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Abstract

**Background:** To investigate current knowledge, attitudes, and practices for CPR quality control among emergency physicians in Chinese tertiary hospitals.

**Methods:** Anonymous questionnaires were distributed to physicians in 75 tertiary hospitals in China between January and July 2018.

**Results:** A total of 1405 respondents answered survey without obvious logical errors. Only 54.4% knew all criteria of high-quality CPR. The main problems during CPR were related to chest compression: low quality due to fatigue (67.3%), inappropriate depth (57.3%) and rate (54.1%). 91.0% respondents considered CPR quality monitoring should be used, 72.4% knew objective method for monitoring, and 63.2% always/often monitored CPR quality during actual resuscitation. The utilization rate of recommended monitoring methods was reported as follow, ETCO\(_2\) was 42.7%, audio-visual feedback devices was 10.1%, coronary perfusion pressure was 17.9%, and invasive arterial pressure was 31.1%. 96.3% respondents considered it was necessary to participate in regular CPR retraining, but 21.4% did not receive any retraining. The ideal retraining interval was considered to be 3 to 6 months, but actual interval was 6 to 12 months. CPR feedback devices were always/often used in training was reported by 49.7% of respondents.

**Conclusion:** Chinese emergency physicians were very concerned about CPR quality, but they did not fully understand the high-quality criteria and impact on prognosis. CPR quality monitoring was not routine procedure during actual resuscitation. The methods recommended in guidelines were rarely used in practice. Many physicians have not received retraining or have received retraining at long intervals. Feedback devices were not commonly used in training.

1. **Background**

The outcomes of cardiac arrest patients in China have been very poor. In Beijing, the capital of China and where medical technology was well developed, Only 1.3% out-of-hospital cardiac arrest (OHCA) patients were discharged, and 1.0% survived with a good neurological outcome (defined as cerebral performance category score was 1 or 2) in 2012\(^1\). 9.1% in-hospital cardiac arrest (IHCA) patients were discharged and 6.4% survived with a good neurological outcome in 2014\(^2\).

Cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) was a lifesaving intervention and the cornerstone of resuscitation from cardiac arrest. When cardiac arrest was taking place, blood circulation was wholly stopped. CPR could provided 10% to 30% of normal blood flow to the heart and 30% to 40% of normal blood flow to the brain\(^3\). Early CPR was an important link in the survival chain, no matter in OHCA or IHCA patients\(^4\).

Survival from cardiac arrest depended on early recognition of the arrest event and immediate activation of the emergency response system, but equally critical was that CPR delivered was high-quality. High-quality CPR included ensuring adequate chest compression rate and depth, allowing full chest recoil.
between compressions, minimizing interruptions in chest compressions, and avoiding excessive ventilation\textsuperscript{[5]}. There was clear evidence that providing high-quality CPR significantly improves resuscitation outcomes\textsuperscript{[6-9]}. Poor-quality CPR should be considered preventable harm. Monitoring both patient physiologic parameters and provider performance during CPR was essential to optimizing CPR quality\textsuperscript{[5]}. Visual observation was the most basic monitoring method. In 2013, the American Heart Association (AHA) published a Consensus Statement focused on strategies to improve CPR quality\textsuperscript{[9]}. Patient physiologic parameters during CPR that were considered pertinent for monitoring included invasive hemodynamic data (coronary perfusion pressure $>$ 20 mmHg or arterial diastolic pressure $>$ 25 mmHg) and end-tidal carbon dioxide (ETC\textsubscript{2}) concentrations $>$ 20 mmHg\textsuperscript{[9]}. Monitors with audiovisual feedback devices to measure provider CPR performance were widely accepted\textsuperscript{[9]}. In 2015, the AHA’s CPR guidelines recommended using feedback devices for real-time optimization of CPR performance\textsuperscript{[5]}. Today, few healthcare organizations consistently applied strategies of systematically monitoring CPR quality even though there was an unacceptable disparity in the quality of resuscitation care and outcomes\textsuperscript{[5]}. As the current knowledge, attitudes, and practices for CPR quality monitoring in China have never been reported, the aim of the present survey was to investigate the use of monitoring among Chinese emergency physicians.

2. Methods

2.1 Geographical background

Mainland China was divided into six administrative regions according to geographical distribution, including the east region, north region, northeast region, southwest region, south-central region, and northwest region. These regions differed in medical development\textsuperscript{[10]}. 

2.2 Study design

This was a cross-sectional multicenter study. In China, only tertiary, or Level III, hospitals had independent emergency departments and were also teaching hospitals, so these hospitals were identified in an attempt to target providers most likely to care for cardiac arrest patients. Tertiary general hospitals in mainland China were selected by separate random sampling in the six administrative regions. We screened for all 374 tertiary general hospitals, which were then coded randomly by SPSS version 25.0 (IBM Corp., Armonk, New York, USA) and then were arranged in ascending order in each administrative region. The top 20\% of hospitals were enrolled in the study, with alternative hospitals considered (in ascending order) if any enrolled hospitals were inaccessible or refused to participate. Finally, 75 hospitals were included. We then conducted a questionnaire survey for all emergency physicians of the selected hospitals.
The questionnaire was developed by a senior emergency physician, and examined and discussed three times by an expert team consisting of an epidemiologist and emergency specialists experienced in the management of cardiac arrest patients. The questionnaire included three parts: (1) background data of respondent; (2) the respondent’s awareness and practices for quality monitoring during actual CPR on a patient; (3) and awareness and practices for quality monitoring in CPR training. A total of 30 questions were included in the questionnaire, including 3 blank questions, 20 single choice questions and 7 multiple choice questions. The paper questionnaires were distributed to the directors of selected emergency departments by mail from January to March in 2018. Data collection ended in July 2018.

The study protocol was approved by Peking University Third Hospital Medical Science Research Ethics Committee (Project number: IRB00006761-M2018030, Ethics approval document number: 2018-176-01).

2.3 Statistical methods

The data were analyzed by SPSS version 25.0 (IBM Corp, Armonk, New York, USA). Quantitative variables were expressed as mean (standard deviation) when following a Gaussian distribution, or median (interquartile range 25%-75%) otherwise. Qualitative variables were expressed as frequencies.

3. Results

A total of 1489 (93.1%) responses were collected from 1600 questionnaires in 75 hospitals; 1405 responses were analyzed and 84 were excluded because of obvious logical errors. General characteristics of respondents were described in Table 1.

Table 1 Characteristics of respondents
| Characteristics                                    | n    | (%)  |
|---------------------------------------------------|------|------|
| **Gender**                                        |      |      |
| Male                                              | 812  | (57.8)|
| Female                                            | 576  | (41.0)|
| No answer                                         | 17   | (1.2)|
| **Age (years), mean ± SD***                       | 35.28±7.40 |     |
| **Academic degrees**                              |      |      |
| Bachelor                                          | 532  | (37.9)|
| Master                                            | 694  | (49.4)|
| Doctorate                                         | 146  | (10.4)|
| No answer                                         | 33   | (2.3)|
| **Title**                                         |      |      |
| Resident                                          | 611  | (43.5)|
| Attending                                         | 500  | (35.6)|
| Associate chief physician                         | 209  | (14.9)|
| Chief physician                                   | 64   | (4.6)|
| No answer                                         | 21   | (1.5)|
| **Years of working, median (Q1,Q3)**              | 7(3,13) |     |
| **Hospital location**                             |      |      |
| East region                                       | 290  | (20.6)|
| North region                                      | 247  | (17.6)|
| Northeast region                                  | 209  | (14.9)|
| South-central region                              | 335  | (23.8)|
| Southwest region                                  | 199  | (14.2)|
| Northwest region                                  | 125  | (8.9)|
| **Number of treated cardiac arrest patients per year** |      |      |
| 0-10                                              | 315  | (22.4)|
| 11-30                                             | 507  | (36.1)|
| 31-50                                             | 251  | (17.9)|
No answer 12 (0.9)

ROSC in treated cardiac arrest patients

| Category | Count | Percentage |
|----------|-------|------------|
| >30%     | 302   | 21.5%      |
| 21%-30%  | 303   | 21.6%      |
| 11%-21%  | 246   | 17.5%      |
| 6%-10%   | 265   | 18.9%      |
| <6%      | 274   | 19.5%      |
| No answer| 15    | 1.1%       |

Discharge survival in treated cardiac arrest patients

| Category | Count | Percentage |
|----------|-------|------------|
| >30%     | 137   | 9.8%       |
| 21%-30%  | 176   | 12.5%      |
| 11%-21%  | 228   | 16.2%      |
| 6%-10%   | 311   | 22.1%      |
| <6%      | 538   | 38.3%      |
| No answer| 15    | 1.1%       |

Good neurological outcome in treated cardiac arrest patients

| Category | Count | Percentage |
|----------|-------|------------|
| >30%     | 125   | 8.9%       |
| 21%-30%  | 153   | 10.9%      |
| 11%-21%  | 181   | 12.9%      |
| 6%-10%   | 286   | 20.4%      |
| <6%      | 644   | 45.8%      |
| No answer| 16    | 1.1%       |

*27 respondents did not answer this question.

**29 respondents did not answer this question.

3.1 Knowledge and attitude for high-quality CPR and quality monitoring

The reported knowledge and attitude for CPR quality and quality monitoring were described in Table 2.
Table 2 Knowledge and attitude for CPR quality and quality monitoring
## Questions and answers

| Question                                                                 | n    | (%)  |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|
| **Which of the following criterion are included in high quality CPR? (n=1402)** |      |      |
| ensuring adequate chest compression depth                               | 1309 | (93.4) |
| ensuring adequate chest compression rate                                | 1304 | (93.0) |
| allowing full chest recoil between compressions                         | 1261 | (89.9) |
| minimizing interruptions in chest compressions                          | 956  | (68.2) |
| ensuring adequate rate of ventilation                                   | 1209 | (86.2) |
| ensuring adequate volume of ventilation                                  | 1158 | (82.6) |
| **Should CPR quality be monitored during resuscitation? (n=1387)**       |      |      |
| Yes                                                                     | 1278 | (92.1) |
| No                                                                      | 63   | (4.5)  |
| I don’t know                                                            | 46   | (3.3)  |
| **Should CPR quality be monitored during resuscitation, when use mechanical CPR device? (n=1376)** |      |      |
| Yes                                                                     | 1298 | (94.3) |
| No                                                                      | 40   | (2.9)  |
| I don’t know                                                            | 38   | (2.8)  |
| **Whether a dedicated person is responsible for quality monitoring? (n=1389)** |      |      |
| Yes                                                                     | 1220 | (87.8) |
| No                                                                      | 91   | (6.6)  |
| I don’t know                                                            | 78   | (5.6)  |
| **Do you know any objective method or technology of CPR quality monitoring? (n=1400)** |      |      |
| Yes                                                                     | 1014 | (72.4) |
| No                                                                      | 386  | (27.6) |
| **How do you learn about monitoring method or technique? (n=1014)**      |      |      |
| Clinical guideline                                                      | 857  | (84.5) |
| Academic conference                                                     | 761  | (75.0) |
| Medical literature                                                      | 584  | (57.6) |
| Company promotion                                                       | 112  | (11.0) |
| Others                        |   15  | (1.5) |
|-------------------------------|-------|-------|
| Do you know which of the following quality monitoring methods? (n=1014) |       |       |
| Palpation of arterial pulse   | 831   | (82.0)|
| Observing of the ECG waveform | 759   | (74.9)|
| Observing of the SpO2 waveform| 662   | (65.3)|
| Pulse oximetry plethysmographic waveform | 484   | (47.7)|
| End-Tidal CO2                 | 727   | (71.7)|
| Coronary perfusion pressure   | 384   | (37.9)|
| Invasive arterial pressure    | 566   | (55.8)|
| Audiovisual feedback device   | 387   | (38.2)|
| Others                        |   8   | (0.8) |
| Do you think CPR quality monitoring could improve CPR quality? (n=1394) |       |       |
| Yes                           | 1158  | (83.1)|
| No                            |   29  | (2.1) |
| No clear conclusion           | 120   | (8.6) |
| Don't know relevant research  |   87  | (6.2) |
| Do you think CPR quality monitoring could improve the return of spontaneous circulation? (n=1391) |       |       |
| Yes                           | 1094  | (78.6)|
| No                            |   38  | (2.7) |
| No clear conclusion           | 158   | (11.4)|
| Don't know relevant research  | 101   | (7.3) |
| Do you think CPR quality monitoring could improve survival? (n=1374) |       |       |
| Yes                           | 1024  | (74.5)|
| No                            |   36  | (2.6) |
| No clear conclusion           | 195   | (14.2)|
| Don't know relevant research  | 119   | (8.7) |
| Do you think CPR quality monitoring could improve the neurologic outcome? (n=1393) |       |       |
| Yes                           | 993   | (71.3)|
|
54.4% of respondents knew all six criteria; 60.9% knew all four criteria of high-quality chest compression and 78.2% knew both criteria of avoiding excessive ventilation.

### 3.2 The Practices of CPR quality monitoring during actual CPR

The reported practices of CPR quality monitoring during actual resuscitation were described in Table 3.

Table 3 The practices of CPR quality monitoring during actual resuscitation

| No                                | 44 (3.2) | 183 (13.1) | 173 (12.4) |
|-----------------------------------|----------|------------|------------|
| No clear conclusion               |          |            |            |
| Don't know relevant research      |          |            |            |
### Questions and answers

| Question                                                                 | n   | (%) |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|-----|
| What are the common problems during actual resuscitation? (n=1364)        |     |     |
| Low quality of chest compression due to fatigue                          | 918 | (67.3) |
| Can not ensure appropriate chest compression depth                        | 782 | (57.3) |
| Can not ensure appropriate chest compression rate                         | 738 | (54.1) |
| No full chest recoil between compressions                                 | 706 | (51.8) |
| Long interruptions between chest compressions                             | 684 | (50.1) |
| Can not ensure appropriate ventilation rate                               | 667 | (48.9) |
| Can not ensure appropriate ventilation volume                             | 643 | (47.1) |
| Too short ventilation delivery time                                       | 430 | (31.5) |
| Insufficient capacity of team leader                                     | 219 | (16.1) |
| Poor cooperation between team members                                    | 36  | (2.6) |
| Others                                                                   | 24  | (1.8) |
| Do you use mechanical CPR devices during actual resuscitation? (n=1391)   |     |     |
| Always                                                                   | 167 | (12.0) |
| Often                                                                    | 407 | (29.3) |
| Sometimes                                                                | 335 | (24.1) |
| Rarely                                                                   | 155 | (11.1) |
| Never                                                                    | 327 | (23.5) |
| Which type of mechanical CPR devices do you use? (n=1038)                 |     |     |
| Piston device only                                                       | 770 | (74.2) |
| Load-distributing band device only                                       | 81  | (7.8) |
| Both of above                                                            | 152 | (14.6) |
| Others                                                                   | 35  | (3.4) |
| Do you monitored CPR quality during actual resuscitation? (n=1375)        |     |     |
| Always                                                                   | 485 | (35.3) |
| Often                                                                    | 384 | (27.9) |
| Sometimes                                                                | 210 | (15.3) |
| Rarely                                                                   | 79  | (5.7) |
| Method                           | Count | Percentage |
|---------------------------------|-------|------------|
| Palpation of arterial pulse     | 1010  | (87.2)     |
| Observing of the ECG waveform   | 994   | (85.8)     |
| Observing of the SpO2 waveform  | 811   | (70.0)     |
| Pulse oximetry plethysmographic waveform | 274   | (23.7)     |
| End-Tidal CO2                   | 495   | (42.7)     |
| Coronary perfusion pressure     | 207   | (17.9)     |
| Invasive arterial pressure      | 360   | (31.1)     |
| Audiovisual feedback device     | 117   | (10.1)     |
| Others                          | 6     | (0.5)      |

| Method                           | Count | Percentage |
|---------------------------------|-------|------------|
| Completely                      | 75    | (6.5)      |
| Most                            | 528   | (45.6)     |
| Few                             | 496   | (42.8)     |
| Never                           | 50    | (4.3)      |

| Interval                        | Count | Percentage |
|---------------------------------|-------|------------|
| 0-2minutes                      | 496   | (43.2)     |
| 3-6minutes                      | 471   | (41.0)     |
| 7-10minutes                     | 100   | (8.7)      |
| >10minutes                      | 82    | (7.1)      |

| Method                           | Count | Percentage |
|---------------------------------|-------|------------|
| Always                          | 255   | (22.1)     |
| Often                           | 299   | (26.0)     |
| Sometimes                       | 289   | (25.1)     |
| Rarely                          | 210   | (18.2)     |
| Never                           | 99    | (8.6)      |

Use of recommended monitoring technology and reasons for not always using were described in Fig. 1 and Fig. 2.
3.3 Quality monitoring in CPR training

Practices and attitudes on quality monitoring in CPR training were described in Table 4.

Table 4 Quality monitoring in CPR training
Questions and answers

Training and retraining

| Question                                                                 | n     | (%)  |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|------|
| Do you think emergency physicians should participate in regular CPR retraining? (n=1346) |       |      |
| Yes                                                                      | 1296  | (96.3)|
| No                                                                       | 38    | (2.8)|
| Do not know                                                              | 12    | (0.9)|
| What is the ideal interval between retraining in your opinion? (n=1294)  |       |      |
| 3 months                                                                 | 443   | (34.2)|
| 6 months                                                                 | 500   | (38.6)|
| 12 months                                                                | 272   | (21.0)|
| 24 months                                                                | 71    | (5.5)|
| Other interval                                                           | 8     | (0.6)|
| Have you attend CPR training or retraining as a trainee? (n=1344)        |       |      |
| Yes                                                                      | 1057  | (78.6)|
| No                                                                       | 287   | (21.4)|
| What is the ideal interval between your retraining in actual? (n=1043)   |       |      |
| 3 months                                                                 | 283   | (27.1)|
| 6 months                                                                 | 332   | (31.8)|
| 12 months                                                                | 333   | (31.9)|
| 24 months                                                                | 79    | (7.6)|
| Other interval                                                           | 16    | (1.5)|

CPR feedback devices

| Question                                                                 | n     | (%)  |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|------|
| Do you think using CPR feedback devices could improve CPR performance in training? (n=1343) |       |      |
| Yes                                                                      | 1210  | (90.1)|
| No                                                                       | 45    | (3.4)|
| Do not know                                                              | 88    | (6.6)|
| Did you used CPR feedback devices in your actual training or retraining? (n=1052) |       |      |
which part of training does CPR feedback devices usually be used? (n=787)

| Usage  | Count | Percentage |
|--------|-------|------------|
| Always | 222   | 21.0       |
| Often  | 303   | 28.7       |
| Sometimes | 178 | 16.8       |
| Rarely | 84    | 7.9        |
| Never  | 265   | 25.1       |

4. Discussion

4.1 Knowledge and attitudes for CPR quality monitoring

We found it was a good situation that 92.1% of respondents considered quality monitoring was needed during CPR. Mechanical compression devices were designed for some special situations and were considered to reduce the physical burden of emergency physicians\[11\]. Because the emergency department in China was often crowded, the use rate of mechanical devices during resuscitation was high. In this situation, 94.3% of respondents considered CPR quality need to be monitored. This showed that emergency physicians were concerned about the CPR quality monitoring.

High-quality CPR was an important link between survival chains, and it may be more important than other links\[4\]. Unfortunately, only 54.4% of respondents to this survey knew all six criteria of high-quality CPR and 60.9% knew all four criteria of high-quality chest compression. Most respondents were concerned about depth, rate and chest recoil during compression. But it was concluded that emergency physicians in tertiary general hospitals did not pay enough attention to minimizing interruptions. Minimizing interruption was also an important criterion of high-quality CPR emphasized in AHA's CPR guidelines\[5\]. Continuous chest compressions could maintain adequate coronary perfusion pressure, thereby increasing the likelihood of achieving ROSC\[12\]. Chest compression fraction of 80% was recommended to make sure compressions were continued with as few interruptions as possible during CPR. But in this survey, only 68.0% of respondents knew this criterion. This was a problem for improving CPR quality and it was important to strengthen education on minimizing interruption.

Visual observation was the most basic and widely used monitoring method, but objective parameters were recommended to be used for monitoring\[9\]. We found 72.4% of respondents knew objective monitoring technique. Clinical guidelines and academic conference were the main way to understand the technology. But in our survey, Chinese emergency physicians did not know much about the techniques recommended in the guidelines, especially Audiovisual feedback devices.
It was important to note that respondents revealed some misunderstandings regarding clinical findings on CPR quality control. For example, 71.3% of Chinese emergency physicians considered that using CPR quality monitoring devices could improve cardiac patient's outcome. While current studies have not demonstrated significant improvement in outcome related to CPR quality monitoring during actual cardiac arrest events\[^{6, 9, 13}\].

Although Chinese emergency physicians were concerned about CPR quality, they were lack of understanding of few criteria, new objective parameter monitoring methods and research results.

4.2 Practices in CPR quality monitoring

Chest compression quality was considered by respondents to be a main problem during actual resuscitation in China. Low quality due to fatigue, inappropriate compression depth, and inappropriate compression rate were the top three problems noted in actual CPR. In contrast, personal ability and cooperation of resuscitation team members were not issues. Because of this, quality control was placed on a vital position in China. But CPR quality monitoring was not shown to be a routine procedure in Chinese emergency department. Only 63.2% of respondents replied that they always/often monitored CPR quality during actual resuscitation. This showed that in clinical practice, the compliance of Chinese emergency physicians in CPR quality monitoring was not high.

Accurate measurement of CPR quality was precondition for high quality CPR. Objective parameter monitoring methods were better than visual observation\[^{5}\]. Our results showed that recommended monitoring methods were rarely used in Chinese emergency department. ETCO\(_2\) was the most commonly used methods. The opinions and clinical experience of experts strongly supported prioritizing the use of ETCO\(_2\) to adjust the compression technique during resuscitation\[^{5, 9}\]. Endotracheal intubation was not difficult for emergency physicians, because of wide use of advanced equipment like videolaryngoscope in China. Previous studies have shown that advanced airway could be placed in the first few minutes during resuscitation\[^{14}\]. In this situation, ETCO2 data was easier to obtain. This may be the reason of why ETCO2 was widely utilized in China. However, audio-visual feedback devices was another method recommended by AHA's CPR guidelines for quality monitoring\[^{5}\]. It was a noninvasive technology for real-time monitoring, recording, and feedback about CPR performance\[^{15, 16}\]. We found that less than 20% of respondents have used this technology. Pulse oximetry was a common clinical technique, its waveform could reflect peripheral tissue perfusion. Some research found that appearance of pulse oximetry plethysmographic waveform was related to CPR quality\[^{17, 18}\]. Pulse oximetry plethysmographic waveform, as a monitoring technology, was recommended for CPR quality monitoring by Chinese expert consensus in 2018. However, the utilization rate of this technology was still lower than that of ETCO\(_2\) and Invasive arterial pressure. Lack of equipment and understanding were the main reasons respondents gave for the low usage rate in China.

The biggest problem in quality monitoring was that unrecommended methods were widely used for quality monitoring in Chinese emergency department. Palpation of the arterial pulse, observing ECG
waveform, and observing SpO\textsubscript{2} waveform were the top three most commonly used method. Palpation of arterial pulse was the most commonly used method to evaluate chest compression quality; but it has been shown to be unreliable and cannot be used for continuous monitoring during actual resuscitation\textsuperscript{[19, 20]}. Therefore, the guidelines did not recommend this method for CPR quality monitoring,\textsuperscript{[9]}. Regular ECG waveforms accompanying chest compression can be observed in some patients, but shape of waveform has no clear relationships with the quality of chest compressions\textsuperscript{[21]}. ECG waveform was widely used for quality monitorin, that reflected the misunderstanding of its meaning in Chinese emergency physicians.

Continuing education of physicians in emergency departments was crucial to increase the rates of utilization of recommended technology\textsuperscript{[22]}. Although CPR quality monitoring has been recommended by CPR guidelines, few specific consensus protocols exist that provide detail on how to best implement the monitoring. The development and publication of standardized monitoring protocols will likely help physicians to better utilize CPR quality monitoring in China.

4.3 Quality monitoring in CPR training

Basic life support and advanced cardiac life support techniques were the core skills of resuscitation\textsuperscript{[23]}. CPR training course was a key part of Chinese resident training program. In most tertiary hospitals, all emergency physicians needed to take basic life support courses and many of them also needed to take advanced cardiac life support courses. CPR training courses in many hospitals were certified by the American Heart Association\textsuperscript{[24]}. CPR training was not a one-time training. Retraining was recommended by AHA guidelines, because skills and knowledge may decay within 3 to 12 months after initial training\textsuperscript{[23]}. The retraining system was widely accepted in China, where 96.3% of respondents believed it was necessary to retrain after initial training. Responses showed that CPR retraining received great attention, and that a “frequent” training system was more acceptable. 72.8% of respondents considered the ideal interval between trainings to be 3 to 6 months, though there was no clear recommendation on optimum time interval\textsuperscript{[23]}. Unfortunately, the survey results revealed a large gap between ideal training programs and actual implementation, as 21.4% of emergency physicians did not receive any retraining after initial training. Among those who did, the actual retraining interval was 6 to 12 months, significantly longer than desired. This showed that most hospitals did not have standard retraining systems. Retraining may be difficult to implement in some hospitals. Short-frequent retraining may be a solution in China. Because it would not increase the cost, if total training time was fixed. Physicians were more likely to take part in short time training course after busy work. And frequent retraining was helpful to the consolidation of skills.

Chinese physicians were in agreement on the use of new technology and equipment for CPR training. According to AHA’s CPR guidelines, feedback devices should be used in training to learn CPR skills\textsuperscript{[23]}. This attitude was supported by 90.1% of respondents, who believed that CPR feedback devices can improve performance during training. However, attitudes and practice was so different. The typical training course in Chinese hospitals includes two parts: theoretical teaching and simulation exercises.
While the structure of the training course is reasonable, only 49.7% of respondents replied that CPR feedback devices were always/often used in training, and 25.1% replied that they never used feedback devices. In developing countries like China, there were many hospitals that have no ability to purchase these devices. This may become an important barrier to improving CPR quality.

5. Conclusions

In this survey we found Chinese physicians in tertiary hospitals were very concerned about CPR quality, but they did not fully understand the high-quality criteria and impact on prognosis. Most emergency physicians considered it was necessary to monitor CPR quality, but quality monitoring was not routine procedure during actual resuscitation. Recommended monitoring methods such as audio-visual feedback device was rarely used in practice. However, many physicians used methods not recommended. Although retraining was considered important, many physicians have not received retraining or have received retraining at long intervals. Feedback devices were not commonly used in training.

In the future Chinese emergency physicians should receive systematic continuing education on CPR quality control. Standard Operation Procedure should be established to guide CPR quality monitoring during actual resuscitation, including hemodynamic parameters, ETCO₂ and audio-visual feedback devices. Retraining plan and feedback devices should also be an important part of CPR training.

6. Limitations

Emergency department of tertiary hospitals were targeted for this survey, because their providers were likely to have the most experience in caring for cardiac arrest patients. At the same time their providers have a higher level of technology than the others. The overrepresentation of these hospitals may have subjected the survey to bias. In other words, it was likely that the CPR quality monitoring responses reflected in our survey demonstrated an optimistic perspective. The true proportions of knowledge, attitudes, and practices of monitoring across all Chinese hospitals may be lower than those reported in this survey. Additionally, though the majority of published examples of quantifying qualitative data used dichotomous variables for simplicity, such conversion may result in overestimation or underestimation due to identical grading of responses such as “usually” and “always,” and “sometimes” and “never.”

List Of Abbreviations

OHCA  out-of-hospital cardiac arrest  
IHCA  in-hospital cardiac arrest  
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Figure 1
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Figure 2
Reasons for not always using recommended monitoring technology