

**Accogli A<sup>1</sup>**, Mariani M<sup>1</sup>, Montrucchio G<sup>1,2</sup>, Simonetti U<sup>2</sup>, Bonetto C<sup>2</sup>, Feltrin M<sup>1</sup>, Francesconi M<sup>1</sup>, Gilardino B<sup>1</sup>, Zinnato C<sup>1</sup>, Urbino R<sup>2</sup>, Brazzi L<sup>1,2</sup>, Sales G<sup>2</sup>

1. Department of Surgical Science, University of Turin, Italy;

2. Department of Anesthesia, Intensive Care and Emergency, 'Città della Salute e della Scienza' Hospital, Turin, Italy.

## Background

Veno-venous extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (VV-ECMO) has been proposed as a rescue therapy for severe COVID-19 related ARDS, refractory to conventional management strategies [1-2]; however, its effectiveness in COVID-19 treatment algorithm is still unconfirmed.[3] We report the ECMO referral Turin hospital experience, comparing patients with COVID-19 related ARDS treated with VV-ECMO and conventional management.

## Methods

Demographic characteristics and clinical data of all adult patients with severe COVID-19 related ARDS, intubated and mechanically ventilated in the Intensive Care Unit (ICU) at "Città della Salute e della Scienza" Hospital (Turin, Italy), between February and December 2020, were collected retrospectively.

## Results

115 patients were admitted to ICU and 35 required VV-ECMO support. VV-ECMO patients were significantly older, with higher BMI and SOFA score at ICU admission. Time between patients' hospitalization to invasive mechanical ventilation (IMV) was longer in ECMO patients (5, IQR:1-11 versus 3, IQR:1-6), similarly to noninvasive support ventilation days. Patients in the ECMO group required more rescue therapies.

The median ICU and hospital length of stay were 11 (IQR:6-22) vs 28 (IQR:18-40) days and 27 (IQR:17-38) vs 34 (IQR:23-46) days in conventional versus ECMO patients, respectively; median length of IMV was higher in the ECMO group (21 days, IQR12-34 vs 9 days, IQR:5-18); the overall mortality was 61.7%, 87.7% and 51.2% in ECMO and in conventional patients, respectively. (Table 1)

**Table 1. Comparison between patients with severe COVID-19 related ARDS treated with conventional therapies versus VV-ECMO support.**

	TOTAL (N=115)	Conventional Group (N=80)	VV-ECMO Group (N=35)	p-value
Age, years, median (IQR)	63 (55-71)	68 (59-73)	54 (50-61)	< 0.001
BMI, median (IQR)	27.8 (26.0-31.6)	27.7 (25.5-31.2)	29.4 (27.6-32.4)	0.015
Gender (male), n (%)	91 (79.1)	62 (77.5)	29 (82.9)	0.515
Absence of comorbidity, n (%)	17 (14.8)	10 (12.5)	7 (20.0)	0.297
Cardiomyopathy (no HTA)	16 (13.9)	16 (20.0)	0	0.003
Hypertension	68 (59.1)	55 (68.8)	13 (37.1)	0.002
Chronic lung disease	14 (12.2)	10 (12.5)	4 (11.4)	1.000
Chronic kidney disease	6 (5.2)	6 (7.5)	0	0.175
Diabetes mellitus	21 (18.3)	17 (21.3)	4 (11.4)	0.296
SOFA at ICU admission, median (IQR)	7 (5-10)	5 (4-8)	9 (7-12)	< 0.001
Days from symptoms to hospitalization, median (IQR)	5 (2-7)	6 (1-9)	4 (3-7)	0.210
Days from hospitalization to IMV, median (IQR)	3 (1-7)	3 (1-6)	5 (1-11)	0.034
Days from IMV to ECMO, median (IQR)	-	-	5 (2-7)	-
Non-invasive ventilatory support (NIV-S):				
HFNC, n (%)	17 (14.8)	15 (18.8)	2 (5.7)	0.089
CPAP/NIV, n (%)	93 (80.9)	62 (77.5)	31 (88.6)	0.204
Days of NIV-S, median (IQR)	3 (1-6)	2 (1-5)	5 (2-9)	0.008
Rescue therapies, n (%)				
Curarization	106 (92.2)	71 (88.8)	35 (100)	0.055
iNO	27 (23.5)	12 (15.0)	15 (42.9)	0.001
Prone positioning	81 (70.4)	51 (63.7)	30 (85.7)	0.018
Steroids	91 (79.1)	60 (75.0)	31 (88.6)	0.135
Tocilizumab	21 (18.3)	10 (12.5)	11 (31.4)	0.016
Hyperimmune serum	11 (9.6)	7 (8.8)	4 (11.4)	0.733
Remdesivir	23 (20.0)	9 (11.3)	14 (40.0)	< 0.001
Outcomes:				
Length of IMV, days, median (IQR)	12 (6-24)	9 (5-18)	21 (12-34)	0.006
Length of ECMO, days, median (IQR)	-	-	16 (9-23)	-
ICU length of stay, days, median (IQR)	16 (9-27)	11 (6-22)	28 (18-40)	< 0.001
Hospital length of stay, days, median (IQR)	28 (18-40)	27 (17-38)	34 (23-46)	0.063
Mortality, n (%)	71 (61.7)	41 (51.2)	30 (85.7)	< 0.001

List of abbreviations: COVID-19: Coronavirus Disease 2019; ARDS: Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome; VV-ECMO: veno-venous ExtraCorporeal Membrane Oxygenation; IQR: Interquartile Range; HTA: Hypertension; SOFA: Sequential Organ Failure Assessment; ICU: Intensive Care Unit; IMV: Invasive Mechanical Ventilation; HFNC: High Flow Nasal Cannula; CPAP: Continuous Positive Airway Pressure; NIV: Not-Invasive Ventilation; iNO: Inhaled Nitric Oxide.

## Conclusions

The results of this preliminary analysis seem to suggest that COVID-19 related ARDS patients treated with VV-ECMO and conventional management are significantly different. This seems to explain the need for more rescue therapies (such as pharmacological ones, but also prone positioning, inhaled nitric oxide) before ECMO and the significantly worse outcome.

However, it should be noted that evidences regarding the use of ECMO for treating COVID-19 related ARDS are still heterogenous [2,4] and a defined consensus on its effectiveness is still lacking [5,6]. Further studies clarifying the role and correct timing of ECMO in COVID-19 treatment algorithm are needed. [3].

## References

1. Abrams D., et al. ECMO during the COVID-19 pandemic: when is it unjustified? Crit Care 2020; 24: 507;
2. Namendys-Silva S.A. ECMO for ARDS due to COVID-19. Hear Lung 2020; 49:348-349;
3. Marullo A.G., et al. Extracorporeal membrane oxygenation for critically ill patients with coronavirus-associated disease 2019: an updated perspective of the European experience. Minerva Cardioangiol 2020; 68:368-372;
4. Supady A., et al. Survival after extracorporeal membrane oxygenation in severe COVID-19 ARDS: results from an international multicenter registry. Crit Care 2021; 25:1-4;
5. Ma X., et al. Extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO) in critically ill patients with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pneumonia and acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS). Med Sci Monit 2020; 26:1-10;
6. MacLaren G., et al. What's new in ECMO for COVID-19? Intensive Care Med 2021; 47:107-109.