.<br>296 ( $paCO_2$  = arterial partial pressure of carbon dioxide, ALT = alanine aminotransferase, CI = Cardiac

296 (paCO<sub>2</sub> = arterial partial pressure of carbon dioxide,  $ALT =$  alanine aminotransferase, CI = Cardiac Index,<br>297 RPM = Revolutions per Minute, FDO2 = Fraction of Delivered Oxygen)

 $RPM =$  Revolutions per Minute,  $FDO2 =$  Fraction of Delivered Oxygen)

298

299

300

301

302

303

304

305

306 307

308

309

310

311

312

313

315 **Table 3:**

	Coefficient	Hazard Ratio	p-value	<b>Hazard Ratio</b> 95% CI	
pH	4.31	74.1	0.33	0.013	430761
$paCO2$ (mmHg)	0.027	1.03	0.50	0.95	1.11
Lactate (mmoL/L)	0.14	1.14	0.15	0.95	1.38
Hematocrit (%)	$-0.044$	0.96	0.49	0.85	1.08
Platelet $(x10^3 \mu L)$	0.011	1.01	0.04	1.00	1.02
Fibrinogen (mg/dL)	- 0.015	0.99	0.004	0.98	1.00
Creatinine (mg/dL)	1.14	3.12	0.02	1.18	8.27
ALT (U/L)	$-0.0005$	1.00	0.073	1.00	1.00
CI (L/min/m <sup>2</sup> )	0.44	1.55	0.60	0.30	8.01
<b>RPM</b>	0.0007	1.00	0.47	1.00	1.00
Sweep (L/min)	0.017	1.02	0.95	0.58	1.79
FDO <sub>2</sub>	- 0.012	0.99	0.49	0.96	1.02

316 **Table 3:** Cox Hazard Coefficient and Hazard ratio for each variable analyzed between the two cohorts,

317 survived versus deceased. (paCO<sub>2</sub> = arterial partial pressure of carbon dioxide, ALT = alanine<br>318 aminotransferase, CI = Cardiac Index, RPM = Revolutions per Minute, FDO2 = Fraction of D

aminotransferase,  $CI = Cardiac Index$ ,  $RPM = Revolutions$  per Minute,  $FDO2 = Fraction of Delivered$ 319 Oxygen)







 *Figure 1***:** Averaged ECMO parameters every hour from time of ECMO cannulation, grouped on those 323 who survived versus those who died.  $CI = Cardiac Index$ ,  $RPM = Revolutions$  per Minute,  $FDO2 =$ Fraction of Delivered Oxygen.

- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 

- 
- 
- 
- 

## 337 **Supplemental Table:**



338 **Supplemental Table 1:** Diagnoses of patients included in the analysis.

339 1. Treml B, Breitkopf R, Bukumirić Z, Bachler M, Boesch J, Rajsic S. ECMO Predictors of 340 Mortality: A 10-Year Referral Centre Experience. J Clin Med. 2022 Feb 24;11(5). PubMed PMID: 341 35268314. PMCID: PMC8911127. Epub 20220224. eng.

 2. Djordjevic I, Sabashnikov A, Deppe AC, Kuhn E, Eghbalzadeh K, Merkle J, et al. Risk factors associated with 30-day mortality for out-of-center ECMO support: experience from the newly launched ECMO retrieval service. J Artif Organs. 2019 Jun;22(2):110-7. PubMed PMID: 30673894. Epub 20190123. eng.

346 3. Punn R, Axelrod DM, Sherman-Levine S, Roth SJ, Tacy TA. Predictors of mortality in 347 pediatric patients on venoarterial extracorporeal membrane oxygenation. Pediatr Crit Care Med. 348 2014 Nov;15(9):870-7. PubMed PMID: 25230312. PMCID: PMC4221423. eng.

349 4. Kolovos NS, Bratton SL, Moler FW, Bove EL, Ohye RG, Bartlett RH, et al. Outcome of 350 pediatric patients treated with extracorporeal life support after cardiac surgery. Ann Thorac Surg. 351 2003 Nov;76(5):1435-41; discussion 41-2. PubMed PMID: 14602263. eng.

352 5. Morris MC, Ittenbach RF, Godinez RI, Portnoy JD, Tabbutt S, Hanna BD, et al. Risk 353 factors for mortality in 137 pediatric cardiac intensive care unit patients managed with

 extracorporeal membrane oxygenation. Crit Care Med. 2004 Apr;32(4):1061-9. PubMed PMID: 15071402. eng.

 6. Derby CD, Kolcz J, Kerins PJ, Duncan DR, Quezada E, Pizarro C. Aristotle score predicts outcome in patients requiring extracorporeal circulatory support following repair of congenital heart disease. ASAIO J. 2007;53(1):82-6. PubMed PMID: 17237653. eng.

 7. Delmo Walter EM, Alexi-Meskishvili V, Huebler M, Loforte A, Stiller B, Weng Y, et al. Extracorporeal membrane oxygenation for intraoperative cardiac support in children with congenital heart disease. Interact Cardiovasc Thorac Surg. 2010 May;10(5):753-8. PubMed PMID: 20139198. Epub 20100205. eng.

- 8. Stephens AF, Šeman M, Diehl A, Pilcher D, Barbaro RP, Brodie D, et al. ECMO PAL: using deep neural networks for survival prediction in venoarterial extracorporeal membrane oxygenation. Intensive Care Med. 2023 Sep;49(9):1090-9. PubMed PMID: 37548758. PMCID: PMC10499722. Epub 20230807. eng.
- 9. Pappalardo F, Pieri M, Greco T, Patroniti N, Pesenti A, Arcadipane A, et al. Predicting mortality risk in patients undergoing venovenous ECMO for ARDS due to influenza A (H1N1) pneumonia: the ECMOnet score. Intensive Care Med. 2013 Feb;39(2):275-81. PubMed PMID: 23160769. PMCID: PMC7095375. Epub 20121116. eng.
- 10. Schmidt M, Burrell A, Roberts L, Bailey M, Sheldrake J, Rycus PT, et al. Predicting survival after ECMO for refractory cardiogenic shock: the survival after veno-arterial-ECMO (SAVE)-score. Eur Heart J. 2015 Sep 01;36(33):2246-56. PubMed PMID: 26033984. Epub 20150601. eng.
- 11. Shah N, Said AS. Extracorporeal Support Prognostication-Time to Move the Goal Posts? Membranes (Basel). 2021 Jul 15;11(7). PubMed PMID: 34357187. PMCID: PMC8304743. Epub 20210715. eng.
- 12. Mehta NM, Turner D, Walsh B, Zurakowski D, Betit P, Wilson J, et al. Factors associated with survival in pediatric extracorporeal membrane oxygenation--a single-center experience. J Pediatr Surg. 2010 Oct;45(10):1995-2003. PubMed PMID: 20920718. eng.
- 13. Barbaro RP, Boonstra PS, Paden ML, Roberts LA, Annich GM, Bartlett RH, et al. Development and validation of the pediatric risk estimate score for children using extracorporeal respiratory support (Ped-RESCUERS). Intensive Care Med. 2016 May;42(5):879-88. PubMed PMID: 27007109. PMCID: PMC6379065. Epub 20160323. eng.
- 14. Barbaro RP, Paden ML, Guner YS, Raman L, Ryerson LM, Alexander P, et al. Pediatric Extracorporeal Life Support Organization Registry International Report 2016. ASAIO J. 2017;63(4):456-63. PubMed PMID: 28557863. PMCID: PMC5626007. eng.
- 15. Taka H, Kotani Y, Kuroko Y, Iwadou S, Iwasaki T, Kasahara S. Risk factors and outcomes of pediatric extracorporeal membrane oxygenation. Asian Cardiovasc Thorac Ann. 2021 Nov;29(9):916-21. PubMed PMID: 33611945. Epub 20210220. eng.
- 16. Aharon AS, Drinkwater DC, Churchwell KB, Quisling SV, Reddy VS, Taylor M, et al. Extracorporeal membrane oxygenation in children after repair of congenital cardiac lesions. Ann Thorac Surg. 2001 Dec;72(6):2095-101; discussion 101-2. PubMed PMID: 11789800. eng.
- 17. Liao MT, Tsai IJ, Lin FH, Tseng LJ, Huang SC, Chen YS, et al. Risk factors for in-hospital mortality and acute kidney injury in neonatal-pediatric patients receiving extracorporeal membrane oxygenation. J Formos Med Assoc. 2021 Sep;120(9):1758-67. PubMed PMID: 33810928. Epub 20210331. eng.
- 18. Betrus C, Remenapp R, Charpie J, Kudelka T, Brophy P, Smoyer WE, et al. Enhanced hemolysis in pediatric patients requiring extracorporeal membrane oxygenation and continuous renal replacement therapy. Ann Thorac Cardiovasc Surg. 2007 Dec;13(6):378-83. PubMed PMID: 18292719. eng.
- 19. Chu JH, Sarathy S, Ramesh S, Rudolph K, Raghavan ML, Badheka A. Risk factors for hemolysis with centrifugal pumps in pediatric extracorporeal membrane oxygenation: Is pump

 replacement an answer? Perfusion. 2023 May;38(4):771-80. PubMed PMID: 35354417. Epub 20220330. eng. 20. Jenks CL, Zia A, Venkataraman R, Raman L. High Hemoglobin Is an Independent Risk Factor for the Development of Hemolysis During Pediatric Extracorporeal Life Support. J Intensive Care Med. 2019 Mar;34(3):259-64. PubMed PMID: 28486865. Epub 20170510. eng. 21. Annich GM. Extracorporeal life support: the precarious balance of hemostasis. J Thromb Haemost. 2015 Jun;13 Suppl 1:S336-42. PubMed PMID: 26149045. eng. 22. Dalton HJ, Reeder R, Garcia-Filion P, Holubkov R, Berg RA, Zuppa A, et al. Factors Associated with Bleeding and Thrombosis in Children Receiving Extracorporeal Membrane Oxygenation. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2017 Sep 15;196(6):762-71. PubMed PMID: 28328243. PMCID: PMC5620676. eng. 23. Williams DC, Turi JL, Hornik CP, Bonadonna DK, Williford WL, Walczak RJ, et al. Circuit oxygenator contributes to extracorporeal membrane oxygenation-induced hemolysis. ASAIO J. 2015;61(2):190-5. PubMed PMID: 25419829. PMCID: PMC4537148. eng. 24. Lequier L, Horton SB, McMullan DM, Bartlett RH. Extracorporeal membrane oxygenation circuitry. Pediatr Crit Care Med. 2013 Jun;14(5 Suppl 1):S7-12. PubMed PMID: 23735989. PMCID: PMC3742331. eng. 25. Kozlova Е, Chernysh А, Moroz V, Sergunova V, Gudkova О, Kuzovlev А. Nanodefects of membranes cause destruction of packed red blood cells during long-term storage. Exp Cell Res. 2015 Oct 01;337(2):192-201. PubMed PMID: 26169694. Epub 20150710. eng. 26. Mulholland JW, Massey W, Shelton JC. Investigation and quantification of the blood trauma caused by the combined dynamic forces experienced during cardiopulmonary bypass. Perfusion. 2000 Nov;15(6):485-94. PubMed PMID: 11131211. eng. 27. Baslaim G, Bashore J, Al-Malki F, Jamjoom A. Can the outcome of pediatric extracorporeal membrane oxygenation after cardiac surgery be predicted? Ann Thorac Cardiovasc Surg. 2006 Feb;12(1):21-7. PubMed PMID: 16572070. eng.