

Part 3: Defibrillation

The 2005 Consensus Conference considered questions related to the sequence of shock delivery and the use and effectiveness of various waveforms and energies. These questions have been grouped into the following categories: (1) strategies before defibrillation, (2) use of automated external defibrillators (AEDs), (3) electrode-patient interface, (4) use of the electrocardiographic (ECG) waveform to alter management, (5) waveform and energy levels for the initial shock, (6) sequence after failure of the initial shock (ie, second and subsequent shocks), and (7) other related topics.

The *ECC Guidelines 2000*¹ state that defibrillation should be attempted as soon as ventricular fibrillation (VF) is detected, regardless of the response interval (ie, time between collapse and arrival of the AED). If the response interval is >4 to 5 minutes, however, there is evidence that 1½ to 3 minutes of CPR before attempted defibrillation may improve the victim's chance of survival. The data in support of out-of-hospital AED programs continues to accumulate, and there is some evidence supporting the use of AEDs in the hospital. Analysis of the VF waveform enables prediction of the likelihood of defibrillation success; with this information the rescuer can be instructed to give CPR or attempt defibrillation. This technology was developed by analysis of downloads from AEDs; it has yet to be applied prospectively to improve defibrillation success and is not available outside research programs.

All new defibrillators deliver a shock with a biphasic waveform. There are several varieties of biphasic waveform, but the best variant and the optimal energy level and shock strategy (fixed versus escalating) have yet to be determined. Biphasic devices achieve higher first-shock success rates than monophasic defibrillators. This fact, combined with the knowledge that interruptions to chest compressions are harmful, suggests that a 1-shock strategy (1 shock followed immediately by CPR) may be preferable to the traditional 3-shock sequence for VF and pulseless ventricular tachycardia (VT).

Strategies Before Defibrillation

Precordial Thump^{W59,W166B}

Consensus on Science

No prospective studies have evaluated the use of the precordial (chest) thump. In 3 case series (LOE 5)²⁻⁴ VF or pulseless VT was converted to a perfusing rhythm by a precordial thump. The likelihood of conversion of VF de-

creased rapidly with time (LOE 5).⁴ The conversion rate was higher for unstable or pulseless VT than for VF (LOE 5).²⁻⁶

Several observational studies indicated that an effective thump was delivered by a closed fist from a height of 5 to 40 cm (LOE 5).^{3,4,6-8} Other observational studies indicated that additional tachyarrhythmias, such as unstable supraventricular tachycardia (SVT), were terminated by precordial thump (LOE 5).^{9,10} Potential complications of the precordial thump include rhythm deteriorations, such as rate acceleration of VT, conversion of VT into VF, complete heart block, and asystole (LOE 5^{3,5,6,8,11,12}; LOE 6¹³). Existing data does not allow an accurate estimate of the likelihood of these complications.

Treatment Recommendation

One immediate precordial thump may be considered after a monitored cardiac arrest if an electrical defibrillator is not immediately available.

CPR Before Defibrillation^{W68,W177}

Consensus on Science

In a before-after study (LOE 4)¹⁴ and a randomized trial (LOE 2),¹⁵ 1½ to 3 minutes of CPR by paramedics or EMS physicians before attempted defibrillation improved return of spontaneous circulation (ROSC) and survival rates for adults with out-of-hospital VF or VT when the response interval (ambulance dispatch to arrival) and time to defibrillation was ≥4 to 5 minutes. This contrasts with the results of another trial in adults with out-of-hospital VF or VT, in which 1½ minutes of paramedic CPR before defibrillation did not improve ROSC or survival to hospital discharge (LOE 2).¹⁶ In animal studies of VF lasting ≥5 minutes, CPR (often with administration of epinephrine) before defibrillation improved hemodynamics and survival rates (LOE 6).¹⁷⁻²¹

Treatment Recommendation

A 1½- to 3-minute period of CPR before attempting defibrillation may be considered in adults with out-of-hospital VF or pulseless VT and EMS response (call to arrival) intervals >4 to 5 minutes. There is no evidence to support or refute the use of CPR before defibrillation for in-hospital cardiac arrest.

Use of AEDS

AED Programs^{W174,W175}

Consensus on Science

A randomized trial of trained lay responders in public settings (LOE 2)²² and observational studies of CPR and defibrillation

From the 2005 International Consensus Conference on Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation and Emergency Cardiovascular Care Science With Treatment Recommendations, hosted by the American Heart Association in Dallas, Texas, January 23-30, 2005.

This article has been copublished in *Resuscitation*.

(*Circulation*. 2005;112:III-17-III-24.)

© 2005 International Liaison Committee on Resuscitation, American Heart Association, and European Resuscitation Council.

This special supplement to *Circulation* is freely available at <http://www.circulationaha.org> DOI: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.105.166473

performed by trained professional responders in casinos (LOE 5)²³ and lay responders in airports (LOE 5)²⁴ and on commercial passenger airplanes (LOE 5)^{25,26} showed that AED programs are safe and feasible and significantly increase survival from out-of-hospital VF cardiac arrest if the emergency response plan is effectively implemented and sustained. In some studies defibrillation by trained first responders (eg, firefighters or police officers) has improved survival rates from witnessed out-of-hospital VF sudden cardiac arrest (LOE 2²⁷; LOE 3^{28,29}; LOE 4^{30,31}; LOE 5³²). In other studies AED defibrillation by trained first responders has not improved survival.^{14,33}

Approximately 80% of out-of-hospital cardiac arrests occur in a private or residential setting (LOE 4).³⁴ However, there is insufficient data to support or refute the effectiveness of home AED programs.

Treatment Recommendation

Use of AEDs by trained lay and professional responders is recommended to increase survival rates in patients with cardiac arrest. Use of AEDs in public settings (airports, casinos, sports facilities, etc) where witnessed cardiac arrest is likely to occur can be useful if an effective response plan is in place. The response plan should include equipment maintenance, training of likely responders, coordination with local EMS systems, and program monitoring. No recommendation can be made for or against personal or home AED deployment.

AED Program Quality Assurance and Maintenance^{W178}

Consensus on Science

No published trials specifically evaluated the effectiveness of AED program quality improvement efforts to further improve survival rates. Case series and reports suggest that potential improvements can be made by reviewing AED function (rhythm analysis and shock), battery and pad readiness, operator performance, and system performance (eg, mock codes, time to shock, outcomes) (LOE 5).^{35–42}

Treatment Recommendation

AED programs should optimize AED function (rhythm analysis and shock), battery and pad readiness, operator performance, and system performance (eg, mock codes, time to shock, outcomes).

AED Use in Hospitals^{W62A}

Consensus on Science

No published randomized trials have compared AEDs with manual defibrillators in hospitals. One study of adults with in-hospital cardiac arrest with shockable rhythms showed higher survival-to-hospital discharge rates when defibrillation was provided through an AED program than with manual defibrillation alone (LOE 4).⁴³ In an animal model, use of an AED substantially interrupted and delayed chest compressions compared with manual defibrillation (LOE 6).⁴⁴ A manikin study showed that use of an AED significantly increased the likelihood of delivering 3 shocks but increased the time to deliver the shocks when compared with manual defibrillators (LOE 6).⁴⁵ In contrast, a study of mock arrests in simulated patients showed that use of monitoring leads and

fully automated defibrillators reduced time to defibrillation when compared with manual defibrillators (LOE 7).⁴⁶

Treatment Recommendation

Use of AEDs is reasonable to facilitate early defibrillation in hospitals.

Electrode-Patient Interface

Electrode Pad/Paddle Position and

Size^{W63A,W63B,W173A,W173B}

Consensus on Science

Position. No studies of cardiac arrest in humans have evaluated the effect of pad/paddle position on defibrillation success or survival rates. Most studies evaluated cardioversion (eg, atrial fibrillation [AF]) or secondary end points (eg, transthoracic impedance [TTI]). Placement of paddles or electrode pads on the superior-anterior right chest and the inferior-lateral left chest were effective (paddles studied in AF, LOE 2⁴⁷; pads studied in AF, LOE 3⁴⁸; effect of pad position on TTI, LOE 3⁴⁹). Alternative paddle or pad positions that were reported to be effective were apex-posterior (pads studied in VF and AF, LOE 4⁵⁰; effect of pad position on TTI, LOE 3⁴⁹), and anteroposterior (paddles studied in AF, LOE 2⁵¹; pads studied in AF, LOE 2⁵², LOE 3⁵³; effect of pad position on TTI, LOE 3⁴⁹). One study showed lower TTI with longitudinal placement of the apical paddle (LOE 3).⁵⁴ Placement of the pad on the female breast increased impedance and may decrease efficacy of defibrillation (LOE 5).⁵⁵ High-voltage alternating current (eg, from high power lines) interfered with AED analysis (LOE 6).⁵⁶

Size. One human study (LOE 3)⁵⁷ and one animal study (LOE 6)⁵⁸ documented higher defibrillation success rates with larger paddles: 12.8-cm paddles were superior to 8-cm paddles. Eight studies (LOE 3^{53,57,59,60}; LOE 5⁶¹; LOE 6^{55,62,63}) demonstrated that increased pad size decreased TTI. In one canine study, significantly increased myocardial damage was reported after defibrillation with small (4.3 cm) electrodes compared with larger (8 and 12 cm) electrodes (LOE 6).⁶⁴

Treatment Recommendation

Paddles and electrode pads should be placed on the exposed chest in an anterolateral position. Acceptable alternative positions are anteroposterior (paddles and pads) and apex-posterior (pads). In large-breasted patients it is reasonable to place the left electrode pad (or paddle) lateral to or underneath the left breast. Defibrillation success may be higher with 12-cm electrodes than with 8-cm electrodes. Small electrodes (4.3 cm) may be harmful; myocardial injury can occur.

Self-Adhesive Defibrillation Pads Versus Paddles^{W71}

Consensus on Science

One randomized trial (LOE 2)⁶⁵ and 2 retrospective comparisons (LOE 4)^{50,66} showed that TTI is similar when either pads or paddles are used. One prospective comparison of pads and paddles (LOE 3)⁶⁷ showed lower TTI when paddles were applied at an optimal force of 8 kg compared with pads. One randomized study of chronic AF showed similar effectiveness for self-adhesive pads and manual paddles when monophasic

damped sinusoidal or BTE waveforms were evaluated separately (LOE 7).⁶⁸ Several studies (LOE 5⁶⁹⁻⁷¹; LOE 6⁷²) showed the practical benefits of pads over paddles for routine monitoring and defibrillation, prehospital defibrillation, and perioperative defibrillation.

Treatment Recommendation

Self-adhesive defibrillation pads are safe and effective and are an acceptable alternative to standard defibrillation paddles.

Waveform Analysis

VF waveform analysis has the potential to improve the timing and effectiveness of defibrillation attempts; this should minimize interruptions in precordial compressions and reduce the number of unsuccessful high-energy shocks, which cause postresuscitation myocardial injury. The technology is advancing rapidly but is not yet available to assist rescuers.

Prediction of Shock Success From VF

Waveform^{W64A,W64B,W64C,W65A}

Consensus on Science

Retrospective analyses of the VF waveform in clinical and animal studies and theoretical models (LOE 4⁷³⁻⁸²; LOE 6⁸³⁻⁹³) suggest that it is possible to predict with varying reliability the success of defibrillation from the fibrillation waveform. No studies specifically evaluated whether treatment can be altered by the prediction of defibrillation success to improve survival from cardiac arrest.

Initial Shock Waveform and Energy Levels

Several related questions were reviewed. Outcome after defibrillation has been studied by many investigators. When evaluating these studies the reviewer must consider the setting (eg, out-of-hospital versus in-hospital), the initial rhythm (eg, VF/pulseless VT), the duration of arrests (eg, out-of-hospital with typical EMS response interval versus electrophysiology study with 15-second arrest interval), and the specific outcome measured (eg, termination of VF at 5 seconds).

Biphasic Versus Monophasic Waveforms for Ventricular Defibrillation^{W61A,W61B,W172}

Consensus on Science

In 3 randomized cardiac arrest studies (LOE 2),⁹⁴⁻⁹⁶ a reanalysis of one of these studies (LOE 2),⁹³ 2 observational cardiac arrest studies (LOE 4),^{98,99} a meta-analysis of 7 randomized trials in the electrophysiology laboratory (LOE 1),¹⁰⁰ and multiple animal studies, defibrillation with a biphasic waveform, using equal or lower energy levels, was at least as effective for termination of VF as monophasic waveforms. No specific waveform (either monophasic or biphasic) was consistently associated with a greater incidence of ROSC or higher hospital discharge rates from cardiac arrest than any other specific waveform. One retrospective study (LOE 4)⁹⁹ showed a lower survival-to-hospital-discharge rate after defibrillation with a biphasic truncated exponential (BTE) waveform when compared with a monophasic truncated exponential (MTE) device (20% versus 39.7%, $P=0.01$), but

survival was a secondary end point. This study had multiple potential confounders, including the fact that CPR was provided to more subjects in the MTE group.

No direct comparison of the different biphasic waveforms has been reported as of 2005.

Treatment Recommendation

Biphasic waveform shocks are safe and effective for termination of VF when compared with monophasic waveform shocks.

Energy Level for Defibrillation^{W60A,W60B}

Consensus on Science

Eight human clinical studies (LOE 2⁹⁴; LOE 3¹⁰¹; LOE 5^{95,96,98,99,102,103}) described initial biphasic selected shock energy levels ranging from 100 J to 200 J with different devices but without clearly demonstrating an optimal energy level. These human clinical studies also described use of subsequent selected shock energy levels with different devices for shock-refractory VF/VT ranging from 150 J to 360 J but without clearly demonstrating an optimal energy level.

Seven more laboratory studies (LOE 7)¹⁰⁴⁻¹¹⁰ in stable patients evaluated termination of induced VF with energy levels of 115 J to 200 J.

Neither human clinical nor laboratory studies demonstrated evidence of significantly greater benefit or harm from any energy level used currently. One human study in the out-of-hospital setting showed an increased incidence of transient heart block following 2 or more 320-J monophasic damped sine wave (MDS) shocks when compared with an equal number of 175-J MDS shocks, but there was no difference in long-term clinical outcome (LOE 2).¹¹¹

Only 1 of the reviewed animal studies showed harm caused by attempted defibrillation with doses in the range of 120 J to 360 J in adult animals; this study indicated that myocardial damage was caused by higher-energy shocks (LOE 6).¹¹²

One in-hospital study of 100 patients in VF compared MDS shocks of low (200 J to 240 J), intermediate (300 J to 320 J), and high (400 J to 440 J) energy (LOE 2).¹¹³ First-shock efficacy (termination of VF for ≥ 5 seconds) was 39% for the low-energy group, 58% for the intermediate-energy group, and 56% for the high-energy dose group. These differences did not achieve statistical significance. A study of electrical cardioversion for AF indicated that 360-J MDS shocks were more effective than 100-J or 200-J MDS shocks (LOE 7).¹¹⁴ Cardioversion of a well-perfused myocardium, however, is not the same as defibrillation attempted during VF cardiac arrest, and any extrapolation should be interpreted cautiously.

Treatment Recommendation

There is insufficient evidence for or against specific selected energy levels for the first or subsequent biphasic shocks. With a biphasic defibrillator it is reasonable to use 150 J to 200 J with BTE waveforms or 120 J with the rectilinear biphasic waveform for the initial shock. With a monophasic waveform defibrillator, an initial shock of 360 J is reasonable.

Second and Subsequent Shocks

Fixed Versus Escalating Energy^{W171}

Consensus on Science

Only one small human clinical study (LOE 3)¹⁰¹ compared fixed energy with escalating energies using biphasic defibrillators. The study did not identify a clear benefit for either strategy.

Treatment Recommendation

Nonescalating- and escalating-energy biphasic waveform defibrillation can be used safely and effectively to terminate VF of both short and long duration.

1-Shock Protocol Versus 3-Shock Sequence^{W69A,W69B,W69C}

Consensus on Science

No published human or animal studies compared a 1-shock protocol with a 3-stacked shock sequence for any outcome. The magnitude of success of initial or subsequent shocks depended on the specific group of patients, the initial rhythm, and the outcome considered. Shock success was defined as termination of VF for ≥ 5 seconds after the shock. Resuscitation success can include ROSC and survival to hospital discharge. Only shock success is cited below.

First-shock success. Six studies of defibrillation in out-of-hospital cardiac arrest reported first-shock success in patients whose initial rhythm was shockable (VF/pulseless VT):

- In studies that used a 200-J MDS waveform, the first-shock success rate was 77% to 91% (LOE 2^{94,97}; LOE 5^{95,99}). In studies that used a 200-J MTE waveform, the first-shock success rate was 54% to 63% (LOE 4).^{97,99}
- In studies that used a 150-J BTE waveform^{97,99,115,116} and 1 study that used a 200-J BTE waveform,⁹⁵ the first-shock success rate was 86% to 98%.^{95,97,99,115,116}
- The first-shock success rate with a 120-J rectilinear biphasic waveform was 85% (according to L.J. Morrison, MD, in oral discussion at the 2005 Consensus Conference).⁹⁴

Although the first-shock success rate was relatively high in patients with out-of-hospital cardiac arrest and an initial rhythm of VF, the average rate of ROSC with the first shock (for MDS, MTE, and BTE waveforms) was 21% (range 13% to 23%) (LOE 5).⁹⁹

Second- and third-shock success rates. Six studies of defibrillation in out-of-hospital cardiac arrest reported the shock success (defined above) rate of the first shock and subsequent 2 shocks (if the initial shock was unsuccessful) for patients with an initial rhythm of VF/pulseless VT. The figures below refer to only those patients who remained in VF after the first shock, and they represent the proportion of these cases successfully defibrillated by either the second or third shock.

- In 2 studies that used the MDS waveform with increasing energy levels (200 J to 200/300 J to 360 J), the combined shock success of the second and/or third shocks when the first shock failed was 68% to 72% (LOE 5).^{94,99} In 2 studies that used the MTE waveform with increasing energy levels

(200 J to 200 to 360 J), the combined shock success of the second and third shocks when the first shock failed was 27% to 60% (LOE 5).^{97,99}

- In 4 studies that used the fixed-energy 150-J BTE waveform, the combined shock success of the second and third shocks when the first shock failed was 50% to 90% (LOE 5).^{97,99,115,116}
- In the 1 study that used a rectilinear waveform with increasing energy levels (120 J to 150 J to 200 J), the combined success rate of the second and third shocks when the first shock failed was 85% (LOE 5).⁹⁴

One study of defibrillation for out-of-hospital cardiac arrest in which the initial rhythm was VF reported a 26% rate of ROSC with the initial series of up to 3 shocks (for BTE waveforms) combined with preshock or postshock CPR or both (LOE 5).¹¹⁶

Treatment Recommendation

Priorities in resuscitation should include early assessment of the need for defibrillation (Part 2: "Adult Basic Life Support"), provision of CPR until a defibrillator is available, and minimization of interruptions in chest compressions. Rescuers can optimize the likelihood of defibrillation success by optimizing the performance of CPR, timing of shock delivery with respect to CPR, and the combination of waveform and energy levels. A 1-shock strategy may improve outcome by reducing interruption of chest compressions. A 3-stacked shock sequence can be optimized by immediate resumption of effective chest compressions after each shock (irrespective of the rhythm) and by minimizing the hands-off time for rhythm analysis.

Related Defibrillation Topics

Defibrillator Data Collection^{W66}

Consensus on Science

Collection of data from defibrillators enables a comparison of actual performance during cardiac arrests and training events. The results of 3 observational studies (LOE 5)¹¹⁷⁻¹¹⁹ suggest that the rate and depth of external cardiac compressions and ventilation rate were at variance with current guidelines.

Treatment Recommendation

Monitor/defibrillators modified to enable collection of data on compression rate and depth and ventilation rate may be useful for monitoring and improving process and outcomes after cardiac arrest.

Oxygen and Fire Risk During Defibrillation^{W70A,W70B}

Consensus on Science

Several case reports (LOE 5)¹²⁰⁻¹²⁵ described instances of fires ignited by sparks from poorly attached defibrillator paddles in the presence of an oxygen-enriched atmosphere. The oxygen-enriched atmosphere rarely extends >0.5 m (1.5 ft) in any direction from the oxygen outflow point, and the oxygen concentration returns quickly to ambient when the source of enrichment is removed (LOE 5¹²²; LOE 6¹²⁶). The most severe fires were caused when ventilator tubing was disconnected from the tracheal tube and then left adjacent to

the patient's head during attempted defibrillation (LOE 5).^{121,123,125} In at least one case a spark generated during defibrillation ignited oxygen delivered by a simple transparent face mask that was left in place (LOE 5).¹²⁰

In a manikin study (LOE 6)¹²⁶ there was no increase in oxygen concentration anywhere around the manikin when the ventilation device was left attached to the tracheal tube, even with an oxygen flow of 15 L/min.

Treatment Recommendation

Rescuers should take precautions to minimize sparking (by paying attention to pad/paddle placement, contact, etc) during attempted defibrillation. Rescuers should try to ensure that defibrillation is not attempted in an oxygen-enriched atmosphere.

References

- American Heart Association in collaboration with International Liaison Committee on Resuscitation. Guidelines for Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation and Emergency Cardiovascular Care—An International Consensus on Science. *Circulation*. 2000;102(suppl 1):I-1-I-384.
- Befeler B. Mechanical stimulation of the heart: its therapeutic value in tachyarrhythmias. *Chest*. 1978;73:832–838.
- Volkman HK, Klumbies A, Kühnert H, Paliege R, Dannberg G, Siebert K. Terminierung von Kammertachykardien durch mechanische Herzstimulation mit Präkordialschlägen [Terminating ventricular tachycardias by mechanical heart stimulation with precordial thumps]. *Z Kardiol*. 1990;79:717–724.
- Caldwell G, Millar G, Quinn E. Simple mechanical methods for cardioversion: defence of the precordial thump and cough version. *BMJ*. 1985;291:627–630.
- Morgera T, Baldi N, Chersevani D, Medugno G, Camerini F. Chest thump and ventricular tachycardia. *Pacing Clin Electrophysiol*. 1979;2:69–75.
- Rahner E, Zeh E. Die Regularisierung von Kammertachykardien durch präkordialen Faustschlag [The regularization of ventricular tachycardias by precordial thumping]. *Medizinische Welt*. 1978;29:1659–1663.
- Zeh E, Rahner E. [The manual extrathoracic stimulation of the heart: technique and effect of the precordial thump (author's transl)]. *Z Kardiol*. 1978;67:299–304.
- Gertsch M, Hottinger S, Hess T. Serial chest thumps for the treatment of ventricular tachycardia in patients with coronary artery disease. *Clin Cardiol*. 1992;15:181–188.
- Cotol S, Moldovan D, Carasca E. Precordial thump in the treatment of cardiac arrhythmias (electrophysiologic considerations). *Physiologie*. 1980;17:285–288.
- Cotoi S. Precordial thump and termination of cardiac reentrant tachyarrhythmias. *Am Heart J*. 1981;101:675–677.
- Krijne R. Rate acceleration of ventricular tachycardia after a precordial chest thump. *Am J Cardiol*. 1984;53:964–965.
- Sciarovsky S, Kracoff OH, Agmon J. Acceleration of ventricular tachycardia induced by a chest thump. *Chest*. 1981;80:596–599.
- Yakaitis RW, Redding JS. Precordial thumping during cardiac resuscitation. *Crit Care Med*. 1973;1:22–26.
- Cobb LA, Fahrenbruch CE, Walsh TR, Copass MK, Olsufka M, Breskin M, Hallstrom AP. Influence of cardiopulmonary resuscitation prior to defibrillation in patients with out-of-hospital ventricular fibrillation. *JAMA*. 1999;281:1182–1188.
- Wik L, Hansen TB, Fylling F, Steen T, Vaagenes P, Auestad BH, Steen PA. Delaying defibrillation to give basic cardiopulmonary resuscitation to patients with out-of-hospital ventricular fibrillation: a randomized trial. *JAMA*. 2003;289:1389–1395.
- Jacobs IG, Finn JC, Oxer HF, Jelinek GA. CPR before defibrillation in out-of-hospital cardiac arrest: a randomized trial. *Emerg Med Australas*. 2005;17:39–45.
- Berg RA, Hilwig RW, Kern KB, Ewy GA. Precursorshock cardiopulmonary resuscitation improves ventricular fibrillation median frequency and myocardial readiness for successful defibrillation from prolonged ventricular fibrillation: a randomized, controlled swine study. *Ann Emerg Med*. 2002;40:563–570.
- Berg RA, Hilwig RW, Ewy GA, Kern KB. Precursorshock cardiopulmonary resuscitation improves initial response to defibrillation from prolonged ventricular fibrillation: a randomized, controlled swine study. *Crit Care Med*. 2004;32:1352–1357.
- Kolarova J, Ayoub IM, Yi Z, Gazmuri RJ. Optimal timing for electrical defibrillation after prolonged untreated ventricular fibrillation. *Crit Care Med*. 2003;31:2022–2028.
- Niemann JT, Cairns CB, Sharma J, Lewis RJ. Treatment of prolonged ventricular fibrillation: immediate countershock versus high-dose epinephrine and CPR preceding countershock. *Circulation*. 1992;85:281–287.
- Yakaitis RW, Ewy GA, Otto CW, Taren DL, Moon TE. Influence of time and therapy on ventricular defibrillation in dogs. *Crit Care Med*. 1980;8:157–163.
- The Public Access Defibrillation Trial Investigators. Public-access defibrillation and survival after out-of-hospital cardiac arrest. *N Engl J Med*. 2004;351:637–646.
- Valenzuela TD, Roe DJ, Nichol G, Clark LL, Spaite DW, Hardman RG. Outcomes of rapid defibrillation by security officers after cardiac arrest in casinos. *N Engl J Med*. 2000;343:1206–1209.
- Caffrey SL, Willoughby PJ, Pepe PE, Becker LB. Public use of automated external defibrillators. *N Engl J Med*. 2002;347:1242–1247.
- O'Rourke MF, Donaldson E, Geddes JS. An airline cardiac arrest program. *Circulation*. 1997;96:2849–2853.
- Page RL, Joglar JA, Kowal RC, Zagrodzky JD, Nelson LL, Ramaswamy K, Barbera SJ, Hamdan MH, McKenas DK. Use of automated external defibrillators by a US airline. *N Engl J Med*. 2000;343:1210–1216.
- van Alem AP, Vrenken RH, de Vos R, Tijssen JG, Koster RW. Use of automated external defibrillator by first responders in out of hospital cardiac arrest: prospective controlled trial [published correction appears in *BMJ*. 2004;328:396]. *BMJ*. 2003;327:1312.
- Myerburg RJ, Fenster J, Velez M, Rosenberg D, Lai S, Kurlansky P, Newton S, Knox M, Castellanos A. Impact of community-wide police car deployment of automated external defibrillators on survival from out-of-hospital cardiac arrest. *Circulation*. 2002;106:1058–1064.
- Capucci A, Aschieri D, Piepoli MF, Bardy GH, Iconomu E, Arvedi M. Tripling survival from sudden cardiac arrest via early defibrillation without traditional education in cardiopulmonary resuscitation. *Circulation*. 2002;106:1065–1070.
- White RD, Bunch TJ, Hankins DG. Evolution of a community-wide early defibrillation programme experience over 13 years using police/fire personnel and paramedics as responders. *Resuscitation*. 2005;65:279–283.
- Mosesso VN Jr, Davis EA, Auble TE, Paris PM, Yealy DM. Use of automated external defibrillators by police officers for treatment of out-of-hospital cardiac arrest. *Ann Emerg Med*. 1998;32:200–207.
- Smith KL, McNeil JJ. Cardiac arrests treated by ambulance paramedics and fire fighters: the Emergency Medical Response program. *Med J Australia*. 2002;177:305–309.
- Kellermann AL, Hackman BB, Somes G, Kreth TK, Nail L, Dobyns P. Impact of first-responder defibrillation in an urban emergency medical services system. *JAMA*. 1993;270:1708–1713.
- Becker L, Eisenberg M, Fahrenbruch C, Cobb L. Public locations of cardiac arrest: implications for public access defibrillation. *Circulation*. 1998;97:2106–2109.
- Herlitz J, Bang A, Axelsson A, Graves JR, Lindqvist J. Experience with the use of automated external defibrillators in out of hospital cardiac arrest. *Resuscitation*. 1998;37:3–7.
- Kellermann AL, Hackman BB, Dobyns P, Frazier C, Nail L. Engineering excellence: options to enhance firefighter compliance with standing orders for first-responder defibrillation. *Ann Emerg Med*. 1993;22:1269–1275.
- Macdonald RD, Swanson JM, Mottley JL, Weinstein C. Performance and error analysis of automated external defibrillator use in the out-of-hospital setting. *Ann Emerg Med*. 2001;38:262–267.
- Sunde K, Eftestol T, Askenberg C, Steen PA. Quality assessment of defibrillation and advanced life support using data from the medical control module of the defibrillator. *Resuscitation*. 1999;41:237–247.
- Cleland MJ, Maloney JP, Rowe BH. Problems associated with the Z-fold region of defibrillation electrodes. *J Emerg Med*. 1998;16:157–161.
- Davis EA, Mosesso VN Jr. Performance of police first responders in utilizing automated external defibrillation on victims of sudden cardiac arrest. *Prehosp Emerg Care*. 1998;2:101–107.

41. Ornato JP, Shipley J, Powell RG, Racht EM. Inappropriate electrical countershocks by an automated external defibrillator. *Ann Emerg Med.* 1992;21:1278–1282.
42. Calle PA, Monsieurs KG, Buylaert WA. Unreliable post event report from an automated external defibrillator. *Resuscitation.* 2001;50:357–361.
43. Zafari AM, Zarter SK, Heggen V, Wilson P, Taylor RA, Reddy K, Backscheider AG, Dudley SC Jr. A program encouraging early defibrillation results in improved in-hospital resuscitation efficacy. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2004;44:846–852.
44. Berg RA, Hilwig RW, Kern KB, Sanders AB, Xavier LC, Ewy GA. Automated external defibrillation versus manual defibrillation for prolonged ventricular fibrillation: lethal delays of chest compressions before and after countershocks. *Ann Emerg Med.* 2003;42:458–467.
45. Domanovits H, Meron G, Sterz F, Kofler J, Oschatz E, Holzer M, Mullner M, Laggner AN. Successful automatic external defibrillator operation by people trained only in basic life support in a simulated cardiac arrest situation. *Resuscitation.* 1998;39:47–50.
46. Cusnir H, Tongia R, Sheka KP, Kavesteen D, Segal RR, Nowakiwskyj VN, Cassera F, Scherer H, Costello D, Valerio L, Yens DP, Shani J, Hollander G. In hospital cardiac arrest: a role for automatic defibrillation. *Resuscitation.* 2004;63:183–188.
47. Alp NJ, Rahman S, Bell JA, Shahi M. Randomised comparison of antero-lateral versus antero-posterior paddle positions for DC cardioversion of persistent atrial fibrillation. *Int J Cardiol.* 2000;75:211–216.
48. Mathew TP, Moore A, McIntyre M, Harbinson MT, Campbell NP, Adgey AA, Dalzell GW. Randomised comparison of electrode positions for cardioversion of atrial fibrillation. *Heart.* 1999;81:576–579.
49. Garcia LA, Kerber RE. Transthoracic defibrillation: does electrode adhesive pad position alter transthoracic impedance? *Resuscitation.* 1998;37:139–143.
50. Kerber RE, Martins JB, Kelly KJ, Ferguson DW, Kouba C, Jensen SR, Newman B, Parke JD, Kieso R, Melton J. Self-adhesive preapplied electrode pads for defibrillation and cardioversion. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 1984;3:815–820.
51. Botto GL, Politi A, Bonini W, Broffoni T, Bonatti R. External cardioversion of atrial fibrillation: role of paddle position on technical efficacy and energy requirements. *Heart.* 1999;82:726–730.
52. Kirchhof P, Eckardt L, Loh P, Weber K, Fischer RJ, Seidl KH, Bocker D, Breithardt G, Haverkamp W, Borggrefe M. Anterior-posterior versus anterior-lateral electrode positions for external cardioversion of atrial fibrillation: a randomised trial. *Lancet.* 2002;360:1275–1279.
53. Kerber RE, Grayzel J, Hoyt R, Marcus M, Kennedy J. Transthoracic resistance in human defibrillation: influence of body weight, chest size, serial shocks, paddle size and paddle contact pressure. *Circulation.* 1981;63:676–682.
54. Deakin CD, Sado DM, Petley GW, Clewlow F. Is the orientation of the apical defibrillation paddle of importance during manual external defibrillation? *Resuscitation.* 2003;56:15–18.
55. Pagan-Carlo LA, Spencer KT, Robertson CE, Dengler A, Birkett C, Kerber RE. Transthoracic defibrillation: importance of avoiding electrode placement directly on the female breast. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 1996;27:449–452.
56. Kanz KG, Kay MV, Biberthaler P, Russ W, Wessel S, Lackner CK, Mutschler W. Susceptibility of automated external defibrillators to train overhead lines and metro third rails. *Resuscitation.* 2004;62:189–198.
57. Dalzell GW, Cunningham SR, Anderson J, Adgey AA. Electrode pad size, transthoracic impedance and success of external ventricular defibrillation. *Am J Cardiol.* 1989;64:741–744.
58. Thomas ED, Ewy GA, Dahl CF, Ewy MD. Effectiveness of direct current defibrillation: role of paddle electrode size. *Am Heart J.* 1977;93:463–467.
59. Samson RA, Atkins DL, Kerber RE. Optimal size of self-adhesive preapplied electrode pads in pediatric defibrillation. *Am J Cardiol.* 1995;75:544–545.
60. Atkins DL, Sirna S, Kieso R, Charbonnier F, Kerber RE. Pediatric defibrillation: importance of paddle size in determining transthoracic impedance. *Pediatrics.* 1988;82:914–918.
61. Atkins DL, Kerber RE. Pediatric defibrillation: current flow is improved by using “adult” electrode paddles. *Pediatrics.* 1994;94:90–93.
62. Hoyt R, Grayzel J, Kerber RE. Determinants of intracardiac current in defibrillation: experimental studies in dogs. *Circulation.* 1981;64:818–823.
63. Killingsworth CR, Melnick SB, Chapman FW, Walker RG, Smith WM, Ideker RE, Walcott GP. Defibrillation threshold and cardiac responses using an external biphasic defibrillator with pediatric and adult adhesive patches in pediatric-sized piglets. *Resuscitation.* 2002;55:177–185.
64. Dahl CF, Ewy GA, Warner ED, Thomas ED. Myocardial necrosis from direct current countershock: effect of paddle electrode size and time interval between discharges. *Circulation.* 1974;50:956–961.
65. Deakin C, McLaren R, Petley G, Clewlow F, Dalrymple-Hay M. A comparison of transthoracic impedance using standard defibrillation paddles and self-adhesive defibrillation pads. *Resuscitation.* 1998;39:43–46.
66. Kerber RE, Martins JB, Ferguson DW, Jensen SR, Parke JD, Kieso R, Melton J. Experimental evaluation and initial clinical application of new self-adhesive defibrillation electrodes. *Int J Cardiol.* 1985;8:57–66.
67. Deakin CD. Paddle size in defibrillation. *Br J Anaesth.* 1998;81:657–658.
68. Kirchhof P, Monnig G, Wasmer K, Heinecke A, Breithardt G, Eckardt L, Bocker D. A trial of self-adhesive patch electrodes and hand-held paddle electrodes for external cardioversion of atrial fibrillation (MOBIPAPA). *Eur Heart J [serial online].* February 25, 2005. Epub ahead of print.
69. Bojar RM, Payne DD, Rastegar H, Diehl JT, Cleveland RJ. Use of self-adhesive external defibrillator pads for complex cardiac surgical procedures. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 1988;46:587–588.
70. Brown J, Rogers J, Soar J. Cardiac arrest during surgery and ventilation in the prone position: a case report and systematic review. *Resuscitation.* 2001;50:233–238.
71. Wilson RF, Sirna S, White CW, Kerber RE. Defibrillation of high-risk patients during coronary angiography using self-adhesive, preapplied electrode pads. *Am J Cardiol.* 1987;60:380–382.
72. Bradbury N, Hyde D, Nolan J. Reliability of ECG monitoring with a gel pad/paddle combination after defibrillation. *Resuscitation.* 2000;44:203–206.
73. Callaway CW, Sherman LD, Mosesso VN Jr, Dietrich TJ, Holt E, Clarkson MC. Scaling exponent predicts defibrillation success for out-of-hospital ventricular fibrillation cardiac arrest. *Circulation.* 2001;103:1656–1661.
74. Eftestol T, Sunde K, Aase SO, Husoy JH, Steen PA. Predicting outcome of defibrillation by spectral characterization and nonparametric classification of ventricular fibrillation in patients with out-of-hospital cardiac arrest. *Circulation.* 2000;102:1523–1529.
75. Eftestol T, Wik L, Sunde K, Steen PA. Effects of cardiopulmonary resuscitation on predictors of ventricular fibrillation defibrillation success during out-of-hospital cardiac arrest. *Circulation.* 2004;110:10–15.
76. Weaver WD, Cobb LA, Dennis D, Ray R, Hallstrom AP, Copass MK. Amplitude of ventricular fibrillation waveform and outcome after cardiac arrest. *Ann Intern Med.* 1985;102:53–55.
77. Brown CG, Dzwonczyk R. Signal analysis of the human electrocardiogram during ventricular fibrillation: frequency and amplitude parameters as predictors of successful countershock. *Ann Emerg Med.* 1996;27:184–188.
78. Callahan M, Braun O, Valentine W, Clark DM, Zegans C. Prehospital cardiac arrest treated by urban first-responders: profile of patient response and prediction of outcome by ventricular fibrillation waveform. *Ann Emerg Med.* 1993;22:1664–1677.
79. Strohmenger HU, Lindner KH, Brown CG. Analysis of the ventricular fibrillation ECG signal amplitude and frequency parameters as predictors of countershock success in humans. *Chest.* 1997;111:584–589.
80. Strohmenger HU, Eftestol T, Sunde K, Wenzel V, Mair M, Ulmer H, Lindner KH, Steen PA. The predictive value of ventricular fibrillation electrocardiogram signal frequency and amplitude variables in patients with out-of-hospital cardiac arrest. *Anesth Analg.* 2001;93:1428–1433.
81. Podbregar M, Kovacic M, Podbregar-Mars A, Brezocnik M. Predicting defibrillation success by ‘genetic’ programming in patients with out-of-hospital cardiac arrest. *Resuscitation.* 2003;57:153–159.
82. Monsieurs KG, De Cauwer H, Wuyts FL, Bossaert LL. A rule for early outcome classification of out-of-hospital cardiac arrest patients presenting with ventricular fibrillation. *Resuscitation.* 1998;36:37–44.
83. Menegazzi JJ, Callaway CW, Sherman LD, Hostler DP, Wang HE, Fertig KC, Logue ES. Ventricular fibrillation scaling exponent can guide timing of defibrillation and other therapies. *Circulation.* 2004;109:926–931.
84. Povoas HP, Weil MH, Tang W, Bisera J, Klouche K, Barbatsis A. Predicting the success of defibrillation by electrocardiographic analysis. *Resuscitation.* 2002;53:77–82.

85. Noc M, Weil MH, Tang W, Sun S, Perna A, Bisera J. Electrocardiographic prediction of the success of cardiac resuscitation. *Crit Care Med.* 1999;27:708–714.
86. Strohmer HU, Lindner KH, Keller A, Lindner IM, Pfenninger EG. Spectral analysis of ventricular fibrillation and closed-chest cardiopulmonary resuscitation. *Resuscitation.* 1996;33:155–161.
87. Noc M, Weil MH, Gazmuri RJ, Sun S, Bisera J, Tang W. Ventricular fibrillation voltage as a monitor of the effectiveness of cardiopulmonary resuscitation. *J Lab Clin Med.* 1994;124:421–426.
88. Lightfoot CB, Nremt P, Callaway CW, Hsieh M, Fertig KC, Sherman LD, Menegazzi JJ. Dynamic nature of electrocardiographic waveform predicts rescue shock outcome in porcine ventricular fibrillation. *Ann Emerg Med.* 2003;42:230–241.
89. Marn-Perna A, Weil MH, Tang W, Perna A, Bisera J. Optimizing timing of ventricular defibrillation. *Crit Care Med.* 2001;29:2360–2365.
90. Hamprecht FA, Achleitner U, Krismer AC, Lindner KH, Wenzel V, Strohmer HU, Thiel W, van Gunsteren WF, Amann A. Fibrillation power, an alternative method of ECG spectral analysis for prediction of countershock success in a porcine model of ventricular fibrillation. *Resuscitation.* 2001;50:287–296.
91. Amann A, Achleitner U, Antretter H, Bonatti JO, Krismer AC, Lindner KH, Rieder J, Wenzel V, Voelckel WG, Strohmer HU. Analysing ventricular fibrillation ECG-signals and predicting defibrillation success during cardiopulmonary resuscitation employing N(alpha)-histograms. *Resuscitation.* 2001;50:77–85.
92. Brown CG, Griffith RF, Van Ligten P, Hoekstra J, Nejman G, Mitchell L, Dzwonczyk R. Median frequency—a new parameter for predicting defibrillation success rate. *Ann Emerg Med.* 1991;20:787–789.
93. Amann A, Rheinberger K, Achleitner U, Krismer AC, Lingnau W, Lindner KH, Wenzel V. The prediction of defibrillation outcome using a new combination of mean frequency and amplitude in porcine models of cardiac arrest. *Anesth Analg.* 2002;95:716–722.
94. Morrison LJ, Dorian P, Long J, Vermeulen M, Schwartz B, Sawadsky B, et al. Out-of-hospital cardiac arrest rectilinear biphasic to monophasic damped sine defibrillation waveforms with advanced life support intervention trial (ORBIT). *Resuscitation.* 2005;66:149–157.
95. van Alem AP, Chapman FW, Lank P, Hart AA, Koster RW. A prospective, randomised and blinded comparison of first shock success of monophasic and biphasic waveforms in out-of-hospital cardiac arrest. *Resuscitation.* 2003;58:17–24.
96. Schneider T, Martens PR, Paschen H, Kuisma M, Wolcke B, Gliner BE, Russell JK, Weaver WD, Bossaert L, Chamberlain D. Multicenter, randomized, controlled trial of 150-J biphasic shocks compared with 200- to 360-J monophasic shocks in the resuscitation of out-of-hospital cardiac arrest victims. *Circulation.* 2000;102:1780–1787.
97. Martens PR, Russell JK, Wolcke B, Paschen H, Kuisma M, Gliner BE, Weaver WD, Bossaert L, Chamberlain D, Schneider T. Optimal Response to Cardiac Arrest study: defibrillation waveform effects. *Resuscitation.* 2001;49:233–243.
98. Stothert JC, Hatcher TS, Gupton CL, Love JE, Brewer JE. Rectilinear biphasic waveform defibrillation of out-of-hospital cardiac arrest. *Prehosp Emerg Care.* 2004;8:388–392.
99. Carpenter J, Rea TD, Murray JA, Kudenchuk PJ, Eisenberg MS. Defibrillation waveform and post-shock rhythm in out-of-hospital ventricular fibrillation cardiac arrest. *Resuscitation.* 2003;59:189–196.
100. Faddy SC, Powell J, Craig JC. Biphasic and monophasic shocks for transthoracic defibrillation: a meta analysis of randomised controlled trials. *Resuscitation.* 2003;58:9–16.
101. Walsh SJ, McClelland AJ, Owens CG, Allen J, Anderson JM, Turner C, Adgey AA. Efficacy of distinct energy delivery protocols comparing two biphasic defibrillators for cardiac arrest. *Am J Cardiol.* 2004;94:378–380.
102. Gliner BE, Lyster TE, Dillion SM, Bardy GH. Transthoracic defibrillation of swine with monophasic and biphasic waveforms. *Circulation.* 1995;92:1634–1643.
103. White RD, Russell JK. Refibrillation, resuscitation and survival in out-of-hospital sudden cardiac arrest victims treated with biphasic automated external defibrillators. *Resuscitation.* 2002;55:17–23.
104. Bain AC, Swerdlow CD, Love CJ, Ellenbogen KA, Deering TF, Brewer JE, Augustini RS, Tchou PJ. Multicenter study of principles-based waveforms for external defibrillation. *Ann Emerg Med.* 2001;37:5–12.
105. Bardy GH, Gliner BE, Kudenchuk PJ, Poole JE, Dolack GL, Jones GK, Anderson J, Troutman C, Johnson G. Truncated biphasic pulses for transthoracic defibrillation. *Circulation.* 1995;91:1768–1774.
106. Bardy GH, Marchlinski F, Sharma A, Worley SJ, Luceri RM, Yee R, Halperin BD, Fellows CL, Ahern TS, Chilson DA, Packer DL, Wilber DJ, Mattioni TA, Reddy R, Kronmal RA, Lazzara R. Multicenter comparison of truncated biphasic shocks and standard damped sine wave monophasic shocks for transthoracic ventricular fibrillation. Transthoracic Investigators. *Circulation.* 1996;94:2507–2514.
107. Greene HL, DiMarco JP, Kudenchuk PJ, Scheinman MM, Tang AS, Reiter MJ, Echt DS, Chapman PD, Jazayeri MR, Chapman FW, et al. Comparison of monophasic and biphasic defibrillating pulse waveforms for transthoracic cardioversion. Biphasic Waveform Defibrillation Investigators. *Am J Cardiol.* 1995;75:1135–1139.
108. Higgins SL, Herre JM, Epstein AE, Greer GS, Friedman PL, Gleva ML, Porterfield JG, Chapman FW, Finkel ES, Schmitt PW, Nova RC, Greene HL. A comparison of biphasic and monophasic shocks for external defibrillation. Physio-Control Biphasic Investigators. *Prehosp Emerg Care.* 2000;4:305–313.
109. Higgins SL, O'Grady SG, Banville I, Chapman FW, Schmitt PW, Lank P, Walker RG, Iliina M. Efficacy of lower-energy biphasic shocks for transthoracic defibrillation: a follow-up clinical study. *Prehosp Emerg Care.* 2004;8:262–267.
110. Mittal S, Ayati S, Stein KM, Knight BP, Morady F, Schwartzman D, Cavlovich D, Platia EV, Calkins H, Tchou PJ, Miller JM, Wharton JM, Sung RJ, Slotwiner DJ, Markowitz SM, Lerman BB. Comparison of a novel rectilinear biphasic waveform with a damped sine wave monophasic waveform for transthoracic ventricular defibrillation. ZOLL Investigators. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 1999;34:1595–1601.
111. Weaver WD, Cobb LA, Copass MK, Hallstrom AP. Ventricular defibrillation: a comparative trial using 175-J and 320-J shocks. *N Engl J Med.* 1982;307:1101–1106.
112. Tang W, Weil MH, Sun S, Yamaguchi H, Povoas HP, Perna AM, Bisera J. The effects of biphasic and conventional monophasic defibrillation on postresuscitation myocardial function. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 1999;34:815–822.
113. Morgan JP, Hearne SF, Raizes GS, White RD, Giuliani ER. High-energy versus low-energy defibrillation: experience in patients (excluding those in the intensive care unit) at Mayo Clinic-affiliated hospitals. *Mayo Clin Proc.* 1984;59:829–834.
114. Joglar JA, Hamdan MH, Ramaswamy K, Zagrodzky JD, Sheehan CJ, Nelson LL, Andrews TC, Page RL. Initial energy for elective external cardioversion of persistent atrial fibrillation. *Am J Cardiol.* 2000;86:348–350.
115. Gliner BE, Jorgenson DB, Poole JE, White RD, Kanz KG, Lyster TD, Leyde KW, Powers DJ, Morgan CB, Kronmal RA, Bardy GH. Treatment of out-of-hospital cardiac arrest with a low-energy impedance-compensating biphasic waveform automatic external defibrillator. The LIFE Investigators. *Biomed Instrum Technol.* 1998;32:631–644.
116. White RD, Blackwell TH, Russell JK, Snyder DE, Jorgenson DB. Transthoracic impedance does not affect defibrillation, resuscitation or survival in patients with out-of-hospital cardiac arrest treated with a non-escalating biphasic waveform defibrillator. *Resuscitation.* 2005;64:63–69.
117. Auferheide TP, Sigurdsson G, Pirralo RG, Yannopoulos D, McKnite S, von Briesen C, Sparks CW, Conrad CJ, Provo TA, Lurie KG. Hyperventilation-induced hypotension during cardiopulmonary resuscitation. *Circulation.* 2004;109:1960–1965.
118. Abella BS, Alvarado JP, Myklebust H, Edelson DP, Barry A, O'Hearn N, Vanden Hoek TL, Becker LB. Quality of cardiopulmonary resuscitation during in-hospital cardiac arrest. *JAMA.* 2005;293:305–310.
119. Wik L, Kramer-Johansen J, Myklebust H, Sorebo H, Svensson L, Fellows B, Steen PA. Quality of cardiopulmonary resuscitation during out-of-hospital cardiac arrest. *JAMA.* 2005;293:299–304.
120. Miller PH. Potential fire hazard in defibrillation. *JAMA.* 1972;221:192.
121. Hummel RS III, Ornato JP, Weinberg SM, Clarke AM. Spark-generating properties of electrode gels used during defibrillation: a potential fire hazard. *JAMA.* 1988;260:3021–3024.
122. Fires from defibrillation during oxygen administration. *Health Devices.* 1994;23:307–309.
123. Lefever J, Smith A. Risk of fire when using defibrillation in an oxygen enriched atmosphere. *Med Devices Agency Safety Notices.* 1995;3:1–3.
124. Ward ME. Risk of fires when using defibrillators in an oxygen enriched atmosphere. *Resuscitation.* 1996;31:173.
125. Theodorou AA, Gutierrez JA, Berg RA. Fire attributable to a defibrillation attempt in a neonate. *Pediatrics.* 2003;112:677–679.

126. Robertshaw H, McAnulty G. Ambient oxygen concentrations during simulated cardiopulmonary resuscitation. *Anaesthesia*. 1998;53:634–637.

Worksheets Cited

- W59. <http://circ.ahajournals.org/cgi/content/full/CIRCULATIONAHA.105.170522/DC90>
- W60A. <http://circ.ahajournals.org/cgi/content/full/CIRCULATIONAHA.105.170522/DC91>
- W60B. <http://circ.ahajournals.org/cgi/content/full/CIRCULATIONAHA.105.170522/DC92>
- W61A. <http://circ.ahajournals.org/cgi/content/full/CIRCULATIONAHA.105.170522/DC93>
- W61B. <http://circ.ahajournals.org/cgi/content/full/CIRCULATIONAHA.105.170522/DC94>
- W62A. <http://circ.ahajournals.org/cgi/content/full/CIRCULATIONAHA.105.170522/DC95>
- W63A. <http://circ.ahajournals.org/cgi/content/full/CIRCULATIONAHA.105.170522/DC97>
- W63B. <http://circ.ahajournals.org/cgi/content/full/CIRCULATIONAHA.105.170522/DC98>
- W64A. <http://circ.ahajournals.org/cgi/content/full/CIRCULATIONAHA.105.170522/DC99>
- W64B. <http://circ.ahajournals.org/cgi/content/full/CIRCULATIONAHA.105.170522/DC100>
- W64C. <http://circ.ahajournals.org/cgi/content/full/CIRCULATIONAHA.105.170522/DC101>
- W65A. <http://circ.ahajournals.org/cgi/content/full/CIRCULATIONAHA.105.170522/DC102>
- W66. <http://circ.ahajournals.org/cgi/content/full/CIRCULATIONAHA.105.170522/DC104>
- W68. <http://circ.ahajournals.org/cgi/content/full/CIRCULATIONAHA.105.170522/DC106>
- W69A. <http://circ.ahajournals.org/cgi/content/full/CIRCULATIONAHA.105.170522/DC107>
- W69B. <http://circ.ahajournals.org/cgi/content/full/CIRCULATIONAHA.105.170522/DC108>
- W69C. <http://circ.ahajournals.org/cgi/content/full/CIRCULATIONAHA.105.170522/DC109>
- W70A. <http://circ.ahajournals.org/cgi/content/full/CIRCULATIONAHA.105.170522/DC110>
- W70B. <http://circ.ahajournals.org/cgi/content/full/CIRCULATIONAHA.105.170522/DC111>
- W71. <http://circ.ahajournals.org/cgi/content/full/CIRCULATIONAHA.105.170522/DC112>
- W166B. <http://circ.ahajournals.org/cgi/content/full/CIRCULATIONAHA.105.170522/DC285>
- W171. <http://circ.ahajournals.org/cgi/content/full/CIRCULATIONAHA.105.170522/DC294>
- W172. <http://circ.ahajournals.org/cgi/content/full/CIRCULATIONAHA.105.170522/DC295>
- W173A. <http://circ.ahajournals.org/cgi/content/full/CIRCULATIONAHA.105.170522/DC296>
- W174. <http://circ.ahajournals.org/cgi/content/full/CIRCULATIONAHA.105.170522/DC299>
- W175. <http://circ.ahajournals.org/cgi/content/full/CIRCULATIONAHA.105.170522/DC300>
- W177. <http://circ.ahajournals.org/cgi/content/full/CIRCULATIONAHA.105.170522/DC302>
- W178. <http://circ.ahajournals.org/cgi/content/full/CIRCULATIONAHA.105.170522/DC303>