REPLY

## Authors' reply: Non-invasive therapeutics to prevent left ventricular distension in venoarterial-ECMO patients: no room for epinephrine!

Nicolas Massart<sup>1,2</sup>, Erwan Flecher<sup>3</sup>, Vincent Auffret<sup>4,5</sup>, James T. Ross<sup>4,5</sup>, Alexandre Mansour<sup>2,6</sup> and Nicolas Nesseler<sup>2,6,7\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Intensive-care Unit, Yves Le Foll Hospital, Saint-Brieuc, France; <sup>2</sup>Department of Anesthesia and Critical Care, Pontchaillou, University Hospital of Rennes, Rennes, France; <sup>3</sup>Department of Thoracic and Cardiovascular Surgery, Signal and Image Treatment Laboratory (LTSI), Inserm U1099, Pontchaillou University Hospital, University of Rennes, *1*, Rennes, France; <sup>4</sup>Service de Cardiologie, Univ Rennes, CHU de Rennes, Inserm LTSI U1099, F-35000, Rennes, France; <sup>5</sup>Department of Surgery, University of California Davis Medical Center, Sacramento, CA, USA; <sup>6</sup>CIC 1414 (Centre d'Investigation Clinique de Rennes), Univ Rennes, CHU Rennes, Inserm, F-35000, Rennes, Inserm, F-35000, Rennes, France; <sup>7</sup>Institut NUMECAN—UMR\_A 1341, UMR\_S 1241, Univ Rennes, CHU de Rennes, Inra, Inserm, F-35000, Rennes, France

Received: 3 September 2021; Accepted: 28 October 2021

\*Correspondence to: Dr Nicolas Nesseler, Hôpital Pontchaillou, Pôle Anesthésie, SAMU, Urgences, Réanimations, Médecine Interne et Gériatrie (ASUR-MIG), rue Henri Le Guilloux, 35033 Rennes Cedex 9, France. Tel: 33.2.99.28.42.46; Fax: 33.2.99.28.24.21. Email: nicolas.nesseler@chu-rennes.fr

## Dear editor,

We thank Julien Guihaire and Simon Dang Van for their careful reading and thoughtful comments about our article on epinephrine infusion during VA-ECMO support.<sup>1</sup> As they point out, the timing and indication for epinephrine infusion are useful additional data which may help to clarify the negative outcomes that we observed with epinephrine use. At the time of VA-ECMO cannulation, 229/262 patients (87%) received epinephrine infusion, and for the 33 others (13%), epinephrine was started during the first 24 h of VA-ECMO support, suggesting the early use of epinephrine in our study population. Concerning the indication, detailed information was limited in our database, but we found that out of hospital cardiac arrest was a significantly more frequent reason for ECMO cannulation (18% vs. 10%) in the epinephrine group, whereas medical cardiogenic shock was significantly less represented (30% vs. 41%).

We agree that in patients on VA-ECMO, preventing left ventricular (LV) distention is critical in order to avoid pulmonary congestion and thrombus formation and to promote myocardial recovery.<sup>2</sup> Accordingly, interventional options for LV unloading while on VA-ECMO were used in 25% of the patients in our cohort, with up to 119/589 patients (20%) being supported with intra-aortic balloon pump and 26/589 (4%) with micro-axial flow pump Impella (Abiomed, Danvers, MA, USA). We have been developing a percutaneous balloon atrial septostomy programme in our institution from 2016, but the item was added only recently in our database. Of note, 12 patients benefited from the technique in the study period.

To date, the best approach to manage pulmonary congestion in patients on VA-ECMO remains a matter of debate. We strongly support the idea of a prospective study to address this important question. While we agree with Guihaire and Dang Van that inotropic support is one of the first-line non-invasive treatment for LV distension, we disagree that epinephrine is the best agent to achieve this goal. Epinephrine is a so-called inopressor so the reduction in LV distension achieved by its inotropic effects may be limited by the increased afterload created by its vasopressor effects. In fact, vasodilation is also one of the first-line non-invasive strategy for LV distension, as highlighted by the recent 2020 EACTS/ ELSO/STS/AATS expert consensus on post-cardiotomy extracorporeal life support in adult patients.<sup>3</sup> We would argue that the dual goals of inotropy and vasodilation are more likely to be achieved with an ionodilator such as dobutamine. In our institution, moderate inotropic support is systematically maintained after ECMO cannulation to prevent LV distension as well as blood stasis and avoid intra-ventricular or aortic root thrombus formation.

As asked by Guihaire and Dang Van, we observed a lower rate of successful ECMO weaning in patients exposed to epinephrine. Indeed, only 117/262 (45%) patients were decannulated alive in the epinephrine group, compared with 210/327 (64%) in the non-epinephrine group (P < 0.001). Of note, our weaning protocol follows the Extracorporeal Life Support Extracorporeal Life Support Organization (ELSO) recommendations (ELSO Guidelines for Cardiopulmonary Extracorporeal Life Support Extracorporeal Life Support Organization, Version 1.4 August 2017, Ann Arbor, MI,

© 2022 The Authors. ESC Heart Failure published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd on behalf of European Society of Cardiology.

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs License, which permits use and distribution in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, the use is non-commercial and no modifications or adaptations are made.

USA). Withdrawal of VA-ECMO is considered only if the inotropic support is minimal, to allow room for inotropic adjustment after decannulation if needed.

Finally, because we highlighted impaired splanchnic perfusion as a potential driver of epinephrine side effects, Guihaire and Dang Van wondered if mesenteric infarction was a frequent cause of death in our cohort. Only 2 deaths in each group were related to mesenteric ischemia (P = 1.0). Other main causes of death in the epinephrine and the non-epinephrine groups were persistent cardiac failure (n = 41 vs. 33, respectively; P = 0.058), multiple organ failure

(n = 23 vs. 26, respectively; P = 0.83), neurological complications (n = 9 vs. 5, respectively P = 0.17), sepsis (n = 4 vs. 5, respectively; P = 1.0), haemorrhage (n = 3 vs. 9, respectively; P = 0.24), and thrombosis (n = 3 vs. 1, respectively; P = 0.33). One may suspect that some patients dying of persistent cardiac failure had also associated pulmonary oedema, but the cause of death in this group of patients was not due to refractory respiratory failure. Given the availability of other methods to reduce LV distension and pulmonary congestion, we suggest that epinephrine should be used sparingly in VA-ECMO patients until further research can be completed.

## References

- Massart N, Mansour A, Ross JT, Ecoffey C, Aninat C, Verhoye J, Launey Y, Tadie J, Auffret V, Flecher E, Nesseler N. Epinephrine administration in venoarterial extracorporeal membrane oxygenation patients is associated with mortality: a retrospective cohort study. ESC Hear Fail 2021; 8: 2899–2906.
- Patel B, Diaz-Gomez JL, Ghanta RK, Bracey AW, Chatterjee S. Management of extracorporeal membrane oxygenation for postcardiotomy cardiogenic shock. *Anesthesiology* 2021; 135: 497–507.
- Lorusso R, Whitman G, Milojevic M, Raffa G, McMullan DM, Boeken U, Haft J, Bermudez CA, Shah AS, D'Alessandro

DA. 2020 EACTS/ELSO/STS/AATS expert consensus on post-cardiotomy extracorporeal life support in adult patients. *Eur J Cardio-thorac* 2020; **59**: 12–53.