

LINC- A multicenter, randomized trial comparing a mechanical CPR algorithm using LUCAS vs. Manual CPR in out-of-hospital cardiac arrest patients

Sten Rubertsson, Professor Department of Anaesthesiology and Intensive Care, Uppsala University, Sweden





Conflict of Interest

PI for the LINC study Consultation/Advisory-Physio-Control





Thank you!!!

Authors;

Erik Lindgren, M.D., David Smekal, M.D., Ollie Östlund, Ph. D., Johan Silfverstolpe, M.D., Robert A. Lichtveld, M.D., Ph.D., Rene Boomars, M-PA., Björn Ahlstedt, M.D., Gunnar Skoog, M.D., Robert Kastberg, M.D., David Halliwell, R.N., Martyn Box, R.N., Johan Herlitz, M.D., Ph.D., Rolf Karlsten, M.D., Ph.D.

The LINC study group;

Liselott Rehn, R.N., Tomas Nyman R.N., Wendy Bruins

Ph.D., Anja Radstok R.N., Helena Puggioli, R.N., Anna Lindblad,

R.N., Douglas Chamberlain, M.D., Fredrik Arnwald-Physio-Control, Bjarne Madsen Hardig, R.N., Ph.D. Physio-Control



LINC - from 2008 to 2013

2.300 000 population covered

>1500

in-hospital employees trained or informed

771

paramedics trained, twice a year

889

quality tests performed with paramedics

115

LUCAS devices in use

26

ambulance stations

14

hospitals





What is LINC?

A multicenter, randomized, controlled trial designed to evaluate the efficacy and safety of:







LUCAS 2TM



Mechanical Compression-Decompression

Electricity-battery

•100 compressions/min

•4-5 cm compression depth

Complete chest recoil

•50/50 duty cycle

•Allows defibrillation when running





Inclusion criteria

 Unexpected adult out-of-hospital cardiac arrest where an attempt of resuscitation is considered appropriate





Exclusion criteria

- Traumatic cardiac arrest, including hanging
- Age believed to be < 18 years
- Known pregnancy
- Patients body size not fitting the LUCAS
- Defibrillated

before LUCAS arrives at scene

crew witnessed VF/VT with ROSC







Study Algorithms





LINC study

Background variables

L-CPR

M-CPR

Age (mean)

69.0 y.o

69.1 y.o Sex-male

67%





Primary outcome





Outcome



Secondary outcome and CPC in all survivors







Conclusions

- Mechanical chest compressions using the LUCAS device in combination with defibrillation during ongoing compressions provided no improved 4-hour survival compared to conventional manual chest compressions in outof-hospital CA patients
- There was good neurologic outcome in the vast majority of the survivors in both groups





Summary

 Thus, in clinical practice CPR with the LUCAS device and defibrillation during ongoing compressions seems to have similar effectiveness as manual chest compressions

