

The Role of Nurses in Managing Cardiogenic Shock

Sahar Abdullah Aljoaid ¹, Ahmed Zaid Sattam Altamyat ², Hind Hulayyil Masad Alharbi ³, Fahdah Shabib Alruwaili ⁴, Norah Mohammed Dharman Alshammari ⁵, Reem Turki Alruwaili ⁶, Mohammed Nasser Muqbil Alshammari ⁷, Rawabia Adel Aljohanl ⁸, Turkey Bandar M Alshemarry ⁹, Tamam Mohammed Shehab Alruwaili ¹⁰

1- Nursing specialist, Al-Faisaliah Health Center, Taif, Saudi Arabia.

2- Nursing technician, Rafha Central Hospital, Rafha, Saudi Arabia.

3- Nursing technician, Al Bukayriyah General Hospital, Qassim, Saudi Arabia

4- Nursing technician, Maternity and Children Hospital in Aljouf, Sakaka, Aljouf, Saudi Arabia

5- Nursing technician, Maternity and Children's Hospital, Hafar Al-Batin, Saudi Arabia.

6- Nursing technician, King Abdulaziz Specialist Hospital, Sakaka, Al-Jouf, Saudi Arabia

7- Nursing technician, Sharaf Hospital, Hail, Saudi Arabia

8- Nursing, Al-Ahmar Health Center, Umluj, Saudi Arabia

9- Nursing, Rafha Central Hospital, Rafha, Saudi Arabia.

10- Nursing, Al-Jawf Health Cluster, Sakaka, Saudi Arabia.

Abstract:

Nurses play a crucial role in the management of cardiogenic shock, a life-threatening condition often resulting from severe heart failure or myocardial infarction. Their responsibilities begin with rapid assessment and identification of the patient's condition, monitoring vital signs, and recognizing early signs of shock. Utilizing their clinical judgment, nurses implement crucial interventions such as administering medications (e.g., inotropes and diuretics) to improve cardiac output and monitor the patient's response to treatment. They also assess for complications and provide continuous education and emotional support to patients and their families, ensuring they understand the situation and the planned interventions. Collaboration within the healthcare team is essential in the management of cardiogenic shock. Nurses frequently communicate vital findings to physicians and other healthcare providers, facilitating timely decision-making regarding advanced interventions like mechanical circulatory support or catheterization. They also play a key role in patient positioning, fluid management, and conducting frequent assessments to gauge the effectiveness of treatment protocols. By advocating for their patients and providing holistic care that addresses both physical and emotional needs, nurses are integral to improving outcomes in those experiencing cardiogenic shock.

Keywords Cardiogenic Shock, Nurses' Role, Patient Assessment, Vital Signs Monitoring, Medication Administration, Clinical Judgment, Emotional Support, Healthcare Collaboration, Interventions, Patient Advocacy.

Introduction:

Cardiogenic shock is a life-threatening condition characterized by inadequate tissue perfusion resulting from severe heart failure. It is most commonly seen in patients following a myocardial infarction but can also occur due to various other cardiac or non-cardiac insults. The condition poses significant challenges to the health care system, contributing to increased morbidity and mortality rates. In the context of health care, early recognition and intervention are vital to improve outcomes for patients suffering from this acute state of circulatory

collapse. Within this framework, nurses play a pivotal role, extending their influence far beyond traditional patient care to encompass a wide array of responsibilities that are essential for the effective management of cardiogenic shock [1].

The complexity of cardiogenic shock necessitates a multidisciplinary approach, where nurses serve as critical connectors between patients and the various members of the healthcare team. Their comprehensive training equips them to conduct thorough assessments, monitor hemodynamic status, and identify changes that may indicate

deterioration. Nurses are on the front lines of patient care, constantly observing clinical signs and symptoms, which places them in an ideal position to alert physicians to critical developments. The importance of this proactive patient monitoring cannot be overstated, especially in acute care settings where rapid intervention is crucial [2].

In addition to vigilant monitoring, nurses are involved in the implementation of advanced therapeutic strategies aimed at stabilizing the patient's condition. This encompasses not only the administration of medications—such as inotropes and vasopressors—but also the coordination of advanced interventions, such as mechanical circulatory support (MCS) devices. Nurses are essential in the education and support of patients and families, providing information on treatment options, potential outcomes, and the emotional challenges posed by such a severe medical condition. The complexity of information that nurses must handle requires both advanced clinical knowledge and strong communication skills, adding a layer of responsibility that is vital for maintaining patient-centered care during critical situations [3].

The interdisciplinary nature of managing cardiogenic shock further emphasizes the indispensable role of nurses as patient advocates and team leaders. Effective communication among healthcare providers is paramount to delivering synchronous and efficient care. Nurses frequently act as the linchpin in this dynamic, coordinating care efforts and ensuring that the flow of information is both timely and accurate. This synergy is especially vital during the initial assessment phase and when establishing treatment protocols, as swift decision-making can be the difference between survival and mortality in patients experiencing cardiogenic shock [3].

The role of nurses in managing cardiogenic shock extends beyond immediate patient care and clinical interventions; it includes engagement in quality improvement initiatives, research, and education. Understanding the epidemiology of cardiogenic shock, its risk factors, and the evolving landscape of cardiac care is critical. Nurses are increasingly involved in research activities, contributing to the evidence base that informs best practices and treatment strategies. By participating in quality improvement projects, nurses help to identify gaps

in care and develop strategies to enhance patient outcomes, thereby nurturing a culture of continuous improvement within healthcare settings [3].

Furthermore, the emotional and psychological toll of cardiogenic shock on patients and their families cannot be overlooked. Nurses, with their holistic approach to care, are well-positioned to provide support that addresses these aspects. They enhance the overall care experience by fostering relationships built on trust, compassion, and empathy. By acting as patient educators and emotional supporters, nurses help patients and families navigate the complexities of the treatment process, often serving as the primary point of contact for queries, concerns, and decision-making processes [4].

Pathophysiology of Cardiogenic Shock:

Cardiogenic shock is a critical condition characterized by inadequate perfusion of tissues due to severe impairment of cardiac function. It is often the result of various cardiac pathologies, primarily stemming from myocardial infarction, congestive heart failure, or severe arrhythmias. Understanding the pathophysiology underlying cardiogenic shock is essential for effective diagnosis, treatment, and management, given its high mortality rates [5].

To comprehend cardiogenic shock, one must first grasp the responsibilities of the heart in maintaining hemodynamic stability. The heart functions as a pump that circulates blood throughout the body, supplying oxygen and nutrients to various tissues. This operation is achieved through the coordinated contraction of the cardiac muscle, regulated by electrical impulses generated in the cardiac conduction system. Under normal conditions, the heart maintains an adequate cardiac output, defined as the volume of blood the heart pumps per minute, influenced by heart rate and stroke volume [6].

Mechanisms Leading to Cardiogenic Shock

Cardiogenic shock typically arises from a precipitous decline in cardiac output, often precipitated by one or more of the following mechanisms:

1. **Myocardial Ischemia:** The most common etiology of cardiogenic shock is acute myocardial infarction (AMI), where a blockage of coronary arteries restricts

blood flow to heart tissue. This ischemia results in the death of cardiac myocytes, leading to decreased contractility. The loss of viable myocardial tissue diminishes the heart's ability to generate sufficient force to pump blood effectively, leading to compromised perfusion pressure [7].

2. **Mechanical Heart Failure:** Conditions such as severe valve dysfunction (e.g., aortic stenosis, mitral regurgitation), left ventricular outflow obstruction, or myocardial rupture can also precipitate cardiogenic shock. Such mechanical failures disrupt normal hemodynamic patterns, further reducing cardiac output.
3. **Arrhythmias:** Tachyarrhythmias, like ventricular tachycardia or fibrillation, can compromise the heart's filling and ejection phases, significantly impairing output. Conversely, bradyarrhythmias, including complete heart block, may hinder the heart rate, also leading to inadequate cardiac output.
4. **Severe Heart Failure:** Patients with chronic heart failure can succumb to an acute exacerbation, where a reduced cardiac output manifests suddenly due to increased myocardial workload or loss of compensatory mechanisms. As the heart struggles to pump against heightened systemic vascular resistance, perfusion to vital organs diminishes, culminating in shock [7].
5. **Increased Preload and Afterload:** Conditions elevating venous return (preload) or systemic vascular resistance (afterload) can also exacerbate heart failure, precipitating shock. Elevated preload can lead to pulmonary congestion, whereas an increased afterload demands heightened contractility which a weakened heart may not sustain [8].

Physiological Changes Associated with Cardiogenic Shock

The severe reduction in cardiac output initiates a cascade of systemic responses aimed at compensating for the inadequate perfusion:

- **Activation of the Sympathetic Nervous System:** In response to reduced blood flow, the body activates the sympathetic nervous system and releases catecholamines (epinephrine and norepinephrine) to promote vasoconstriction and increase heart rate. While this response temporarily improves organ perfusion, prolonged activation can lead to increased myocardial oxygen demand, further straining the already compromised heart [9].
- **Renin-Angiotensin-Aldosterone System (RAAS) Activation:** Decreased renal perfusion stimulates the RAAS, initiating a hormonal response that facilitates fluid retention to increase blood volume and blood pressure. However, this fluid overload may exacerbate cardiac workload and precipitate congestion, especially in patients with heart failure [9].
- **Increased Inflammatory Mediators:** In cardiogenic shock, the damaged myocardium and tissues release inflammatory cytokines, contributing to a systemic inflammatory response. This response can lead to endothelial dysfunction, vascular permeability changes, and further myocardial damage, perpetuating a vicious cycle of impairment.
- **Tissue Hypoperfusion and Ischemia:** As cardiac output falls, inadequate oxygen delivery to vital organs ensues. Systems that are typically resilient, such as the kidneys and gastrointestinal tract, may quickly succumb to acute injury, leading to complications such as renal failure, multi-organ dysfunction syndrome, or gut ischemia [10].

Clinical Implications

Recognizing the symptoms and signs of cardiogenic shock is crucial for timely intervention. Patients may present with hypotension, tachycardia, cool and clammy skin, altered mental status, and oliguria, indicative of poor perfusion. Diagnostic evaluation typically involves electrocardiography, echocardiography, serum biomarkers (e.g., troponins), and hemodynamic monitoring via arterial lines or pulmonary artery catheters [11].

Management of cardiogenic shock focuses on restoring adequate perfusion and addressing the underlying cause. Initial strategies may involve intravenous fluid resuscitation, though caution is advised in cases of significant left ventricular dysfunction. Pharmacologic interventions, including inotropes (e.g., dobutamine, dopamine) or vasopressors (e.g., norepinephrine), aim to enhance cardiac contractility and systemic vascular resistance. Invasive interventions such as intra-aortic balloon pump (IABP) support, ventricular assist devices, or coronary revascularization might be indicated based on the etiology and severity of the shock [11].

Nursing Assessment and Early Detection:

Cardiogenic shock (CS) is a critical condition characterized by the heart's inability to pump sufficient blood to meet the body's needs, resulting in tissue hypoperfusion and potential organ failure. This state can occur following various cardiac events such as myocardial infarction, heart failure, or arrhythmias and poses significant risks to patient outcomes. The role of nursing in the evaluation and early detection of cardiogenic shock is paramount as timely intervention can dramatically improve prognosis [12].

Before delving deeper into nursing evaluation and detection methodologies, it is essential to understand the underlying pathophysiology of cardiogenic shock. In cardiogenic shock, the heart's functionality is severely compromised, leading to decreased cardiac output and consequently inadequate perfusion to vital organs. Common causes include large anterior wall myocardial infarctions, severe valve dysfunction, cardiomyopathy, and certain arrhythmic events. The clinical manifestations can be subtle at onset, often resembling other conditions; therefore, early recognition is critical [12].

The Role of Nursing in Evaluation

1. Initial Assessment and History Taking

The first step in nursing evaluation is a comprehensive initial assessment. Nurses must gather a thorough patient history, including risk factors such as a history of heart disease, hypertension, diabetes, or previous myocardial infarctions. Additionally, interviewing the patient

about the onset of symptoms—such as chest pain, shortness of breath, fatigue, and palpitations—can provide vital information about the cardiac status [13].

2. Physical Examination

A complete physical examination should be performed to assess the patient's current hemodynamic status. Key indicators include:

- **Vital Signs:** Monitoring blood pressure, heart rate, respiratory rate, and temperature is crucial. In cardiogenic shock, one would typically observe hypotension (systolic blood pressure < 90 mmHg), tachycardia, and potential signs of respiratory distress [14].
- **Cardiac Auscultation:** Abnormal heart sounds, such as gallops or murmur, can indicate underlying dysfunctions in heart mechanics.
- **Capillary Refill Time:** A prolonged capillary refill (>2 seconds) may suggest peripheral hypoperfusion.
- **Skin Assessment:** Cold, clammy skin with pallor can indicate shock, contrasting with the warm, flushed skin often seen in septic shock.
- **Urine Output:** A decline in urine output can indicate decreasing renal perfusion, an important consideration in evaluating the severity of cardiogenic shock [14].

3. Use of Diagnostic Tools

Nurses play a key role in coordinating and interpreting diagnostic assessments. These may include:

- **Electrocardiogram (ECG):** Identifying ST-segment elevations, arrhythmias, or other abnormalities can provide insights

into cardiac ischemia or infarction [15].

- **Laboratory Tests:** Nurses facilitate blood draws for biomarkers indicative of cardiac stress or damage, such as troponin levels, and other tests including BNP (B-type natriuretic peptide) for heart failure evaluation.
- **Imaging Studies:** Chest X-rays or echocardiograms can reveal underlying structural abnormalities, pleural effusion, or reduced ejection fraction [15].

4. Monitoring Hemodynamic Status

Utilizing invasive monitoring techniques, such as central venous pressure (CVP) and arterial line measurements, can provide real-time data on hemodynamic status, enabling nurses to assess the severity of shock. Additionally, non-invasive methods, such as continuous cardiac output monitoring, can aid in evaluating response to interventions [16].

Clinical Indicators of Cardiogenic Shock

Nurses must be keenly aware of the critical clinical indicators that aid in the early detection of cardiogenic shock. These include:

- **Altered Mental Status:** Signs of confusion or disorientation can signal reduced cerebral perfusion, a hallmark of shock.
- **Tachycardia and Hypotension:** Persistent tachycardia (>100 beats per minute) and signs of hypotension are key warning signals.
- **Decreased Urinary Output:** Urine output dropping below 0.5 mL/kg/hr can indicate renal hypoperfusion.
- **Diaphoresis and Cool Extremities:** These signs can highlight the body's compensatory mechanisms in response to shock [16].

Limitations in Detection

While nursing evaluation plays a fundamental role in the early detection of cardiogenic shock, several limitations exist. First and foremost, the nonspecific nature of early symptoms can lead to diagnostic challenges. The subtlety of initial signs can result in missed diagnoses if healthcare providers do not maintain a high index of suspicion [17].

Furthermore, patients with preexisting conditions such as chronic heart failure may present with atypical symptoms. Consequently, experienced nursing judgment is critical. Misinterpretation of vital signs or physical findings could lead to delayed interventions [17].

Collaboration and Interprofessional Approach

To ensure a thorough approach to the detection and management of cardiogenic shock, collaboration among healthcare professionals is essential. Nurses, along with physicians, pharmacists, and other specialists, form a cohesive team that can devise comprehensive care plans. Effective communication and shared knowledge foster a holistic evaluation that may enhance early detection efforts [18].

Interprofessional rounds and checklists can serve as valuable tools for ensuring that all team members are on the same page regarding assessment, leading to a culture of vigilance and rapid response to changing patient conditions. By working collaboratively, healthcare providers can leverage diverse expertise to facilitate timely interventions and optimize patient outcomes [18].

Pharmacological Interventions:

Cardiogenic shock (CS) is a life-threatening clinical syndrome characterized by inadequate tissue perfusion and oxygen delivery due to severe reduction in cardiac output. This condition often arises following a significant myocardial infarction, but it can also result from other cardiac conditions such as myocarditis, acute valve dysfunction, or chronic cardiomyopathies. The prognosis for patients experiencing cardiogenic shock is poor, with mortality rates that can range from 40% to 90%. To enhance survival rates and support hemodynamic stability in these patients, prompt and effective pharmacological interventions are critical [19].

Before delving into pharmacological interventions, it is essential to understand the pathophysiological basis of cardiogenic shock. In this condition, the heart's ability to pump blood sufficiently to meet the metabolic demands of the body is compromised. This results in inadequate perfusion of vital organs, leading to symptoms such as hypotension, tachycardia, weak pulses, altered mental status, and oliguria. Early recognition and treatment are essential, as delaying intervention can lead to multi-organ failure and death [19].

Initial Management Strategies

The management of cardiogenic shock typically requires a combination of pharmacological and non-pharmacological interventions. Mechanical support devices, such as intra-aortic balloon pumps (IABP) or impella devices, may be employed to assist the failing heart. However, pharmacological therapy plays a pivotal role in stabilizing the patient and restoring adequate circulation.

To ensure immediate action, clinicians often initiate treatment with intravenous fluids and medications to address perfusion and cardiac output. The goals of pharmacotherapy in cardiogenic shock include improving cardiac output, enhancing myocardial oxygen delivery, and maintaining systemic vascular resistance [20].

Vasopressors

Vasopressors are medications that induce vasoconstriction and raise systemic vascular resistance, which can help to increase blood pressure in patients experiencing hypotension due to cardiogenic shock. Commonly used vasopressors include norepinephrine and epinephrine [21].

- **Norepinephrine:** Often considered the first-line agent for the management of hypotension in cardiogenic shock, norepinephrine acts primarily on alpha-1 adrenergic receptors, resulting in vasoconstriction. Additionally, it has some beta-1 adrenergic activity, providing a modest inotropic effect that can help improve cardiac output without significantly increasing heart rate, which is particularly beneficial in patients with already elevated heart rates [22].

- **Epinephrine:** While epinephrine also induces vasoconstriction through alpha-1 receptor activity, it is associated with more pronounced beta-1 and beta-2 agonistic effects. This can result in increased heart rate, myocardial contractility, and peripheral vasodilation. Although effective, the use of epinephrine may elevate myocardial oxygen consumption, potentially exacerbating ischemia, particularly in settings where myocardial perfusion is already compromised [23].

Inotropes

Inotropic agents are another essential component of pharmacological therapy for cardiogenic shock, as they directly enhance myocardial contractility. The primary inotropes used in this context include dobutamine and milrinone [24].

- **Dobutamine:** Dobutamine is a beta-1 adrenergic agonist that increases myocardial contractility and stroke volume without significantly raising systemic vascular resistance. It is particularly indicated for patients who have low cardiac output but adequate blood pressure. However, it can cause tachyarrhythmias and may exacerbate myocardial oxygen demand.
- **Milrinone:** Milrinone, a phosphodiesterase-3 inhibitor, facilitates increased intracellular cAMP levels, resulting in vasodilation and enhanced myocardial contractility. It is often used in patients who are not responding to catecholamines alone. However, its vasodilatory effects can sometimes lead to hypotension, necessitating careful monitoring and titration of doses [25].

Adjunctive Medications

In addition to vasopressors and inotropes, other adjunctive medications may be employed in the management of cardiogenic shock. These include anticoagulants, beta-blockers, and diuretics [26].

- **Anticoagulants:** The risk of thrombus formation during cardiogenic shock necessitates the use of anticoagulants to prevent complications such as deep vein

thrombosis or pulmonary embolism. Low molecular weight heparins (LMWH) or unfractionated heparin (UFH) can be administered based on the clinical scenario.

- **Beta-blockers:** While typically contraindicated in acute scenarios due to their negative inotropic effects, beta-blockers may be incorporated in a later phase of treatment once hemodynamic stability is achieved, particularly in patients with underlying heart failure or chronic coronary artery disease [26].
- **Diuretics:** In cases where fluid overload occurs, diuretics can help manage volume status and reduce cardiac workload. However, care must be taken to avoid excessive diuresis, which could lead to hypotension or renal impairment [26].

Monitoring and Considerations

As with all pharmacological treatments, continuous monitoring of the patient is crucial. Clinicians must assess hemodynamic parameters, including blood pressure, heart rate, urine output, and signs of end-organ perfusion, to ensure that the chosen interventions are effective and well tolerated. Additionally, potential side effects of these medications, such as arrhythmias, hypotension, or exacerbated myocardial ischemia, must be closely monitored [27].

Non-Pharmacological Management Strategies:

Cardiogenic shock (CS) represents a life-threatening condition characterized by the heart's inability to effectively pump blood, leading to inadequate tissue perfusion and profound hypotension. Typically arising from various cardiovascular disorders such as myocardial infarction, cardiomyopathy, and arrhythmias, this syndrome poses significant challenges to clinicians. While pharmacological interventions—such as inotropes and vasodilators—are foundational in the management of cardiogenic shock, non-pharmacological strategies are equally critical in optimizing patient outcomes [27].

1. Mechanical Circulatory Support

Among the most effective non-pharmacological interventions for cardiogenic shock are mechanical circulatory support devices. These devices are

designed to assist the failing heart with the goal of improving hemodynamics and increasing organ perfusion [28].

- **Intra-aortic balloon pump (IABP):** The IABP is a widely used mechanical device that augments coronary blood flow and decreases myocardial oxygen demand through timed inflation and deflation. Positioned in the descending aorta, the IABP inflates during diastole, increasing coronary perfusion pressure, and deflates just before systole, decreasing afterload. This dual action helps to improve cardiac output, particularly in patients suffering from myocardial ischemia [29].
- **Ventricular assist devices (VADs):** VADs can be used for short-term or long-term management of advanced heart failure or cardiogenic shock. External VADs can provide varying degrees of support depending on the patient's condition and may be temporary measures until recovery or heart transplantation is possible [30].
- **Extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO):** ECMO offers a temporary means to provide both cardiac and respiratory support, effectively oxygenating blood and mechanically circulating it throughout the body. It is typically employed in cases of extreme cardiogenic shock with concomitant respiratory insufficiency or as a bridge to more definitive therapies.

2. Advanced Hemodynamic Monitoring

For effective management of cardiogenic shock, it is crucial to have precise and customized hemodynamic monitoring. Advanced monitoring techniques such as pulmonary artery catheterization allow for the assessment of cardiac output, filling pressures, and systemic vascular resistance. These measurements help guide therapy and enable clinicians to tailor treatments based on real-time data [31].

- **Cardiac output monitoring:** Utilizing devices like the thermodilution catheter or the pulse contour analysis can help

clinicians assess the effectiveness of interventions and adjust fluid resuscitation and inotropic support accordingly.

- **Non-invasive monitoring methods:** Technologies such as the bioreactance or trans-thoracic echocardiography provide clinicians with more accessible tools for real-time assessment of hemodynamics without the complications associated with invasive mechanical monitoring [32].

3. Optimizing Fluid Management

In patients with cardiogenic shock, careful management of fluid status is paramount. Volume overload can lead to pulmonary congestion and further compromise cardiac function. Thus, fluid management focuses on achieving euvolemia through judicious use of intravenous fluids, diuretics, and advanced monitoring strategies.

- **Fluid resuscitation:** Initial management may involve the administration of intravenous fluids, though great caution is warranted. The clinician must strike a balance between combating hypovolemia and avoiding fluid overload.
- **Diuretics:** Administering loop diuretics may aid in controlling volume overload in patients who show signs of congestion while ensuring adequate renal perfusion and function [33].

4. Nutritional Support

Nutrition plays a significant role in the recovery of patients experiencing cardiogenic shock. An adequately nourished body is better equipped to tolerate stress, heal, and recover from insult.

- **Enteral feeding:** Early initiation of enteral nutrition is encouraged to maintain gastrointestinal integrity and support metabolic demands. Avoiding prolonged fasting can help mitigate muscle wasting and preserve functional capacity [34].
- **Caloric assessment:** Monitoring caloric intake and ensuring that nutritional demands are met can aid recovery and help prevent complications, particularly in

patients with prolonged stays in intensive care settings [34].

5. Supportive Care and Rehabilitation

The management of cardiogenic shock extends beyond immediate intervention and includes long-term rehabilitation efforts. Early mobilization, physical therapy, and psychological support can greatly improve outcomes and enhance the quality of life for survivors of this severe condition.

- **Early mobilization:** Engaging patients in early mobility and rehabilitation facilitates recovery, improves cardiac function, and can reduce hospital length of stay.
- **Psychological support:** Providing mental health support is essential as patients may experience anxiety, depression, or post-traumatic stress after a critical illness. Incorporating psychological professionals may aid in the recovery process and improve overall well-being [35].

Interdisciplinary Collaboration in Care:

Cardiogenic shock (CS) is a critical condition characterized by the heart's inability to pump sufficient blood to meet the body's needs, leading to inadequate tissue perfusion and oxygenation. It is often a complication of acute myocardial infarction (AMI) but may also arise from other cardiac and non-cardiac causes, including severe arrhythmias, valvular disease, and myocarditis. The management of cardiogenic shock is complex and demands a comprehensive, multidisciplinary approach that involves cardiologists, intensivists, nurses, pharmacists, and other healthcare professionals [36].

The Importance of a Multidisciplinary Approach

The management of cardiogenic shock involves multiple facets, including rapid diagnosis, hemodynamic stabilization, and the initiation of appropriate therapies, such as medication, mechanical support devices, or surgical intervention. Given the wide-ranging implications and potential complications associated with this condition, a singular disciplinary approach is often insufficient. Multidisciplinary cooperation is essential for the following reasons:

1. **Holistic Patient Assessment:** CS presents with a variety of clinical manifestations, and its multidisciplinary team (MDT) is crucial for providing a well-rounded understanding of the patient's condition. Cardiologists can assess heart function through echocardiography and other imaging modalities, while intensivists can evaluate the respiratory and renal systems' status. Nurses play a pivotal role in monitoring vital signs and recognizing subtle changes, while pharmacists ensure that pharmacotherapy aligns with the patient's specific needs. This comprehensive approach can lead to more accurate diagnosis and treatment [37].
2. **Optimized Treatment Protocols:** The management of CS requires a series of treatments that may include inotropes, vasopressors, and anticoagulants, as well as advanced interventions such as intra-aortic balloon pumps (IABP) or extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO). Collaborative input from various specialists helps to develop optimized treatment protocols tailored to individual patients. For example, while cardiologists might focus on optimizing cardiac function and rhythm, intensivists address fluid management and multiorgan failure risks, ensuring that all relevant factors are considered.
3. **Improved Communication:** Effective communication among team members is paramount in the context of cardiogenic shock care. Frequent updates and discussions regarding a patient's status allow for timely adjustments in treatment plans. The integration of electronic health records (EHR) and multidisciplinary rounds facilitates the sharing of information, ensuring that all members of the team are informed and can provide input into patient care decisions [37].

Roles of Key Stakeholders

The management of cardiogenic shock involves numerous healthcare professionals, each contributing unique expertise:

- **Cardiologists:** These specialists are at the forefront of medical management for patients in shock. They focus on diagnosing the underlying cause of CS, adjusting meditative therapy, and determining potential interventions, such as revascularization [38].
- **Intensivists:** Critical care physicians play a vital role when the patient is admitted to an intensive care unit (ICU). They manage complications associated with multiorgan dysfunction, monitor vital signs, and adjust therapy based on the patient's evolving needs.
- **Nursing Staff:** Nurses are essential team members responsible for close monitoring and patient advocacy. Their hands-on approach allows for greater identification of changes in patient status that may require immediate intervention.
- **Pharmacists:** With their expertise in drug interactions, side effects, and optimal medication regimens, pharmacists contribute to creating individual medication plans that reduce adverse effects while maximizing therapeutic benefits.
- **Cardiac Surgeons:** In cases where mechanical circulatory support or surgical interventions are warranted, cardiac surgeons join the team to provide specialty care that may improve outcomes.
- **Social Workers and Psychologists:** The emotional and psychological support for patients and families is often overlooked. Social workers and psychologists play crucial roles in providing counseling resources and assisting with complex decision-making processes [38].

Challenges of Multidisciplinary Cooperation

Despite the apparent advantages of a multidisciplinary approach, challenges persist. Among the most significant obstacles are:

1. **Coordination Issues:** Synchronizing schedules, responsibilities, and interventions can be logistically

challenging. These issues may lead to fragmented care or delays in treatment, which is critical in time-sensitive conditions like CS [39].

2. **Differences in Communication Styles and Professional Culture:** Each discipline may have its own communication norms and decision-making processes. The potential for misunderstandings or conflicts can arise when different professional backgrounds intersect.
3. **Resource Limitations:** Limited resources, such as time constraints, insufficient personnel, or an overwhelming patient load may hinder effective collaboration and comprehensive patient care.
4. **Educational Barriers:** Disparities in training and knowledge levels among team members can lead to gaps in understanding specific aspects of CS management. Ongoing education and interprofessional training can help mitigate this issue [39].

Benefits of Effective Multidisciplinary Care

Despite these challenges, the benefits of efficient multidisciplinary cooperation are numerous:

1. **Enhanced Patient Outcomes:** Research shows that patients with CS managed by multidisciplinary teams have improved survival rates, shorter hospital stays, and lower complication rates. Comprehensive care approaches enhance overall patient well-being [40].
2. **Improved Staff Satisfaction:** A well-coordinated MDT can lead to greater job satisfaction among healthcare professionals, as collaborative environments foster a sense of shared responsibility and mutual support.
3. **Innovation and Advance in Care:** Interdisciplinary collaboration encourages the sharing of knowledge and innovative ideas that can lead to advancements in CS care protocols and treatment modalities.
4. **Continuous Improvement:** Multidisciplinary rounds offer opportunities for feedback and critical

evaluation of patient management, promoting a cycle of continuous improvement in care standards [40].

Patient and Family Education:

Cardiogenic shock is a critical condition that occurs when the heart's ability to pump blood is severely impaired, resulting in insufficient blood flow to the body's organs. This condition often arises from various causes, including acute myocardial infarction, heart failure, or severe arrhythmias. The management of cardiogenic shock is complex and requires a coordinated approach involving a variety of healthcare professionals, among which nurses play a vital role. Educating patients and their families about the role of nurses in managing this condition is essential, as it fosters a supportive environment and enhances the overall care experience [41].

Before delving into the specifics of nursing roles, it is crucial to establish a comprehensive understanding of cardiogenic shock. The hallmark of this condition is a significant drop in cardiac output, which leads to poor tissue perfusion and, consequently, organ dysfunction. Patients may present with symptoms such as sudden shortness of breath, fatigue, confusion, and cold, clammy skin. The severity of symptoms can escalate quickly, necessitating urgent medical intervention. Understanding the nature of cardiogenic shock equips patients and their families to appreciate the complexity of care required and the essential role that nurses play in the management process.

The management of cardiogenic shock typically involves a multidisciplinary approach, including physicians, nurse practitioners, respiratory therapists, pharmacists, and dieticians, among others. Each member of the healthcare team has distinct responsibilities that contribute to the overall goal of stabilizing the patient and improving cardiovascular function. Within this team, nurses are often the frontline caregivers who are intimately involved in patient assessment, monitoring, treatment administration, and emotional support [42].

The Role of Nurses in Managing Cardiogenic Shock

1. Assessment and Monitoring

Nurses are integral in the continuous assessment of patients in cardiogenic shock. They closely monitor vital signs, oxygen saturation levels, urine output, and other indicators of organ perfusion. This ongoing assessment allows nurses to detect subtle changes in the patient's condition, which may signal deterioration. Utilizing advanced monitoring technologies, such as telemetry and intra-aortic balloon pumps, nurses gather critical data that inform medical decisions. By understanding that nurses are responsible for this level of detailed monitoring, patients and their families can appreciate the full scope of care being provided [43].

2. Medication Administration

The pharmacological management of cardiogenic shock often involves a range of medications, including inotropes to improve cardiac contractility, vasopressors to maintain blood pressure, and diuretics to manage fluid overload. Nurses are responsible for the administration of these medications, ensuring that they are given at the correct dosages and intervals. They must also be vigilant for potential side effects and complications, effectively balancing the therapeutic benefits against risks. Educating families about the significance of medication management instills confidence in the care being received, as they understand that nurses are not merely administrative personnel but skilled professionals directly involved in life-saving interventions [44].

3. Supportive Care

Patients in cardiogenic shock often experience significant anxiety and fear due to their critical condition. Nurses provide emotional support and education, addressing both the medical aspects of the illness and the psychosocial needs of the patient and their family. They are instrumental in communication, serving as liaisons between the healthcare team and

the patient's family. By translating medical jargon into understandable language, nurses empower families to understand the patient's condition, care plan, and prognosis. This education is vital as it reduces anxiety and enhances compliance with treatment protocols [45].

4. Collaboration with the Healthcare Team

Nurses play a crucial role in coordinating care among the multidisciplinary team. They communicate critical findings to physicians and other healthcare providers, ensuring that everyone is informed about the patient's status and treatment progress. Additionally, nurses participate in family meetings where care strategies are discussed, contributing their insights based on their continuous patient observations. This collaborative effort ensures a holistic approach to the management of cardiogenic shock, further emphasizing the importance of nurses in navigating complex healthcare dynamics. [46]

5. Patient and Family Education

A fundamental aspect of nursing involves educating patients and families about their condition and the rationale behind treatment decisions. Nurses inform families about the signs of improvement or deterioration in the patient's condition, teaching them when to seek immediate assistance. Additionally, they educate families about lifestyle changes and rehabilitation strategies that may be necessary post-discharge, thus fostering long-term recovery. By recognizing that education is an ongoing process, patients and families can become proactive participants in the patient's recovery journey [47].

6. Advocacy

Nurses serve as advocates for their patients, ensuring that their needs and preferences are respected within the healthcare environment. In managing cardiogenic shock, this role is particularly critical, as patients might be unable to articulate their concerns or preferences due to their condition. By actively listening to patients

and families, nurses can relay these insights to other team members, ensuring that care plans align with the patient's values and wishes. Advocacy is an often-overlooked dimension of nursing care, and understanding this role fosters trust and respect between patients and healthcare providers [48].

Challenges and Ethical Considerations:

Cardiogenic shock is a complex and life-threatening condition that arises when the heart's ability to pump blood is severely compromised, often due to acute myocardial infarction or other cardiac pathologies. This condition results in insufficient blood flow to meet the metabolic needs of the body's tissues, leading to organ dysfunction and, if left untreated, death. While advancements in medical science have provided various therapeutic approaches, the management of cardiogenic shock is fraught with challenges and ethical considerations that must be navigated carefully by healthcare professionals [49].

One of the most significant clinical challenges in the management of cardiogenic shock is the rapid identification of the condition in patients who present with ambiguous symptoms. The onset of cardiogenic shock can be insidious, often mimicking other medical conditions. Symptoms such as dyspnea, hypotension, and altered mental status can overlap with a range of critical conditions, complicating timely diagnosis and intervention. Physicians must possess a high degree of clinical acumen and urgency, as the prognosis for patients with untreated cardiogenic shock is dire [50].

Once diagnosed, initiating effective treatment presents additional challenges. Standard management strategies include the use of pharmacological agents such as inotropes to improve cardiac output, vasopressors to maintain vascular tone, and mechanical circulatory support devices like intra-aortic balloon pumps (IABP) and ventricular assist devices (VADs). However, these interventions are not without risks. Inotropes may increase myocardial oxygen demand, exacerbating ischemia and potentially leading to further cardiac compromise. Similarly, the placement of mechanical devices poses risks for infections, thromboembolic events, and device-related complications. The decision to proceed with such interventions requires careful consideration of the

risks and benefits, as well as an understanding of the underlying cause of the cardiogenic shock [51].

Moreover, the management of cardiogenic shock often intersects with logistical challenges within healthcare systems. Critical care settings are frequently resource-intensive, requiring a multidisciplinary approach involving cardiologists, intensivists, and nursing staff well-trained in the nuances of cardiovascular care. In many regions, there may be limitations on resources, such as availability of advanced mechanical support devices or even adequate intensive care unit (ICU) beds, leading to difficult decisions regarding patient allocation and prioritization [52].

In addition to the clinical hurdles, the ethical implications surrounding cardiogenic shock management are profound. One major ethical concern is the concept of futility in medical treatment. Physicians often face profoundly difficult decisions regarding whether to initiate aggressive treatment in patients with very low chances of recovery or in those whose quality of life may be irreversibly diminished by their cardiac condition. The principle of medical futility indicates that treatments should not only be effective but also align with patients' physiological reality and their wishes. Engaging in honest conversations with patients and their families about the prognosis and realistic treatment outcomes is essential, yet can be uncomfortable and challenging [53].

The ethical principle of autonomy must also be considered when discussing treatment options for cardiogenic shock. Respecting patient autonomy involves recognizing their rights to make informed decisions about their care. This is especially important in advanced care planning and end-of-life discussions. Patients suffering from cardiogenic shock, particularly those with pre-existing advanced heart failure, may have varying values and preferences regarding aggressive interventions, which need to be respected. Healthcare providers should facilitate shared decision-making processes that honor the patient's goals and preferences, thus avoiding paternalistic tendencies while still providing appropriate guidance [54].

Another significant ethical consideration is equity in healthcare delivery. The management of cardiogenic shock can be heavily influenced by socioeconomic factors, including access to care and disparities in

healthcare resources. Patients from marginalized backgrounds may have less access to advanced cardiac therapies, including, but not limited to, coronary intervention and mechanical support devices. Such inequities in access raise ethical concerns related to justice—ensuring that all patients have equitable opportunities to receive life-saving treatments [55].

Additionally, research involving new therapies and devices for treating cardiogenic shock poses ethical dilemmas. Clinical trials provide essential data that can improve treatment paradigms, yet they often require the inclusion of critically ill patients who may be unable to provide informed consent. In such cases, surrogate decision-makers may be relied upon, necessitating clear communication about risks, benefits, and the nature of the research. Researchers and healthcare professionals must navigate these discussions with sensitivity and transparency, ensuring that ethical standards are upheld while fostering advances in medical knowledge [56].

Conclusion:

In conclusion, nurses play an indispensable role in the effective management of cardiogenic shock, a critical condition that demands swift and decisive action. Their multifaceted responsibilities encompass thorough assessment, timely intervention, and ongoing monitoring, all of which are crucial for optimizing patient outcomes. By leveraging their clinical expertise, nurses not only administer essential medications and therapies but also provide critical emotional support and education to patients and their families, fostering a holistic approach to care.

Furthermore, the dynamic nature of cardiogenic shock requires seamless collaboration with interdisciplinary teams, highlighting the importance of communication and shared decision-making in the clinical setting. As the landscape of healthcare continues to evolve, the nursing profession must adapt and enhance its strategies to manage such complex cases effectively. Continued education, training, and research into best practices will empower nurses to navigate the challenges posed by cardiogenic shock, ultimately improving survival rates and quality of life for affected patients.

References:

1. Ghajar A, Ordonez CP, Philips B, Pinzon PQ, Fleming LM, Motiwala SR, Sriwattanakomen R, Ho JE, Grandin EW, Sabe M, et al. Cardiogenic shock related cardiovascular mortality trends in US population: heart failure vs acute myocardial infarction as contributing causes. *Int J Cardiol.* 2022;367:45–48. doi: 10.1016/j.ijcard.2022.08.043.
2. Tehrani BN, Sherwood MW, Rosner C, Truesdell AG, Lee SB, Damluji AA, Desai M, Desai S, Epps KC, Flanagan MC, et al. A standardized and regionalized network of care for cardiogenic shock. *JACC: Heart Fail.* 2022;10:768–781.
3. Jentzer JC, Ahmed AM, Vallabhajosyula S, Burstein B, Tabi M, Barsness GW, Murphy JG, Best PJ, Bell MR. Shock in the cardiac intensive care unit: changes in epidemiology and prognosis over time. *Am Heart J.* 2021;232:94–104. doi: 10.1016/j.ahj.2020.10.054.
4. Vallabhajosyula S, Verghese D, Henry TD, Katz JN, Nicholson WJ, Jaber WA, Jentzer JC. Contemporary management of concomitant cardiac arrest and cardiogenic shock complicating myocardial infarction. *Mayo Clin Proc.* 2022;97:2333–2354. doi: 10.1016/j.mayocp.2022.06.027.
5. Osman M, Syed M, Patibandla S, Sulaiman S, Kheiri B, Shah MK, Bianco C, Balla S, Patel B. Fifteen-year trends in incidence of cardiogenic shock hospitalization and in-hospital mortality in the United States. *J Am Heart Assoc.* 2021;10:e021061. doi: 10.1161/JAHA.121.021061.
6. Jentzer JC, Bhat AG, Patlolla SH, Sinha SS, Miller PE, Lawler PR, van Diepen S, Khanna AK, Zhao D, Vallabhajosyula S. Concomitant sepsis diagnoses in acute myocardial infarction-cardiogenic shock: 15-year national temporal trends, management, and outcomes. *Crit Care Explor.* 2022;4:e0637. doi: 10.1097/CCE.0000000000000637.
7. Tehrani BN, Truesdell AG, Sherwood MW, Desai S, Tran HA, Epps KC, Singh R, Psotka M, Shah P, Cooper LB, et al. Standardized team-based care for

- cardiogenic shock. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2019;73:1659–1669. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2018.12.084.
8. Moghaddam N, van Diepen S, So D, Lawler PR, Fordyce CB. Cardiogenic shock teams and centres: a contemporary review of multidisciplinary care for cardiogenic shock. *ESC Heart Fail*. 2021;8:988–998. doi: 10.1002/ehf2.13180.
9. Venkataraman S, Bhardwaj A, Belford PM, Morris BN, Zhao DX, Vallabhajosyula S. Venous-arterial extracorporeal membrane oxygenation in patients with fulminant myocarditis: a review of contemporary literature. *Medicina*. 2022;58:215. doi: 10.3390/medicina58020215.
10. Baran DA, Grines CL, Bailey S, Burkhoff D, Hall SA, Henry TD, Hollenberg SM, Kapur NK, O'Neill W, Ornato JP, et al. SCAI clinical expert consensus statement on the classification of cardiogenic shock. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv*. 2019;94:29–37. doi: 10.1002/ccd.28329.
11. Tyler JM, Brown C, Jentzer JC, Baran DA, van Diepen S, Kapur NK, Garberich RF, Garcia S, Sharkey SW, Henry TD. Variability in reporting of key outcome predictors in acute myocardial infarction cardiogenic shock trials. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv*. 2022;99:19–26. doi: 10.1002/ccd.29710.
12. Holland EM, Moss TJ. Acute Noncardiovascular Illness in the Cardiac Intensive Care Unit. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2017 Apr 25;69(16):1999–2007. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2017.02.033.
13. Fonarow GC, Abraham WT, Albert NM et al. Influence of beta-blocker continuation or withdrawal on outcomes in patients hospitalized with heart failure: findings from the OPTIMIZE-HF program. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2008 Jul 15;52(3):190–9. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2008.03.048.
14. Vallabhajosyula S, Dunlay SM, Prasad A et al. Acute Noncardiac Organ Failure in Acute Myocardial Infarction With Cardiogenic Shock. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2019 Apr 6;73(14):1781–91. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2019.01.053.
15. Hadian M, Pinsky MR. Evidence-based review of the use of the pulmonary artery catheter: impact data and complications. *Crit Care*. 2006;10(Suppl 3):S8. doi: 10.1186/cc4834.
16. Schumann J, Henrich EC, Strobl H et al. Inotropic agents and vasodilator strategies for the treatment of cardiogenic shock or low cardiac output syndrome. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2018 Jan 29;1 doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD009669.pub3.
17. Rossello X, Vila M, Rivas-Lasarte M et al. Impact of Pulmonary Artery Catheter Use on Short- and Long-Term Mortality in Patients with Cardiogenic Shock. *Cardiology*. 2017;136(1):61–69. doi: 10.1159/000448110.
18. Wheeler AP, Bernard GR, Thompson BT et al. Pulmonary-artery versus central venous catheter to guide treatment of acute lung injury. *N Engl J Med*. 2006 May 25;354(21):2213–24. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa061895.
19. van Diepen S, Reynolds HR, Stebbins A et al. Incidence and outcomes associated with early heart failure pharmacotherapy in patients with ongoing cardiogenic shock. *Crit Care Med*. 2014 Feb;42(2):281–8. doi: 10.1097/CCM.0b013e31829f6242.
20. Binanay C, Califf RM, Hasselblad V et al. Evaluation study of congestive heart failure and pulmonary artery catheterization effectiveness: the ESCAPE trial. *JAMA*. 2005 Oct 5;294(13):1625–33. doi: 10.1001/jama.294.13.1625.
21. Chatterjee K. The Swan-Ganz catheters: past, present, and future. A viewpoint. *Circulation*. 2009 Jan 6;119(1):147–52. doi: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.108.811141.
22. Bohula EA, Katz JN, van Diepen S et al. Demographics, Care Patterns, and Outcomes of Patients Admitted to Cardiac Intensive Care Units: The Critical Care Cardiology Trials Network Prospective North American Multicenter Registry of Cardiac Critical Illness. *JAMA Cardiol*. 2019 Jul 24; doi: 10.1001/jamacardio.2019.2467.

23. Scheinman MM, Abbott JA, Rapaport E. Clinical uses of a flow directed right heart catheter. *Arch Intern Med.* 1969 Jul;124(1):19–24.
24. Gore JM, Goldberg RJ, Spodick DH, Alpert JS, Dalen JE. A community-wide assessment of the use of pulmonary artery catheters in patients with acute myocardial infarction. *Chest.* 1987 Oct;92(4):721–7. doi: 10.1378/chest.92.4.721.
25. Sandham JD, Hull RD, Brant RF et al. A randomized, controlled trial of the use of pulmonary-artery catheters in high-risk surgical patients. *N Engl J Med.* 2003 Jan 2;348(1):5–14. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa021108.
26. Harvey S, Harrison DA, Singer M et al. Assessment of the clinical effectiveness of pulmonary artery catheters in management of patients in intensive care (PAC-Man): a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet.* 2005 Aug 6–12;366(9484):472–7. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(05)67061-4.
27. Tran RH, Aldemerdash A, Chang P et al. Guideline-Directed Medical Therapy and Survival Following Hospitalization in Patients with Heart Failure. *Pharmacotherapy.* 2018 Apr;38(4):406–16. doi: 10.1002/phar.2091.
28. Swan HJ, Ganz W, Forrester J, Marcus H, Diamond G, Chonette D. Catheterization of the heart in man with use of a flow-directed balloon-tipped catheter. *N Engl J Med.* 1970 Aug 27;283(9):447–51. doi: 10.1056/NEJM197008272830902.
29. Thiele H, Akin I, Sandri M, Fuernau G, de Waha S, Meyer-Saraei R, Nordbeck P, Geisler T, Landmesser U, Skurk C, et al. PCI strategies in patients with acute myocardial infarction and cardiogenic shock. *N Engl J Med.* 2017;377:2419–2432. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1710261.
30. Damluji AA, van Diepen S, Katz JN, Menon V, Tamis-Holland JE, Bakitas M, Cohen MG, Balsam LB, Chikwe J. Mechanical complications of acute myocardial infarction: a scientific statement from the American Heart Association. *Circulation.* 2021;144:e16–e35. doi: 10.1161/CIR.0000000000000985.
31. Thiele H, Zeymer U, Neumann FJ, Ferenc M, Olbrich HG, Hausleiter J, Richardt G, Hennersdorf M, Empen K, Fuernau G, et al. Intraaortic balloon support for myocardial infarction with cardiogenic shock. *N Engl J Med.* 2012;367:1287–1296. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1208410.
32. Kanwar MK, Everett KD, Gulati G, Brener MI, Kapur NK. Epidemiology and management of right ventricular-predominant heart failure and shock in the cardiac intensive care unit. *Eur Heart J Acute Cardiovasc Care.* 2022;11:584–594. doi: 10.1093/ehjacc/zuac063.
33. Vallabhajosyula S, Dunlay SM, Prasad A, Kashani K, Sakhuja A, Gersh BJ, Jaffe AS, Holmes DR Jr, Barsness GW. Acute noncardiac organ failure in acute myocardial infarction with cardiogenic shock. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2019;73:1781–1791. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2019.01.053.
34. Jentzer JC, Schrage B, Holmes DE, Dabboura S, Anavekar NS, Kirchhof P, Barsness GW, Blankenberg S, Bell MR, Westermann D. Influence of age and shock severity on short-term survival in patients with cardiogenic shock. *Eur Heart J Acute Cardiovasc Care.* 2021;10:604–612. doi: 10.1093/ehjacc/zuaa035.
35. Bansal M, Mehta A, Balakrishna AM, Sundaram AK, Kanwar A, Singh M, Vallabhajosyula S. Right ventricular dysfunction in sepsis: an updated narrative review. *Shock.* 2023;59:829–837. doi: 10.1097/SHK.0000000000002120.
36. Fernando SM, Mathew R, Sadeghirad B, Brodie D, Belley-Cote EP, Thiele H, van Diepen S, Fan E, Di Santo P, Simard T, et al. Inotropes, vasopressors, and mechanical circulatory support for treatment of cardiogenic shock complicating myocardial infarction: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Can J Anesthesia.* 2022;69:1537–1553. doi: 10.1007/s12630-022-02337-7.
37. Vallabhajosyula S, Dunlay SM, Kashani K, Vallabhajosyula S, Vallabhajosyula S, Sundaragiri PR, Jaffe AS, Barsness GW. Temporal trends and outcomes of prolonged invasive mechanical ventilation and tracheostomy use in acute myocardial

- infarction with cardiogenic shock in the United States. *Int J Cardiol.* 2019;285:6–10. doi: 10.1016/j.ijcard.2019.03.008.
38. Ostadal P, Roykta R, Karasek J, Kruger A, Vondrakova D, Janotka M, Naar J, Smalcova J, Hubatova M, Hromadka M, et al. Extracorporeal membrane oxygenation in the therapy of cardiogenic shock: results of the ECMO-CS randomized clinical trial. *Circulation.* 2023;147:454–464. doi: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.122.062949.
39. Thiele H, Zeymer U, Akin I, Behnes M, Rassaf T, Mahabadi AA, Lehmann R, Eitel I, Graf T, Seidler T, et al. Extracorporeal life support in infarct-related cardiogenic shock. *N Engl J Med.* 2023;389:1286–1297. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2307227.
40. Fihn SD, Blankenship JC, Alexander KP, Bittl JA, Byrne JG, Fletcher BJ, Fonarow GC, Lange RA, Levine GN, Maddox TM, et al. 2014 ACC/AHA/AATS/PCNA/SCAI/STS focused update of the guideline for the diagnosis and management of patients with stable ischemic heart disease. *Circulation.* 2014;130:1749–1767. doi: 10.1161/CIR.0000000000000095.
41. Mathew R, Di Santo P, Jung RG. Milrinone as compared with dobutamine in the treatment of cardiogenic shock. *N Engl J Med.* 2021;385:516–525. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2026845.
42. Na SJ, Park TK, Lee GY, Cho YH, Chung CR, Jeon K, Suh GY, Ahn JH, Carriere KC, Song YB, et al. Impact of a cardiac intensivist on mortality in patients with cardiogenic shock. *Int J Cardiol.* 2017;244:220–225. doi: 10.1016/j.ijcard.2017.06.082.
43. Sterling LH, Fernando SM, Talarico R, Qureshi D, van Diepen S, Herridge MS, Price S, Brodie D, Fan E, Di Santo P, et al. Long-term outcomes of cardiogenic shock complicating myocardial infarction. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2023;82:985–995. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2023.06.026.
44. Vetrovec GW, Lim MJ, Needham KA. Cost savings for pVAD compared to ECMO in the management of acute myocardial infarction complicated by cardiogenic shock: an episode-of-care analysis. *Catheter Cardiovasc Interv.* 2021;98:703–710. doi: 10.1002/ccd.29181.
45. Miller PE, Bromfield SG, Ma Q, Crawford G, Whitney J, DeVries A, Desai NR. Clinical outcomes and cost associated with an intravascular microaxial left ventricular assist device vs intra-aortic balloon pump in patients presenting with acute myocardial infarction complicated by cardiogenic shock. *JAMA Intern Med.* 2022;182:926–933. doi: 10.1001/jamainternmed.2022.2735.
46. Jaamaa-Holmberg S, Salmela B, Suojäranta R, Lemström KB, Lommi J. Cost-utility of venoarterial extracorporeal membrane oxygenation in cardiogenic shock and cardiac arrest. *Eur Heart J Acute Cardiovasc Care.* 2019;9:333–341. doi: 10.1177/2048872619900090.
47. Berg DD, Barnett CF, Kenigsberg BB, Papolos A, Alviar CL, Baird-Zars VM, Barsness GW, Bohula EA, Brennan J, Burke JA, et al. Clinical practice patterns in temporary mechanical circulatory support for shock in the critical care cardiology trials network (CCCTN) registry. *Circ Heart Fail.* 2019;12:e006635.
48. Zweck E, Thayer KL, Helgestad OKL, Kanwar M, Ayouty M, Garan AR, Hernandez-Montfort MC, Wencker D, Sinha SS, et al. Phenotyping cardiogenic shock. *J Am Heart Assoc.* 2021;10:e020085. doi: 10.1161/JAHA.120.020085.
49. Berg KM, Cheng A, Panchal AR, Topjian AA, Aziz K, Bhanji F, Bigham BL, Hirsch KG, Hoover AV, Kurz MC, et al. Part 7: Systems of Care: 2020 American Heart Association guidelines for cardiopulmonary resuscitation and emergency cardiovascular care. *Circulation.* 2020;142:S580–S604. doi: 10.1161/CIR.0000000000000899.
50. Rab T, Ratanapo S, Kern KB, Basir MB, McDaniel M, Meraj P, King SB III, O'Neill W. Cardiac shock care centers: JACC review topic of the week. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2018;72:1972–1980. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc.2018.07.074.

-
51. Harris KM, Strauss CE, Duval S et al. Multidisciplinary standardized care for acute aortic dissection: design and initial outcomes of a regional care model. *Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes*. 2010 Jul;3(4):424–30. doi: 10.1161/CIRCOUTCOMES.109.920140.
52. Hollenberg SM, Kavinsky CJ, Parrillo JE. Cardiogenic shock. *Ann Intern Med*. 1999 Jul 6;131(1):47–59. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-131-1-199907060-00010.
53. Berg DD, Bohula EA, van Diepen S et al. Epidemiology of Shock in Contemporary Cardiac Intensive Care Units. *Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes*. 2019 Mar;12(3) doi: 10.1161/CIRCOUTCOMES.119.005618.
54. Ganesh A, Lindsay P, Fang J et al. Integrated systems of stroke care and reduction in 30-day mortality: A retrospective analysis. *Neurology*. 2016 Mar 8;86(10):898–904. doi: 10.1212/WNL.0000000000002443.
55. Reynolds HR, Hochman JS. Cardiogenic shock: current concepts and improving outcomes. *Circulation*. 2008 Feb 5;117(5):686–97. doi: 10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.106.613596.
56. Celso B, Tepas J, Langland-Orban B et al. A systematic review and meta-analysis comparing outcome of severely injured patients treated in trauma centers following the establishment of trauma systems. *J Trauma*. 2006 Feb;60(2):371–8. doi: 10.1097/01.ta.0000197916.99629.eb. discussion 378.