Cardiogenic shock in emergency medicine, Assessment Approaches

Tubaygi abdulrahman mohsen s, Amin mohammed Sammour, Saud Abdulaziz Almutairi, Turki Maeid Alanazi, Mohammed Abdulkareem M Abdrab Alamir, Tashary, Hamdy Muhammad M, Ayman Abdullah Ahmed Alhazmi, Mohammad Hadi Abass Hakami

Abstract:

In this review, we briefly describe the features and strategical considerations in cardiogenic shock. We also mention etiology and definition of CS to understand it well and methods to manage it. We performed comprehensive search using biomedical databases; Medline, and Embase, for studies concerned with assessment of cardiogenic shock in emergency medicine published with English language up to, October 2017. Patients with CS are critically ill and can rapidly decompensate. If CS is not recognized and managed, tissue hypoperfusion could rapidly result in organ dysfunction and patient fatality. In addition to a focused history and physical examination, the first evaluation of patients with presumed CS needs to include an ECG, CXR, laboratory research studies, and a point-of-care echocardiogram. The preliminary resuscitation of patients with CS is directed towards restoring cardiac output and tissue perfusion. This is accomplished via the administration of intravenous fluids and a mix of inotropic and vasopressor medications. Mechanical circulatory support is indicated for patients with CS who do not react to pharmacologic treatment. These patients should go through emergent reperfusion therapy with either PCI or CABG.

Introduction:

Cardiogenic shock (CS) is one of the most usual cause of death for patients hospitalized with acute myocardial infarction (MI) [1].Although the total incidence stays unmodified, death rates from this clinical entity appear to be declining [2].This beneficial pattern has been connected with increasing usage of reperfusion treatment, revascularization, and hemodynamic support with intra-aortic balloon pumping (IABP). The superior outcome amongst CS patients in the United States over their non-American counterparts has additionally been credited to this hostile method [3].Despite this favorable relationship, these monitorings do not directly verify cause and effect. Revascularization in these reports was not protocol-mandated, however driven by private clinical judgment. Sophisticated post-hoc statistical modification could not readjust for unmeasured variables and this establishes the possibility of option predisposition [4].

Creating a randomized, regulated trial in the setting of CS complicating acute MI is limited by the requirement for suitable treatment, the fast demise of critically sick patients, and doctor bias. Possible information in this field were, nonetheless, clearly necessitated. The National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute supported the SHOCK (Should We Emergently Revascularize Occluded Coronaries for Cardiogenic Shock) trial [5] and (S)MASH (Swiss) Multicenter Trial of Angioplasty for Shock [6], which were designed to load this void. Both tests analyzed the benefit of very early revascularization in the setting of CS. Unfortunately, (S)MASH was terminated too soon because of insufficient patient enrollment. The SHOCK trial was effectively finished and enrollment was stopped in November, 1998.

In this review, we briefly describe the features and strategical considerations in cardiogenic shock. We also mention etiology and definition of CS to understand it well and methods to manage it.

Methodology:

We performed comprehensive search using biomedical databases; Medline, and Embase, for studies concerned with assessment of cardiogenic shock in emergency medicine published with English language up to, October 2017. keywords used in our search through the databases were as; “Cardiogenic shock”, “emergency medicine”, “emergency department”. More relevant articles were recruited from references lists scanning of each included study.

Discussion:

Definition of CS

CS is defined as inadequate cardiac pumping function to satisfy the resting metabolic needs of the body regardless of adequate loading problems. The medical syndrome of CS has been described as: a systolic blood pressure (BP) of less than 90 mm Hg, or above 30 mm Hg below standard BP, for a minimum of 30 mins, with signs of a reduced cardiac outcome (CO). Indications of minimized Carbon Monoxide might appear as decreased urine output (<20 mL/h), impaired cognitive function, and evidence of peripheral vasoconstriction [7].When hemodynamic data are readily available, the diagnosis is verified when cardiac index (CI) is less than 2.2 L/m2 body surface area, and pulmonary capillary wedge pressure (PCWP) greater than 15 mm Hg [8].

Epidemiology

Several patients with CS die prior to hospital arrival. As a result, it is difficult to figure out the true incidence of CS. What is clear, however, is that the proportion of intensive care unit admissions with CS has increased from 4% to 8% over the past 15 years [9].Currently, CS makes complex

approximately 8% to 9% of patients with an STsegment altitude coronary infarction (STEMI), whereas the incidence of CS in patients with a non-ST-segment myocardial infarction (NSTEMI) is roughly 2.5% [10].Death for patients with CS is the same in recent years and remains unacceptably high at about 50% [11].

· Etiologies

The SHOCK Trial Registry is the biggest data set from which to assess the different cardiac etiologies of CS [12].By far, one of the most typical cardiac reason for CS is acute left ventricular failure in the setup of an STEMI [12].Usually this results from anterior wall myocardial infarction and represent nearly 79% of patients with CS [12]. Mechanical complications of ischemic heart disease include extreme mitral regurgitation (7%), ventricular septal rupture (4%), right ventricular failing (3%), and tamponade (1.4%) [12].Of these cardiac reasons, ventricular septal tear carries the greatest mortality. CS can also result from nonischemic cardiac problems. These problems are provided in Table 1. It is necessary to consider these nonischemic etiologies in patients offering with typical symptoms and signs of CS however with nonspecific findings on the electrocardiogram (ECG) and unfavorable laboratory worths for myocardial infarction.

Table 1. Nonischemic etiologies of cardiogenic shock

Etiology	**Examples**
Pharmacologic	Beta blockers Calcium channel blockers Digoxin toxicity
Primary ventricular dysfunction	Acute myocarditis Stress cardiomyopathy (ie,Takatsubo cardiomyopathy) Nonischemic cardiomyopathy (eg, sarcoidosis, amyloidosis, hemochromatosis)
Outflow obstruction	Valvular stenosis Left ventricular outflow obstruction (eg, in Hypertrophic cardiomyopathy)
Acute valvular regurgitation	Trauma Degenerative disease Endocarditis

Endocrine	Severe hypothyroidism
Pericardial disease	Cardiac tamponade Pericardial constriction
Tachyarrhythmias	Supraventricular/atrial tachyarrhythmias Monomorphic VT Polymorphic VT (ie,Torsades de Pointes)
Bradyarrhythmias	Sinus node dysfunction (eg,sick sinus syndrome) AV node dysfunction (eg, AV nodal block)

Abbreviations: AV, atrioventricular; VT, ventricular tachycardia.

- **Initial Assessment**

Developing an accurate diagnosis for the hemodynamically unstable patient is important. The first assessment of all patients presenting with uncertainty of shock includes assessment for indications of tissue perfusion and evaluation of volume status. Physical exam is an invaluable, and typically overlooked and underutilized device in discriminating CS from various other types of shock. Changes in mental standing and oliguria are nonspecific and might go along with all subtypes of shock. Cardiac auscultation may expose a third or 4th heart noise, or whisperings suggesting valvular heart disease or possible mechanical MI difficulty, although the absence of these findings does not exclude the medical diagnosis. The visibility of cool extremities, an indication of outer vasoconstriction, could be helpful in setting apart CS from vasodilatory shock, where warm extremities and bounding pulses might be present.

Extra physical exam findings in patients with CS or approaching CS include pulmonary congestion, peripheral edema, and raised jugular venous pressure (JVP). Patients with primary RV participation or cardiac tamponade may have clear lung fields. Little researches have revealed that the distinction of shock states based upon checkup alone is feasible in the majority of patients [13].Examination of JVP creates the cornerstone of quantity status analysis. Mindful positioning of the patient maybe called for, and in indeterminate cases the hepatojugular reflex ought to be generated. If analysis of the jugular veins is restricted by body habitus, central venous pressure (CVP) might be estimated

with ultrasonography of the jugular vein. However, this technique, like approximated JVP by checkup, tends to take too lightly CVP [14].

In patients with recognized HF who provide with a decompensation, management is focused on 2 critical aspects: evaluation of tissue perfusion (warm vs chilly) and assessment of volume condition (wet vs dry). Such management has been shown to associate with diagnosis; patients who present as "cold/wet" have the highest danger of fatality or urgent transplantation [15].

A severity-of-illness scoring system for patients with CS complicating acute MI has been suggested, which approximates in-hospital mortality, and could aid with first management and triage (Table 2). This scoring system has been validated with and without the consolidation of hemodynamic data [16].

Table 2. Predictors of mortality in cardiogenic shock [16].

Clinical data	Advanced age Shock on admission Clinical evidence of endorgan hypoperfusion Anoxic brain injury Low systolic BP Prior coronary artery bypass grafting Noninferior MI Creatinine >1.9 mg/dL
Hemodynamic + clinical data	Age Clinical evidence of endorgan hypoperfusion Anoxic brain damage Stroke work LV ejection fraction <28%

The ECG could offer insight beyond the presence/absence of regular MI. ECG diagnosis of RV infarct (altitude in V4R) or posterior infarct ST-segment depression in V1, V2, and/or V3 in the existence of substandard MI hints an increased risk of complications and in-hospital mortality, and must be considered at triage [17].Cardiac tamponade might additionally be thought if reduced

voltage, PR depression, or electrical alternans is present, though these indicators are neither delicate nor specific.

Chest radiography (CXR) ought to be carried out in all patients. It is necessary to keep in mind that the lack of congestion on a preliminary CXR does not exclude the medical diagnosis of acute decompensated cardiac arrest [18].

Lab irregularities in patients with CS are universal. Substantial problems on a complete blood count could be present in CS, although it is mainly gotten to omit other causes of shock. While an elevated white blood cell (WBC) count accompanied by low BP may recommend the diagnosis of septic shock, it is necessary to consider that a powerful inflammatory reaction in MI or CS can likewise cause a leukocytosis, and the presence of a raised WBC matter should not omit the diagnosis of CS. An arterial blood gas ought to be acquired. Metabolic acidosis, or raised lactate levels, suggests insufficient tissue perfusion requiring acceleration of therapy, and hypoxia might determine the requirement for added ventilatory support. Liver enzyme problems could be due to decreased onward flow to the liver, from easy congestion, or both, materializing as elevated levels of transaminases, bilirubins, or alkaline phosphatase. As a matter of fact, the primary problem of a patient in CS might be epigastric pain from liver blockage. Coagulation-factor abnormalities could exist, and may be particularly noticeable in patients already on vitamin K antagonists.

- **Bedside Echocardiography in emergency department**

If CS is presumed based upon history, physical exam, and laboratory and routine analysis imaging researches, transthoracic echocardiography (TTE) is indicated [18]. Although bedside TTE in the ED may suffer from fundamental technological restrictions because of bad acoustic windows from

patients that are difficult to position and those on mechanical ventilation, it might supply step-by-step diagnostic details [19].

A detailed echocardiographic examination includes 2-dimensional (2D), M-mode and Doppler parts. As ultrasound portability and accessibility have improved, some clinicians have promoted integrating bedside echo into their initial evaluation with hand-held gadgets such as the GE Vscan. While an adequate 2D and color flow Doppler examination can be performed, a full echocardiographic evaluation is not feasible due to the fact that continual and pulse-wave Doppler functions and M-mode are not available. However, this may not be medically substantial; in the authors' experience, a lot of reasons for CS can be identified only based upon 2D and shade Doppler assessment.

Cardiac tamponade is a swiftly reversible, lifethreatening problem most readily diagnosed by echocardiogram. Echocardiographic indications of tamponade in the setup of a pericardial effusion consist of end-diastolic right atrial (RA) collapse (a highly delicate sign) and RV collapse (less delicate yet more particular), substandard vena cava (IVC) dilation, and above 25% inspiratory variant in mitral inflow velocity gauged by pulse-wave Doppler [20].ED doctors learnt bedside echocardiography could detect pericardial effusions with outstanding accuracy. Echo-guided, bedside pericardiocentesis is safe and effective, and can be performed without the requirement for fluoroscopy.

CS can be basically left out in the presence of typical or hyperkinetic ventricular function in the lack of a serious valvular lesion or cardiac tamponade, both which are easily obvious on Doppler echocardiography. The existence of a minimized LV ejection fraction (LVEF) in the setup of shock does not establish a diagnosis of CS. It bears focus that while a hyperkinetic ventricle in the lack of other structural cardiovascular disease is effective at leaving out the diagnosis of CS, the

visibility of LV disorder is not diagnostic. Additionally, initiation of inotropic treatments prior to establishing a medical diagnosis of CS, based upon a finding of lowered LVEF on TTE, may be unhealthy [21].

Assessment for quantity assessment using resemble is most quickly completed by determining IVC size and percent IVC collapse with sniff (caval index). This method was demonstrated in one series of 83 patients, in which IVC diameter and caval index were gauged by TTE within 24 hours of intrusive hemodynamic dimension. Forty-one of 48 patients with caval index less than 50% had RA pressure (RAP) more than 10 mm Hg, whereas 30 of 35 patients with caval index above 50% had RA pressure less than 10 mm Hg [22].Emergency medical professionals could create efficiency in point-of-care ultrasonography by experience during their residency or fellowship programs, or with readily available programs.

- **Medical management of CS**

Patients without congestion presenting with shock and inadequate tissue perfusion could be challenged with intravenous fluids, unless health examination recommends elevated right- and leftsided filling stress, or intrusive hemodynamic information confirm that filling conditions suffice. Nevertheless, in many CS patients therapy of pulmonary venous systemic congestion is a key goal. This approach is often difficult, and hypotension limits the energy of intravenous diuretics. PAC could clear up management decisions. Treatment with vasopressors and inotropes could assist in diuresis, although this has not been shown in large RCTs. Actually, in spite of common use, strenuous proof for diuretic methods in patients with CS is limited.

RV infarction typically provides in the setup of substandard MI. Physical examination shows the triad of distended neck veins, clear lungs, and hypotension. These patients are preload delicate, and may require numerous litres of liquid to preserve adequate perfusion pressure.

Morphine has been used traditionally to deal with respiratory distress and pulmonary edema in patients with acute decompensated HF, and is still advised in the setting of extreme pain or upper body discomfort; nonetheless, the role for morphine in CS is unclear, as retrospective information have shown intensified outcomes, consisting of increased mortality, in recipients compared with nonrecipients [23].

Vasodilators, consisting of nitroglycerin and nitroprusside, are typically avoided in the setup of CS due to their propensity to trigger hypotension. b-Blockers, calcium-channel blockers, and renin-angiotensin-aldosterone system (RAAS) blockers, such as angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors and angiotensin-receptor blockers, must likewise not be carried out to patients with signs of CS because of their unfavorable inotropic and BP-lowering results. This regulation likewise puts on patients with "preshock": those with indications of reduced Carbon Monoxide yet without significantly reduced BP. In the COMMIT-CCS2 trial, patients with acute MI (87% STEMI) were randomized to metoprolol (as much as 15 mg intravenously, followed by 200 mg orally day-to-day) or sugar pill. Patients that got metoprolol were less likely to suffer from reinfarction or ventricular fibrillation, however had a significant 1.1% boost in absolute threat of developing CS [24].

- **Inotropic and Vasopressor therapy**

FOR CS Vasopressors and inotropes are often needed in CS patients to maintain adequate BP and CO. Limited evidence exists regarding comparative efficacy of the different medicines. As a basic

guideline, they must be utilized at the lowest dosages possible to accomplish the preferred tissue perfusion end points, as adverse effects and complications are dose reliant, and greater dosages have been associated with higher mortality [25].

The largest RCT comparing vasopressors was the SOAP-2 trial, which compared dopamine and norepinephrine (which both possess vasopressor along with inotropic properties) in a heterogeneous team of patients with shock. In the subgroup of these patients with CS, norepinephrine was associated with reduced death, and dopamine with a greater arrhythmia concern [26].Vasopressin and dopamine have a function as 2nd add-on agents for consistent hypotension. Phenylephrine, a pure a-agonist, is typically avoided, as it could significantly boost afterload and reduce the efficiency of a currently falling short left ventricle.

Inotropes boost Carbon Monoxide, however are proarrhythmic and, significantly, could worsen hypotension. The authors normally start treatment with dobutamine for patients in CS. In those patients that are on long-acting b-blockers as an outpatient, the authors might start treatment with milrinone, owing to its mechanism of action distal to the b1-adrenergic receptor. Table 3 summarizes the device of activity and negative effects of available inotropes.

Table 3. Inotropes and vasodilators for cardiogenic shock

Drug Class	Role	Examples	Mechanism	Notes
Inotropes	Improve cardiac output	Dobutamine	Cardiac b1, and peripheral a2 and b2 adrenoceptor agonist (inotrope/ vasodilator)	Vasodilating effects may exacerbate hypotension
		Milrinone	Phosphodiesterase-3 inhibitor, potentiates cAMP; cardiac sarcoplasmic reticulum Ca2+-ATPase activity	Use limited by long half-life and renal metabolism May be of use in patients on b-blockers
		Levosimendan	Increases sensitivity to Ca2+	Found to be equivalent to dobutamine in acute decompensated HF in SURVIVE except lower initial BNP levels[27]

Vasopressos	Increase blood pressure	Norepinephrine	a1 and b1 adrenoceptor agonist (both vasopressor and inotropic properties)[28]	Decreased mortality in subset of SOAP-2 with CS[32]
		Dopamine	Doses 5–10 mg/kg/min: b1 receptor agonist Doses 10–20 mg/kg/min: a1 agonist (both vasopressor and inotropic properties)[29]	Increased arrhythmogenicity in SOAP-2[30]
		Epinephrine	a1, b1, and b2 agonist (both vasopressor and inotropic properties)	In limited RCT data, CS patients treated with epinephrine had higher lactate levels, increased arrhythmias, and higher heart rates compared with norepinephrine/dobutamine [31]

Abbreviations: ATPase, adenosine triphosphatase; BNP, B-type natriuretic peptide; cAMP, cyclic adenosine monophosphate

Conclusion:

Patients with CS are critically ill and can rapidly decompensate. If CS is not recognized and managed, tissue hypoperfusion could rapidly result in organ dysfunction and patient fatality. In addition to a focused history and physical examination, the first evaluation of patients with presumed CS needs to include an ECG, CXR, laboratory research studies, and a point-of-care echocardiogram. The preliminary resuscitation of patients with CS is directed towards restoring cardiac output and tissue perfusion. This is accomplished via the administration of intravenous fluids and a mix of inotropic and vasopressor medications. Mechanical circulatory support is indicated for patients with CS who do not react to pharmacologic treatment. These patients should go through emergent reperfusion therapy with either PCI or CABG.

Reference:

1. Holmes DR, Bates ER, Kleiman NS, et al. Contemporary reperfusion therapy for cardiogenic shock: the GUSTO-I trial experience. J Am Coll Cardiol. 1995; 26: 668–674.

2. Carnendran L, Abboud R, Gurunathan R, et al. Trends in cardiogenic shock: report from the SHOCK study. Eur Heart J. 2001; 22 (6): 472–478.
3. Holmes DR, Califf RM, Van de Werf F, et al. Difference in countries' use of resources and clinical outcome for patients with cardiogenic shock after myocardial infarction: results from the GUSTO trial. Lancet. 1997; 349: 75–78.
4. Hochman JS, Boland J, Sleeper LA, et al. Current spectrum of cardiogenic shock and effect of early revascularization on mortality: results of an international registry. Circulation. 1995; 91: 873–881.
5. Hochman JS, Sleeper LA, Webb JG, et al. Early revascularization in acute myocardial infarction complicated by cardiogenic shock. N Engl J Med. 1999; 341: 625–634.
6. Urban P, Stauffer J-C, Bleed D, et al. A randomized evaluation of early revascularization to treat shock complicating acute myocardial infarction: the (Swiss) Multicenter trial of Angioplasty for Shock— (S)MASH. Eur Heart J. 1999; 20: 1030–1038.
7. Swan HJ, Forrester JS, Diamond G, et al. Hemodynamic spectrum of myocardial infarction and cardiogenic shock. A conceptual model. Circulation 1972; 45(5):1097–110.
8. Forrester JS, Diamond G, Chatterjee K, et al. Medical therapy of acute myocardial infarction by application of hemodynamic subsets (first of two parts). N Engl J Med 1976;295(24):1356–62
9. Puymirat E, Fagon JY, Aegerter P, et al. Cardiogenic shock in intensive care units: evolution of prevalence, patient profile, management and outcomes, 1997-2012. Eur J Heart Fail 2017;19:192–200.
10. Babaev A, Frederick PD, Pasta DJ, et al. Trends in management and outcomes of patients with acute myocardial infarction complicated by cardiogenic shock. JAMA 2005;294:448–54.
11. Aissaoui N, Puymirat E, Simon T, et al. Long-term outcome in early survivors of cardiogenic shock at the acute stage of myocardial infarction; a landmark analysis from the French registry of Acute ST-elevation and non-ST-elevation Myocardial Infarction (FAST_MI) Registry. Crit Care 2014;18: 516–25.
12. Hochman JS, Buller CE, Sleeper LA, et al. Cardiogenic shock complicating acute myocardial infarction–etiologies, management, and outcome: a report from the SHOCK Trial Registry. J Am Coll Cardiol 2000;36:1063–70.
13. Vazquez R, Gheorghe C, Kaufman D, et al. Accuracy of bedside physical examination in distinguishing Assessment and Management of Cardiogenic Shock 661 categoriesofshock:apilotstudy.JHospMed2010;5(8): 471–4.
14. Deol GR, Collett N, Ashby A, et al. Ultrasound accurately reflects the jugular venous examination but underestimates central venous pressure. Chest 2011;139(1):95–100.
15. Nohria A, Tsang SW, Fang JC, et al. Clinical assessment identifies hemodynamic profiles that predict outcomes in patients admitted with heart failure. J Am Coll Cardiol 2003;41(10):1797–804.

16. Sleeper LA, Reynolds HR, White HD, et al. A severity scoring system for risk assessment of patients with cardiogenic shock: a report from the SHOCK Trial and Registry. Am Heart J 2010;160(3):443–50.
17. Zehender M, Kasper W, Kauder E, et al. Right ventricular infarction as an independent predictor of prognosis after acute inferior myocardial infarction. N Engl J Med 1993;328(14):981–8.
18. Collins SP, Lindsell CJ, Storrow AB, et al, ADHERE Scientific Advisory Committee, Investigators and Study Group. Prevalence of negative chest radiography results in the emergency department patient with decompensated heart failure. Ann Emerg Med 2006;47(1):13–8.
19. Labovitz AJ, Noble VE, Bierig M, et al. Focused cardiac ultrasound in the emergent setting: a consensus statement of the American Society of Echocardiography and American College of Emergency Physicians. J Am Soc Echocardiogr 2010; 23(12):1225–30.
20. Jones AE, Tayal VS, Sullivan DM, et al. Randomized, controlled trial of immediate versus delayed goal-directed ultrasound to identify the cause of nontraumatic hypotension in emergency department patients. Crit Care Med 2004;32(8):1703–8.
21. Reydel B, Spodick DH. Frequency and significance of chamber collapses during cardiac tamponade. Am Heart J 1990;119(5):1160–3.
22. Moore CL, Rose GA, Tayal VS, et al. Determination of left ventricular function by emergency physician echocardiography of hypotensive patients. Acad Emerg Med 2002;9(3):186–93.
23. Kircher BJ, Himelman RB, Schiller NB. Noninvasive estimation of right atrial pressure from the inspiratory collapse of the inferior vena cava. Am J Cardiol 1990;66(4):493–6.
24. Peacock WF, Hollander JE, Diercks DB, et al. Morphine and outcomes in acute decompensated heart failure: an ADHERE analysis. Emerg Med J 2008;25(4):205–9.
25. Chen ZM, Pan HC, Chen YP, COMMIT (ClOpidogrel and Metoprolol in Myocardial Infarction Trial) collaborative group. Early intravenous then oral metoprolol in 45,852 patients with acute myocardial infarction: randomised placebo-controlled trial. Lancet 2005; 366(9497):1622–32.
26. Van de Werf F, Bax J, Betriu A, ESC Committee for Practice Guidelines (CPG). Management of acute myocardial infarction in patients presenting with persistent ST-segment elevation: the Task Force on the Management of ST-Segment Elevation Acute Myocardial Infarction of the European Society of Cardiology. Eur Heart J 2008;29(23):2909–45.
27. De Backer D, Biston P, Devriendt J, et al. Comparison of dopamine and norepinephrine in the treatment of shock. N Engl J Med 2010;362(9):779–89.
28. . Mebazaa A, Nieminen MS, Packer M, et al. Levosimendan vs dobutamine for patients with acute decompensated heart failure: the SURVIVE Randomized Trial. JAMA 2007;297(17):1883–91.

29. Practice parameters for hemodynamic support of sepsis in adult patients in sepsis. Task Force of the American College of Critical Care Medicine, Society of Critical Care Medicine. Crit Care Med 1999;27(3): 639–60.
30. Lollgen H, Drexler H. Use of inotropes in the critical care setting. Crit Care Med 1990;18(1 Pt 2):S56–60.
31. Levy B, Perez P, Perny J, et al. Comparison of norepinephrine-dobutamine to epinephrine for hemodynamics, lactate metabolism, and organ function variables in cardiogenic shock. A prospective, randomized pilot study. Crit Care Med 2011;39(3): 450–5.
32. De Backer D, Biston P, Devriendt J, et al. Comparison of dopamine and norepinephrine in the treatment of shock. N Engl J Med 2010;362(9):779–89.