are also available in alerting clinicians to timing and need for palliative care, especially in older patients.³

Evidence for benefit of early palliative care is emerging for structured palliative care services for HF. The PAL-HF randomised controlled trial shows that an interdisciplinary palliative care can yield greater benefits in quality of life, anxiety, depression, and spiritual well-being compared with usual care alone.⁴ Challenges in withholding or withdrawing care options like with non-invasive ventilation, implantable defibrillators, left ventricular assistive devices will need to be further addressed. Serious illness conversation guide from Harvard University is available also in local Hong Kong Chinese setting to facilitate discussion.⁵

Good HF care necessitates an integrated care programme, with palliative team working hand in hand with cardiologists.

REFERENCES

1. Gibbs LME, Addington-Hall J, Gibbs JSR. Dying from Heart Failure: lessons from Palliative Care. *BMJ* 1998;**317**:961–962.
2. Braun LT, Grady KL, Kutner JS, et al. Palliative Care and Cardiovascular Disease and Stroke: A Policy Statement from the American Heart Association/American Stroke Association. *Circulation* 2016;**134**:e198–e225.
3. Coventry PA, Grande GE, Richards TA, Todd CJ. Prediction of appropriate timing of palliative care for older adults with non-malignant life-threatening disease. A systematic review. *Age Ageing* 2005;**34**:218–27.
4. Rogers JG, Patel CB, Mentz RJ, et al. Palliative Care in Heart Failure: The PAL-HF Randomised, Controlled Clinical Trial. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2017;**70**:331–341.
5. Jockey Club End-of-Life Community Care Project. Serious illness communication guide in Hong Kong, 2018. (accessible at https://youtu.be/_5RxYHWCPg).

12

CHALLENGES IN SHOCK MANAGEMENT IN THE EMERGENCY DEPARTMENT

Colin A Graham. Accident and Emergency Medicine Academic Unit, Faculty of Medicine, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Prince of Wales Hospital, Hong Kong SAR

10.1136/heartasia-2019-apahff.12

The diagnosis and emergency management of patients with shock (poor end organ perfusion with reduced tissue oxygen delivery, usually associated with systolic hypotension) is difficult even in optimum circumstances. The challenge is multiplied when patients have to be managed in overcrowded and poorly resourced emergency departments (ED).

In Hong Kong, public hospital EDs manage over two million patient attendances annually, equivalent to 30% of Hong Kong's population. Around 30% of ED patients require emergency hospital admission, with the majority being more than 80 years old. Hong Kong's ageing population, with its associated comorbidities and polypharmacy, has inevitably contributed to rising numbers of critically ill ED patients in recent years.

Shock is a major cause (and consequence) of critical illness in ED patients. Hypovolaemic shock is frequently secondary to gastrointestinal bleeding and trauma; septic shock is increasingly common due to better recognition in the ED and more patients with chronic immunosuppression. Cardiogenic shock is common, usually due to acute myocardial infarction. Optimum treatment for these patients is undoubtedly emergency revascularisation by primary percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI).

Hong Kong currently does not have a regionalised or coordinated PCI service and this may contribute to the poor outcomes seen in elderly patients with cardiogenic shock. Increasingly, patients with acute on chronic heart failure often

present with shock and require a coordinated specialist approach at the earliest opportunity to improve outcomes.

Comprehensive collaboration between emergency medicine physicians, cardiologists, cardiothoracic surgeons and critical care services and shared clinical management are vital to optimise patient outcomes.

13

THE SHOCK TEAM APPROACH: THE RATIONALE AND EVIDENCE

Michael S Kiernan. CardIVascular Center, Tufts Medical Center and Tufts University School of Medicine, Boston, Massachusetts, USA

10.1136/heartasia-2019-apahff.13

Cardiogenic shock (CS) is defined as a state of ineffective cardiac output caused by a cardiac disorder that results in both clinical and biochemical manifestations of inadequate tissue perfusion.¹ Among patients presenting with CS, there is a spectrum of disease whereby some patients can be stabilised with pharmacologic interventions alone, while others require escalation to mechanical circulatory support (MCS).² As patients and treatment options both become increasingly complex, comprehensive critical care may be best delivered in disease-specific service line ICUs.² The model of the cardiac ICU has transitioned over time from one focused on electrocardiographic monitoring for early identification and termination of peri-infarct arrhythmias, to units experienced with invasive haemodynamic monitoring and management of percutaneous/surgically placed MCS devices for the treatment of CS. Early recognition of shock is vital to improving outcomes, and in-hospital survival for CS has been observed to be reduced in patients who are more rapidly supported with MCS.³ Integrating dedicated intensivists into ICU teams has therefore not surprisingly been demonstrated to improve survival in critically-ill patients.⁴ Furthermore, survival for CS may be better when treated at specialised centres with greater experience compared to centres with lower annual volume of shock cases.⁵ Contemporary, comprehensive cardiac critical care includes multidisciplinary teams with expertise in MCS, pharmacotherapy, mechanical ventilation, renal replacement therapies, and palliative care. Shock teams have necessarily expanded beyond a given institution to incorporate networks of centres, such that highly specialised care is centralised at quaternary referral centres with resources and expertise to manage this complex condition.

REFERENCES

1. van Diepen S, Katz JN, Albert NM, Henry TD, Jacobs AK, Kapur NK, Kilic A, Menon V, Ohman EM, Sweitzer NK, Thiele H, Washam JB, Cohen MG; American Heart Association Council on Clinical Cardiology; Council on Cardiovascular and Stroke Nursing; Council on Quality of Care and Outcomes Research; and Mission: Lifeline. Contemporary Management of Cardiogenic Shock: A Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association. *Circulation* 2017;**136**:e232–e268.
2. Morrow DA, Fang JC, Fintel DJ, Granger CB, Katz JN, Kushner FG, Kuvin JT, Lopez-Sendon J, McAreavey D, Nallamothu B, Page RL 2nd, Parillo JE, Peterson PN, Winkelman C; American Heart Association Council on Cardiopulmonary, Critical Care, Perioperative and Resuscitation, Council on Clinical Cardiology, Council on Cardiovascular Nursing, and Council on Quality of Care and Outcomes Research. Evolution of critical care cardiology: transformation of the cardiovascular intensive care unit and the emerging need for new medical staffing and training models: a scientific statement from the American Heart Association. *Circulation* 2012;**126**:1408–1428.
3. Basir MB, Schreiber TL, Grines CL, Dixon SR, Moses JW, Maini BS, Khandelwal AK, Ohman EM, O'Neill WW. Effect of Early Initiation of Mechanical Circulatory Support on Survival in Cardiogenic Shock. *Am J Cardiol* 2017;**119**:845–851.

4. Na SJ, Chung CR, Jeon K, Park CM, Suh GY, Ahn JH, Carriere KC, Song YB, Choi JO, Hahn JY, Choi JH, Choi SH, On YK, Gwon HC, Jeon ES, Kim DK, Yang JH. Association Between Presence of a Cardiac Intensivist and Mortality in an Adult Cardiac Care Unit. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2016;**68**:2637–2648.
5. Shaefi S, O’Gara B, Kociol RD, Joynt K, Mueller A, Nizamuddin J, Mahmood E, Talmor D, Shahul S. Effect of cardiogenic shock hospital volume on mortality in patients with cardiogenic shock. *J Am Heart Assoc* 2015;**4**:e001462.

14

A LIFE SUPPORT-BASED COMPREHENSIVE TREATMENT REGIMEN DRAMATICALLY REDUCED IN-HOSPITAL MORTALITY OF FULMINANT MYOCARDITIS PATIENTS

Dao Wen Wang, Jiangang Jiang, Sheng Li, Yan Wang, Hong Wang, Houjuan Zuo, Ning Zhou, The Chinese Society of Cardiology. Department of Internal Medicine and Institute of Hypertension, Tongji Hospital, Tongji Medical College, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan, China

10.1136/heartasia-2019-apahff.14

Fulminant myocarditis is chiefly caused by viral infections. Its onset is rapid, progresses quickly, and may lead to severe heart failure, circulatory failure and cardiogenic shock in a short time. Its mortality can be up to 50%–70%. Most importantly, there are no treatment options, and no evidence-based international guidelines or expert consensus statements. Here we provide the first expert consensus – the Chinese Society of Cardiology Expert Consensus Statement on the Diagnosis and Treatment of Fulminant Myocarditis – based on data from our recent registered clinical trial. In this statement, we describe for the first time its clinical features and diagnostic criteria, and importantly, a new treatment regimen, ‘life support-based comprehensive treatment regimen’. This comprehensive treatment regimen includes meticulous nutritional and fluid management, administration of glucocorticoid, immunoglobulin and antiviral agents, continuous renal replacement therapy, life-support treatments including application of mechanical respirator(s) and circulatory support systems, intra-aortic balloon pulsation (IABP) and extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO) as well as cardiac pacing if needed. Our practice in multiple cardiac centres demonstrated effectiveness of this treatment by dramatically lowering the mortality of patients with fulminant myocarditis.

15

IMPELLA® USE IN PROTECTED PCI AND CARDIOGENIC SHOCK

Chui Ka Lung. Division of Cardiology, Department of Medicine and Therapeutics, Prince of Wales Hospital, Shatin, Hong Kong SAR

10.1136/heartasia-2019-apahff.15

Intra-aortic balloon pump (IABP) has been used for many years in high-risk PCI or cardiogenic shock. However, the support provided by IABP is limited and a major randomised controlled trial failed to demonstrate a beneficial effect.¹ Impella® is a family of percutaneous mechanical circulatory support (MCS) devices that are used in protected PCI and cardiogenic shock.² Depending on the device model, they provide a blood flow ranging from 2.5 to 5 L/min. The resulting augmented support increases mean arterial blood pressure, cardiac output and coronary flow while unloading left ventricular filling pressure to reduce myocardial oxygen demand.^{2–3} This is an ideal

form of temporary support device for the patient. Moreover, the device is easy to set up and can be inserted very quickly to stabilise the patient. This presentation provides a review on the current data regarding the use of Impella MCS devices.

REFERENCES

1. Thiele H, Zeymer U, Neumann FJ, Ferenc M, Olbrich HG, Hausleiter J, Richardt G, Hennersdorf M, Empen K, Fuernau G, Desch S, Eitel I, Hambrecht R, Fuhrmann J, Böhm M, Ebel H, Schneider S, Schuler G, Werdan K; IABP-SHOCK II Trial Investigators. Intra-aortic balloon support for myocardial infarction with cardiogenic shock. *N Engl J Med* 2012;**367**:1287–1296.
2. O’Neill WW, Kleiman NS, Moses J, Henriques JP, Dixon S, Massaro J, Palacios I, Maini B, Mulukutla S, Dzavik V, Popma J, Douglas PS, Ohman M. A prospective, randomized clinical trial of hemodynamic support with Impella 2.5 versus intra-aortic balloon pump in patients undergoing high-risk percutaneous coronary intervention: the PROTECT II study. *Circulation* 2012;**126**:1717–1727.
3. O’Neill WW, Grines C, Schreiber T, Moses J, Maini B, Dixon SR, Ohman EM. Analysis of outcomes for 15,259 US patients with acute myocardial infarction cardiogenic shock (AMICS) supported with the Impella device. *Am Heart J* 2018;**202**:33–38.

16

ECMO AND MCS FOR PATIENTS UNDERGOING PCI: EXPERIENCE FROM TAIPEI VETERANS GENERAL HOSPITAL

Wei-Ting Wang. Cardiology Division, Taipei Veterans General Hospital, Taipei, Taiwan ROC

10.1136/heartasia-2019-apahff.16

Intra-aortic balloon pump (IABP), which simultaneously augments coronary blood flow and decreases myocardial oxygen demand, usually provides haemodynamic support in patients with impaired left ventricular function undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI)^{1–2} or for patients with established cardiogenic shock.³

Several observational studies have reported that prophylactic IABP insertion could reduce major adverse cardiovascular events (MACE) compared with a provisional counterpulsation strategy during high-risk PCI.⁴ However, meta-analysis did not reveal a benefit of routine elective use of IABP or percutaneous ventricular assisted device.⁵ Due to a lack of national data from Taiwan, this presentation therefore summarises the experience at Taipei Veterans General Hospital, and the patients’ clinical characteristics and long-term outcomes including cardiac mortality and MACE associated with high-risk PCI and/or acute myocardial infarction.

REFERENCES

1. Kern MJ, Aguirre F, Bach R, Donohue T, Siegel R, Segal J. Augmentation of coronary blood flow by intra-aortic balloon pumping in patients after coronary angioplasty. *Circulation* 1993;**87**:500–511.
2. Cohen M, Urban P, Christenson JT, Joseph DL, Freedman RJ Jr, Miller MF, Ohman EM, Reddy RC, Stone GW, Ferguson JJ 3rd; Benchmark Registry Collaborators. Intra-aortic balloon counterpulsation in US and non-US centres: results of the Benchmark Registry. *Eur Heart J* 2003;**24**:1763–1770.
3. Sjaauw KD, Engstrom AE, Vis MM, van der Schaaf RJ, Baan J Jr, Koch KT, de Winter RJ, Piek JJ, Tijssen JG, Henriques JP. A systematic review and meta-analysis of intra-aortic balloon pump therapy in ST-elevation myocardial infarction: should we change the guidelines? *Eur Heart J* 2009;**30**:459–468.
4. Mishra S, Chu WW, Torguson R, Wolfram R, Deible R, Suddath WO, Pichard AD, Satler LF, Kent KM, Waksman R. Role of prophylactic intra-aortic balloon pump in high-risk patients undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention. *Am J Cardiol* 2006;**98**:608–612.
5. Lee JM, Park J, Kang J, Jeon KH, Jung JH, Lee SE, Han JK, Kim HL, Yang HM, Park KW, Kang HJ, Koo BK, Kim SH, Kim HS. The efficacy and safety of mechanical hemodynamic support in patients undergoing high-risk percutaneous coronary intervention with or without cardiogenic shock: Bayesian approach network meta-analysis of 13 randomized controlled trials. *Int J Cardiol* 2015;**184**:36–46.