



HHS Public Access

Author manuscript

Simul Healthc. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2023 February 01.

Published in final edited form as:

Simul Healthc. 2022 February 01; 17(1): 22–28. doi:10.1097/SIH.0000000000000582.

Out-of-hospital cardiac arrest bystander defibrillator search time and experience with and without directional assistance: a randomized simulation trial in a community setting

Anna M. Johnson, PhD, MSPH¹, Christopher J. Cunningham, MD², Jessica K. Zégre-Hemsey, PhD, RN³, Mary E. Grewe, MPH⁴, Bailey M. DeBarmore, MHS, RDN¹, Eugenia Wong, MSPH¹, Fola Omofoye, MD², Wayne D. Rosamond, PhD, MS¹

¹123 West Franklin Street, Suite 410, Department of Epidemiology, Gillings School of Global Public Health, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC 27516

²321 South Columbia Street, School of Medicine, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC 27516

³Campus Box 7460, Carrington Hall, School of Nursing, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC 27599-7460

⁴160 North Medical Drive, Brinkhous-Bullitt Building, 2nd Floor #220-237, North Carolina Translational and Clinical Sciences Institute, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC 27599-7064

Abstract

Introduction: Probability of survival after out-of-hospital cardiac arrest (OHCA) doubles when a bystander initiates cardiopulmonary resuscitation and uses an automated external defibrillator (AED) rapidly. National, state, and community efforts have increased placement of AEDs in public spaces; however, bystander AED use remains <2% in the United States. Little is known about the effect of giving bystanders directional assistance to the closest public access AED.

Methods: We conducted 35 OHCA simulations using a life-size manikin with participants ages 18 through 65 years who searched for public access AEDs in five zones on a university campus. Zones varied by challenges to pedestrian AED acquisition and number of fixed AEDs. Participants completed two searches—first unassisted, and then with verbal direction to the closest AED—and we compared AED delivery times. We conducted pre- and post-test surveys.

Results: In all five zones, median time from simulated OHCA onset to AED delivery was lower when the bystander received directional assistance. Time savings (minutes:seconds) varied by zone, ranging from a median of 0:53 ($p=0.14$) to 3:42 ($p=0.02$). Only three participants immediately located the closest AED without directional assistance; over half reported difficulty locating an AED.

Conclusions: These findings may inform strategies to ensure that AEDs are consistently marked and placed in visible, accessible locations. Continued emphasis on developing strategies to

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR: Anna M. Johnson, PhD, MSPH, Department of Epidemiology, Gillings School of Global Public Health, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 123 W. Franklin St., Suite 410, Chapel Hill, NC 27516, anna.johnson@unc.edu.

improve lay bystanders' ability to locate and use AEDs may improve AED retrieval times and OHCA outcomes.

Keywords

out-of-hospital cardiac arrest; automated external defibrillator; defibrillation; simulation; search time

INTRODUCTION

More than 350,000 out-of-hospital cardiac arrests (OHCA) occur in the United States (US) each year, and approximately 90% do not survive.¹ The probability of OHCA victim survival doubles when a bystander immediately initiates cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) and uses an automated external defibrillator (AED) rapidly.² Likelihood of survival is highest when CPR and defibrillation are initiated within five minutes of OHCA and decreases by 10% for every minute that passes; however, median emergency medical services (EMS) arrival time in the US is eight minutes and can be longer in rural areas.³⁻⁵

Up to 60% of OHCA occurring in a public area have abnormal heart rhythms that can be treated with defibrillation.^{6, 7} To improve access to rapid defibrillation in these cases, AEDs have been made increasingly available in public spaces.⁸⁻¹³ In 2002, the US Congress passed the Community AED Act to require placement of AEDs in federal buildings and to increase their placement in high-traffic areas such as airports, malls, churches, sports arenas, and medical settings.^{12, 13} Some states now also require placement of AEDs in health clubs and gyms, schools, and day care centers,¹² and many other non-EMS first responders now also carry AEDs in their vehicles.¹⁴

Despite programs to increase the availability of AEDs many buildings are still not equipped with AEDs, even in dense urban areas. Further, within buildings that are equipped, public access is often limited, with AEDs accessible only during certain hours, located in a locked area, or obstructed from vision.^{13, 15} AED placement and signage is generally not regulated, and there is currently no requirement that AEDs be registered, further challenging identification and location.^{9, 16} AEDs must be maintained regularly, and regulation of maintenance varies by state, meaning that a bystander searching for an AED may find it out for maintenance or non-functional.^{12, 15}

Large-scale interventions to increase the number of registered AEDs in the community can lead to improvements in bystander defibrillation. For example, the nationwide Danish AED Network initiative deployed resuscitation training, increased placement of public access AEDs, founded an AED registry, and initiated dispatcher-assisted guidance of bystander resuscitation efforts. This initiative was able to increase bystander defibrillation in public areas from 1% in 2001 to 15% in 2012.¹⁷ Over this period, survival after bystander defibrillation also increased. An AED network such as this can be used to guide bystanders to the nearest accessible AED, monitor maintenance of existing AEDs, and guide future AED placement in the community. However, public registries or maps of AED locations in the US are uncommon and, when available, often incomplete or inaccessible to bystanders when needed. Currently no comprehensive or systematic method exists for locating AEDs

in the US.¹³ Despite national, state, and local attempts to increase access to AEDs in the community, bystander AED use in non-clinical settings remains less than 2% in the US,¹⁸ and increased availability of AEDs in public spaces alone has not been found to improve survival after OHCA.^{19–21}

Providing bystanders with knowledge of AED locations can facilitate their identification and retrieval,¹⁵ reduce time to defibrillation,²² and, ultimately, may improve OHCA outcomes. Electronic AED maps and applications are being developed and tested to improve timely bystander location and retrieval of AEDs.^{11, 15} However, little is known about how much time is saved by a bystander having knowledge of the closest AED and their perceptions of the benefits this provides. In this study, we compare search times and experiences between participants with and without verbal direction to the closest public access AED during an OHCA simulation in a community setting.

METHODS

Between March and June 2019, we conducted a randomized trial consisting of 35 OHCA simulation tests with adults ages 18–65 years. Tests were conducted in five zones on the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC) campus, with seven tests per zone. Each zone had different environmental challenges (e.g., stairs, doors, crosswalks) to acquisition of a fixed, public access AED and had varying densities of AEDs (Table 1).

Before each of the 35 simulation tests, participants were consented, interviewed, and given instructions at a central location in order to minimize the time given to participants to acclimate to the simulation environment. Details of the questions asked during this pre-trial interview have been published.²³ Briefly, participants were asked about their familiarity with the campus as well as prior knowledge of and experience with AEDs and drones. Afterward, they were escorted to the test site, where the instructions were briefly repeated, and the simulation was initiated. In each test, a pair of participants matched on sex and age group (18–34, 35–49, or 50–65 years) accompanied a life-sized manikin (Laerdal Resusci Anne) in a simulated OHCA event. Participants were randomized on site at the location of the staged OHCA event (“event site”) to perform one of two roles. In each simulation test, one participant (“caller”) was instructed to stay at the event site, dial a mock 9-1-1 telephone number, and wait for a drone to deliver an AED. Upon receiving the call, the mock 9-1-1 telecommunicator followed a modified 9-1-1 telecommunicator script from our local EMS office that is in line with the AHA’s 2015 guidelines for cardiac arrest basic life support sequence for untrained lay rescuers (See document, Supplemental Digital Content 1, to see the script that was used in each simulation test).²⁴ When instructed by the 9-1-1 telecommunicator to do so, the caller instructed the second participant (“seeker”) to locate an AED in the surrounding area and return it to the event site (Search 1). Both participants were blinded to the location of the event site and AEDs in the area. Each simulation test began with a research team member signaling to the two participants that the manikin had experienced an OHCA and concluded with each participant placing an AED next to the manikin. Search start times and AED discovery and delivery times were recorded. All times were measured using a standardized digital clock (hour:minute:second). Additional details on study design, including sample size calculations and comparisons of drone-delivered

AED versus ground search times, have been published.²⁵ A schematic of the study design is shown in Figure 1.

At the conclusion of the first search, the seeker completed a second search from the same event site. In this second search, however, the seeker was verbally directed by a staff member to the location of the closest publicly available fixed AED and asked to obtain the AED from this known location and return it to the event site (Search 2). If the participant immediately located the closest AED using the most direct path in Search 1, he or she did not complete Search 2. To avoid bias due to prior experience, the Arrest to Search Start Time window (i.e., the elapsed time between time of onset of the mock OHCA to the time in the OHCA script in which the caller is instructed to ask the seeker to “Go Find an AED”) from the first search was added to total elapsed times for both Search 1 and Search 2.

The routes that participants took to locate a fixed AED were tracked using the MapMyWalk application.²⁶ Post-trial surveys probed participants’ experience searching for an AED, including search strategies and cues.²³ The UNC Institutional Review Board approved the trial protocol and consent forms (UNC IRB Number 18-0039), and all tests were conducted in accordance with UNC Public Safety guidelines.

AED and Event Site Geolocation

We established the location of AEDs in each zone using a list available from UNC’s Department of Environment, Health, and Safety that was confirmed by a manual search of the area within 600 feet (200 yards) of event sites. Building managers confirmed the presence AEDs in buildings with restricted access. We manually entered GPS coordinates of AEDs and event sites using the “Coordinates – GPS Formatter” mobile phone application and used ArcGIS (ArcMap desktop version 10.6) to plot the coordinates.^{27, 28} Additional details have been published.²⁵

Pre- and Post-test Surveys

All participants were surveyed individually by trained research staff before and after each test. Pre-test surveys included questions querying participants’ previous experience and comfort level with CPR and AEDs. Post-test surveys focused on participants’ experience searching for an AED. Staff entered responses into REDCap on site.²⁹ The primary analyst (AJ) analyzed qualitative post-test survey data and organized responses thematically. A second team member (MG) reviewed themes, and areas of disagreement were discussed until consensus was reached.

Statistical Analysis

We computed elapsed time between several components of each AED search in minutes:seconds. Summary statistics include median time intervals with interquartile ranges. Data from the pre and post-test surveys are reported as frequencies and percentages. A Likert scale was used for participants’ rating of confidence levels and comfort levels with various aspects of their search experience. Differences in median search times in Searches 1 and 2 were compared using the Mann–Whitney test.

RESULTS

We conducted simulation tests, 18 with women and 17 with men. These included 15, 11 and 9 tests across the three age strata (18–34, 35–49, and 50–65 years), respectively. Three participants (one each in Zones B, C, and D) directly found the closest AED along the most direct path in Search 1 and did not complete Search 2. Seven of the 35 trials were conducted as a single participant as his or her own control due to a co-participant not appearing for the trial.

AED Retrieval Times

In all five zones tested, the median time from onset of the search for an AED in a fixed location to delivery of an AED to the manikin was lower when the bystander received verbal directions to the location of the closest public access AED (Table 2). The time saved (minutes:seconds) in Searches 1 and 2 varied by zone, ranging from a median of 0:53 ($p=0.14$) in Zone D (central campus plaza; six AEDs within 600 feet) to 3:42 ($p=0.02$) in Zone A (dormitory courtyard; one AED within 600 feet). Significant time savings were also noted in the median retrieval time (3:37, $p<0.01$) in Zone E (sports arena sidewalk; eight AEDs within 600 feet), despite it having the highest overall AED density.

The median elapsed time from simulated OHCA to the seeker initiating the AED search ranged from 1:21 in Zone C to 1:37 in Zone A. During this time interval, the participants laid down the manikin, the caller dialed the mock 9-1-1 operator, and the seeker initiated CPR and started the AED search when instructed by the caller. When this initial interval was added to the search/retrieval times for Search 1, the total median time from simulated OHCA to AED delivery was within the American Heart Association's (AHA) target of 5 minutes in only two zones (C and D), the zones with the highest number of publicly available, accessible AEDs. In Search 2, total median times were less than five minutes for all five zones, ranging from 4:19 in Zone E to 2:03 in Zone D. In Search 1, 57% ($n=20$) of participants delivered the AED within the AHA's target of five minutes, compared to all but one ($n=34$, 97%) of those in Search 2.

Participant Perceptions

In pre-test surveys, 24 (68.6%) of participants reported ever having had AED training, 33 (94.2%) reported feeling confident or very confident that they knew what an AED looked like, and 27 (77.1%) reported feeling confident or very confident that they knew how to use an AED.

In post-test surveys, 26 (74.3%) reported having asked for help in their initial search from a bystander not involved in the study, 4 (11.4%) reported having had someone offer help without being asked, and 18 (52.4%) felt that it was easy or very easy to find an AED. Open-ended questions probed participants' feelings and thoughts in Search 1 as well as details on their search strategy and thought process.

AED Search Experience—The most common feelings that participants reported were those of being “anxious,” “stressed,” “panicked,” or having a sense of urgency about their search, with several describing not knowing where to look. A few, however, reported feeling

calm or prepared for their search (e.g., due to training or because when they asked for assistance in locating an AED, they received help).

Many participants reported feeling “disappointed” or “frustrated” with different aspects of the search. Several expressed frustration that non-study bystanders did not know where an AED was when they asked for help. Some participants encountered buildings that were locked or inaccessible; others felt that AEDs were in locations that were not clearly marked or difficult to find.

A few participants reported feeling grateful to have had more than one bystander responding to the simulated event, so that one participant could stay with the “victim” and continue CPR. Upon finding an AED, participants overwhelmingly expressed relief and even joy. Many still felt a sense of urgency to deliver the AED to the event site quickly.

AED Search Strategy—Some participants described starting their search in the closest buildings. Others decided to prioritize populated areas, public buildings, or places with an information desk or staff available. Several felt that athletic buildings would have AEDs available. Some described relying on their prior knowledge or familiarity with campus in prioritizing where to look. Many participants tried to enter buildings that were locked or required authorized entry. An example of one participant’s search paths for Searches 1 and 2 is provided in Figure 2.

Within buildings, participants reported looking for AEDs mounted on a wall near the entryway, near a fire extinguisher or fire alarm, near an entrance desk or lobby, near a bathroom, or in main hallways. Some reported looking for signage or a bright color. A few reported looking on walls at eye level.

DISCUSSION

Timely defibrillation is one of the five links in the AHA’s Chain of Survival: from calling 9-1-1, to early CPR, to rapid defibrillation, to effective advanced life support and integrated post-acute care.³⁰ The AHA aims to implement programs that enable defibrillation within five minutes after collapse.³¹ In this simulation study, even in the AED-rich setting of a university campus and among a study population with experience and confidence with AEDs, approximately half of participants felt that it was difficult or very difficult to locate a fixed, public access AED. In nearly half of the tests without verbal direction, participants were unable to deliver an AED within the AHA’s target of five minutes. Receiving verbal direction to the closest public access AED resulted in time savings of approximately one to four minutes. Given that the likelihood of survival decreases by 10% each minute after the onset of arrest, these time savings may be critical.

Although time savings were greatest in the study zone with only one AED within 600 feet and lowest in the zone with the most plentiful AEDs, the relationship between AED density and unassisted retrieval times was not consistent and was only statistically significant in two of the five zones ($p < 0.05$). In the zone with eight public access AEDs within 600 feet, unassisted search and retrieval times were long. In this zone, although five of these eight were publicly accessible during the time of the tests, participants noted frustrations with

barriers to AED access such as needing to cross roads or climb stairs, to access locked or inaccessible buildings, and poor AED signage.

Interventions to date have focused on increasing access to AEDs in high-traffic public areas; however, findings from this simulation study highlight that even when multiple AEDs are nearby, lay bystanders have difficulty finding and returning them to a victim in a timely manner, contributing to even more “missed opportunities.”²⁸ Strategies to direct a bystander to the location of the nearest AED may improve outcomes. One strategy currently in development is a mobile phone application to help lay bystanders locate the closest public access AED. Programs designed to alert and dispatch nearby CPR-trained laypersons via mobile phone have increased rates of bystander CPR, and similar programs are in the process of being tested for their ability to improve AED retrieval times in places with accessible AEDs.^{32–35} Because many states do not require a registry of AEDs to be maintained, up to half of AEDs deployed in OHCA are unregistered.^{36, 37} To address this, some EMS agencies have partnered with the “PulsePoint AED” application, which uses crowdsourcing to populate its electronic map of public access AEDs, enabling users to upload pictures and confirm accessibility.^{38, 39}

Another strategy to decrease AED search and retrieval time is more similar to the methods used in our simulation study, using directions from the 9-1-1 dispatcher. A recent simulation study found that verbal direction to the nearest public access AED was more effective than either no directional assistance or assistance via an AED geolocation mobile application.¹¹ Current barriers to this strategy include lack of systematically registered and maintained AEDs and integration with 9-1-1 dispatch systems. As highlighted by the findings in this study, strategies to direct bystanders to the closest AED will also need to take into consideration potential access barriers such as roads, stairs, locked doors, and AED signage, which is not currently regulated or systematic.

A particularly innovative potential strategy to improve access to timely defibrillation is the delivery of an AED to a lay bystander by Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAV or “drones”).⁴⁰ This strategy has the advantage of allowing the bystander to stay with the victim and continue CPR while the drone delivers the AED and may serve as a particularly valuable strategy in rural areas^{41–43} or places without public access AEDs (e.g., in homes, where 70% of OHCAs are estimated to occur).²⁸ This strategy is still in the feasibility testing stages, however, in the US.²⁵

Findings from this study suggest that to reach the AHA’s target of lay bystander search and delivery of an AED to an OCHA victim within five minutes, more needs to be done. Requiring registration of AEDs and regulating maintenance, as well as standardizing placement and signage of AEDs would aid lay bystanders in their search for public access AEDs. Our findings about bystanders’ current search strategies and visual cues may inform future strategies to ensure that AEDs are consistently marked and placed in locations that are visible, accessible, and in locations that people are likely to look.

There are limitations to our study. First, this study was conducted in an AED-rich setting. However, even in this environment, participants had difficulty locating AEDs and expressed

distress when searching without directional assistance. Also, study participants were not older than 65 and were not a random sample of the general population. Because this was designed a feasibility study, it was not powered to detect differences between men and women or among age groups. Additionally, our AED database was manually confirmed by study staff. A larger-scale program of alerting bystanders may not have up-to-date information of AEDs, and thus complicate and even prolong the AED search with outdated information. Also a potential limitation, in this simulation our method of directional assistance was performed in person rather than over the phone, which is likely more effective. Further, although we queried in the pre-test survey whether participants had familiarity with AED placement in the general campus environment, we did not query in the post-test survey whether they had familiarity with the specific zone to which they were randomized. Finally, because seekers served as their own controls, participants may have learned about their environment and potential obstacles in Search 1 that may have reduced their time in Search 2. However, in the particular geography of the zones that we investigated, the benefit of practicing in an undirected manner would not expect to bias the elapsed time of the directed search. Further, the majority of the participants did not find the closest AED; in fact, in many of the tests, the closest AED was in a different part of the zone in which the seeker conducted Search 1. Importantly, only three participants directly located the closest AED along the most direct path; therefore, the majority gained little information from prior experience, and in these three cases, the experiment was not repeated.

Our study also has notable strengths. It incorporated timing data and an evaluation of bystander perceptions and was conducted in a community setting with both male and female participants aged 18 to 65 years. Also, the study design incorporated a modified 9-1-1 telecommunicator script from our local EMS office and followed the AHA's 2015 guidelines for cardiac arrest basic life support sequence for untrained lay rescuers.²⁴ This study builds on a growing body of literature informing public health interventions through community-based simulation^{44, 45} and may inform other simulation-based community research. Importantly, this study joins other recent studies demonstrating the utility of simulation-based research for emergency response to OHCA.⁴⁶⁻⁴⁸ This study may serve as a valuable resource for others seeking to implement simulation as a methodology for community-based studies of quality improvement interventions. The findings from this simulation study also emphasize the importance of and opportunities for reducing bystander search times for public access AEDs and may inform strategies, such as systematized AED signage and placement, AED registration, and phone apps that are easily triggered. Findings from this study also highlight the importance of considering potential obstacles or barriers to access (e.g., crosswalks, stairs, locked doors, restricted access) when making decisions in AED placement. Future studies should investigate differences in AED search times, strategies, and cues used by different subgroups of bystanders (e.g., age, sex) and compare time savings, financial costs, and other factors associated with different AED placement and signage strategies.

Conclusions

In this OHCA simulation study, we demonstrated that giving a lay bystander verbal direction to the location of the nearest AED reduced the median search and delivery time in a

variety of public locations with varying AED densities. Continued emphasis on developing strategies and programs to improve lay bystanders' ability to locate and use public AEDs may improve AED retrieval times and OHCA outcomes.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors thank all participants, the UNC Chapel Hill Public Safety Department, and the UNC Chapel Hill campus community. We are indebted to Evan Arnold and Michael Picinich for their time and contributions.

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE SUMMARY

The project described was supported by the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences (NCATS), National Institutes of Health (NIH), through Grant Award Number UL1TR002489. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the NIH. All authors report no other conflicts of interest.

REFERENCES

1. Benjamin EJ, Virani SS, Callaway CW, Chamberlain AM, Chang AR, Cheng S, Chiuve SE, Cushman M, Delling FN, Deo R, de Ferranti SD, Ferguson JF, Fornage M, Gillespie C, Isasi CR, Jimenez MC, Jordan LC, Judd SE, Lackland D, Lichtman JH, Lisabeth L, Liu S, Longenecker CT, Lutsey PL, Mackey JS, Matchar DB, Matsushita K, Mussolino ME, Nasir K, O'Flaherty M, Palaniappan LP, Pandey A, Pandey DK, Reeves MJ, Ritchey MD, Rodriguez CJ, Roth GA, Rosamond WD, Sampson UKA, Satou GM, Shah SH, Spartano NL, Tirschwell DL, Tsao CW, Voeks JH, Willey JZ, Wilkins JT, Wu JH, Alger HM, Wong SS and Muntner P. Heart Disease and Stroke Statistics-2018 Update: A Report From the American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 2018;137:e67–e492. [PubMed: 29386200]
2. Pollack RA, Brown SP, Rea T, Aufderheide T, Barbic D, Buick JE, Christenson J, Idris AH, Jasti J, Kamp M, Kudenchuk P, May S, Muhr M, Nichol G, Ornato JP, Sopko G, Vaillancourt C, Morrison L and Weisfeldt M. Impact of Bystander Automated External Defibrillator Use on Survival and Functional Outcomes in Shockable Observed Public Cardiac Arrests. *Circulation*. 2018;137:2104–2113. [PubMed: 29483086]
3. Larsen MP, Eisenberg MS, Cummins RO and Hallstrom AP. Predicting survival from out-of-hospital cardiac arrest: a graphic model. *Annals of Emergency Medicine*. 1993;22:1652–8. [PubMed: 8214853]
4. Valenzuela TD, Roe DJ, Nichol G, Clark LL, Spaite DW and Hardman RG. Outcomes of rapid defibrillation by security officers after cardiac arrest in casinos. *The New England Journal of Medicine*. 2000;343:1206–9. [PubMed: 11071670]
5. Waalewijn RA, de Vos R, Tijssen JG and Koster RW. Survival models for out-of-hospital cardiopulmonary resuscitation from the perspectives of the bystander, the first responder, and the paramedic. *Resuscitation*. 2001;51:113–22. [PubMed: 11718965]
6. Nichol G, Thomas E, Callaway CW, Hedges J, Powell JL, Aufderheide TP, Rea T, Lowe R, Brown T, Dreyer J, Davis D, Idris A and Stiell I. Regional variation in out-of-hospital cardiac arrest incidence and outcome. *JAMA*. 2008;300:1423–31. [PubMed: 18812533]
7. Weisfeldt ML, Everson-Stewart S, Sitlani C, Rea T, Aufderheide TP, Atkins DL, Bigham B, Brooks SC, Foerster C, Gray R, Ornato JP, Powell J, Kudenchuk PJ and Morrison LJ. Ventricular tachyarrhythmias after cardiac arrest in public versus at home. *The New England Journal of Medicine*. 2011;364:313–21. [PubMed: 21268723]
8. Kitamura T, Kiyohara K, Sakai T, Matsuyama T, Hatakeyama T, Shimamoto T, Izawa J, Fujii T, Nishiyama C, Kawamura T and Iwami T. Public-Access Defibrillation and Out-of-Hospital

Cardiac Arrest in Japan. *The New England Journal of Medicine*. 2016;375:1649–1659. [PubMed: 27783922]

9. Merchant RM and Asch DA. Can you find an automated external defibrillator if a life depends on it? *Circulation: Cardiovascular Quality and Outcomes*. 2012;5:241–3. [PubMed: 22354936]
10. Weisfeldt ML, Sitlani CM, Ornato JP, Rea T, Aufderheide TP, Davis D, Dreyer J, Hess EP, Jui J, Maloney J, Sopko G, Powell J, Nichol G and Morrison LJ. Survival after application of automatic external defibrillators before arrival of the emergency medical system: evaluation in the resuscitation outcomes consortium population of 21 million. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*. 2010;55:1713–20. [PubMed: 20394876]
11. Neves Briard J, Grou-Boileau F, El Bashtaly A, Spenard C, de Champlain F and Homier V. Automated External Defibrillator Geolocalization with a Mobile Application, Verbal Assistance or No Assistance: A Pilot Randomized Simulation (AED G-MAP). *Prehospital Emergency Care*. 2019;23:420–429. [PubMed: 30111222]
12. National Conference of State Legislatures T. State Laws on Cardiac Arrest and Defibrillators. 2017;2020.
13. Leung AC, Asch DA, Lozada KN, Saynisch OB, Asch JM, Becker N, Griffis HM, Shofer F, Hershey JC, Hill S, Branas CC, Nichol G, Becker LB and Merchant RM. Where are lifesaving automated external defibrillators located and how hard is it to find them in a large urban city? *Resuscitation*. 2013;84:910–4. [PubMed: 23357702]
14. Barry T, Doheny MC, Masterson S, Conroy N, Klimas J, Segurado R, Codd M and Bury G. Community first responders for out-of-hospital cardiac arrest in adults and children. *The Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2019;7:Cd012764. [PubMed: 31323120]
15. Smith CM, Griffiths F, Fothergill RT, Vlaev I and Perkins GD. Identifying and overcoming barriers to automated external defibrillator use by GoodSAM volunteer first responders in out-of-hospital cardiac arrest using the Theoretical Domains Framework and Behaviour Change Wheel: a qualitative study. *BMJ Open*. 2020;10:e034908.
16. Aufderheide T, Hazinski MF, Nichol G, Steffens SS, Buroker A, McCune R, Stapleton E, Nadkarni V, Potts J, Ramirez RR, Eigel B, Epstein A, Sayre M, Halperin H and Cummins RO. Community lay rescuer automated external defibrillation programs: key state legislative components and implementation strategies: a summary of a decade of experience for healthcare providers, policymakers, legislators, employers, and community leaders from the American Heart Association Emergency Cardiovascular Care Committee, Council on Clinical Cardiology, and Office of State Advocacy. *Circulation*. 2006;113:1260–70. [PubMed: 16415375]
17. Hansen SM, Hansen CM, Folke F, Rajan S, Kragholm K, Ejlskov L, Gislason G, Kober L, Gerds TA, Hjortshoj S, Lippert F, Torp-Pedersen C and Wissenberg M. Bystander Defibrillation for Out-of-Hospital Cardiac Arrest in Public vs Residential Locations. *JAMA Cardiology*. 2017;2:507–514. [PubMed: 28297003]
18. McNally B, Robb R, Mehta M, Vellano K, Valderrama AL, Yoon PW, Sasson C, Crouch A, Perez AB, Merritt R and Kellermann A. Out-of-hospital cardiac arrest surveillance --- Cardiac Arrest Registry to Enhance Survival (CARES), United States, October 1, 2005--December 31, 2010. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report Surveillance Summaries (Washington, DC: 2002)*. 2011;60:1–19.
19. Folke F, Lippert FK, Nielsen SL, Gislason GH, Hansen ML, Schramm TK, Sorensen R, Fosbol EL, Andersen SS, Rasmussen S, Kober L and Torp-Pedersen C. Location of cardiac arrest in a city center: strategic placement of automated external defibrillators in public locations. *Circulation*. 2009;120:510–7. [PubMed: 19635969]
20. Drezner JA, Rao AL, Heistand J, Bloomingdale MK and Harmon KG. Effectiveness of emergency response planning for sudden cardiac arrest in United States high schools with automated external defibrillators. *Circulation*. 2009;120:518–25. [PubMed: 19635968]
21. Mao RD and Ong ME. Public access defibrillation: improving accessibility and outcomes. *British Medical Bulletin*. 2016;118:25–32. [PubMed: 27034442]
22. Neves Briard J, de Montigny L, Ross D, de Champlain F and Segal E. Is Distance to the Nearest Registered Public Automated Defibrillator Associated with the Probability of Bystander Shock for Victims of Out-of-Hospital Cardiac Arrest? *Prehospital and Disaster Medicine*. 2018;33:153–159. [PubMed: 29433603]

23. Zègre-Hemsey JK, Grewe ME, Johnson AM, Arnold E, Cunningham CJ, Bogle BM and Rosamond WD. Delivery of Automated External Defibrillators via Drones in Simulated Cardiac Arrest: Users' Experiences and the Human-Drone Interaction. *Resuscitation*. 2020;157:83–88. [PubMed: 33080371]
24. Neumar RW, Shuster M, Callaway CW, Gent LM, Atkins DL, Bhanji F, Brooks SC, de Caen AR, Donnino MW, Ferrer JM, Kleinman ME, Kronick SL, Lavonas EJ, Link MS, Mancini ME, Morrison LJ, O'Connor RE, Samson RA, Schexnayder SM, Singletary EM, Sinz EH, Travers AH, Wyckoff MH and Hazinski MF. Part 1: Executive Summary: 2015 American Heart Association Guidelines Update for Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation and Emergency Cardiovascular Care. *Circulation*. 2015;132:S315–67. [PubMed: 26472989]
25. Rosamond WD, Johnson AM, Bogle BM, Arnold E, Cunningham CJ, Picinich M, Williams BM and Zègre-Hemsey JK. Drone Delivery of an Automated External Defibrillator. *The New England Journal of Medicine*. 2020;383:3.
26. Under Armor Inc. MapMyWalk. 2019.
27. Lerner EB, Fairbanks RJ and Shah MN. Identification of out-of-hospital cardiac arrest clusters using a geographic information system. *Academic Emergency Medicine*. 2005;12:81–4. [PubMed: 15635143]
28. Cunningham CJ, Lowe JR, Johnson A, Carter W, Whited WM, Shofer F, Brice JH and Williams JG. Public Access defibrillation: utilization and missed opportunities. *Australasian Journal of Paramedicine*. 2019;16.
29. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N and Conde JG. Research electronic data capture (REDCap)—a metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*. 2009;42:377–81. [PubMed: 18929686]
30. Cummins RO, Ornato JP, Thies WH and Pepe PE. Improving survival from sudden cardiac arrest: the “chain of survival” concept. A statement for health professionals from the Advanced Cardiac Life Support Subcommittee and the Emergency Cardiac Care Committee, American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 1991;83:1832–47. [PubMed: 2022039]
31. Guidelines 2000 for Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation and Emergency Cardiovascular Care. Part 6: advanced cardiovascular life support: section 4: devices to assist circulation. The American Heart Association in collaboration with the International Liaison Committee on Resuscitation. *Circulation*. 2000;102:1105–11. [PubMed: 10966668]
32. Ringh M, Rosenqvist M, Hollenberg J, Jonsson M, Fredman D, Nordberg P, Jarnbert-Pettersson H, Hasselqvist-Ax I, Riva G and Svensson L. Mobile-phone dispatch of laypersons for CPR in out-of-hospital cardiac arrest. *The New England Journal of Medicine*. 2015;372:2316–25. [PubMed: 26061836]
33. Blackwood J, Eisenberg M, Jorgenson D, Nania J, Howard B, Collins B, Connell P, Day T, Rohrbach C and Rea T. Strategy to Address Private Location Cardiac Arrest: A Public Safety Survey. *Prehospital Emergency Care*. 2018;22:784–787. [PubMed: 29768077]
34. Auricchio A, Gianquintieri L, Burkart R, Benvenuti C, Muschiatti S, Peluso S, Mira A, Moccetti T and Caputo ML. Real-life time and distance covered by lay first responders alerted by means of smartphone-application: Implications for early initiation of cardiopulmonary resuscitation and access to automatic external defibrillators. *Resuscitation*. 2019;141:182–187. [PubMed: 31141717]
35. Smith CM, Wilson MH, Ghorbangholi A, Hartley-Sharpe C, Gwinnutt C, Dicker B and Perkins GD. The use of trained volunteers in the response to out-of-hospital cardiac arrest - the GoodSAM experience. *Resuscitation*. 2017;121:123–126. [PubMed: 29079507]
36. Myers JB, French D and Webb W. Lack of integration of automated external defibrillators with EMS response may reduce lifesaving potential of public-access defibrillation. *Prehospital Emergency Care*. 2005;9:339–43. [PubMed: 16147487]
37. Rea T, Blackwood J, Damon S, Phelps R and Eisenberg M. A link between emergency dispatch and public access AEDs: potential implications for early defibrillation. *Resuscitation*. 2011;82:995–8. [PubMed: 21570169]
38. Dainty KN, Vaid H and Brooks SC. North American Public Opinion Survey on the Acceptability of Crowdsourcing Basic Life Support for Out-of-Hospital Cardiac Arrest With the PulsePoint Mobile Phone App. *JMIR mHealth and uHealth*. 2017;5:e63. [PubMed: 28526668]

39. PulsePoint. Allegheny County, Pittsburgh Announce Launch of Lifesaving Smartphone Application. 2016;2018.
40. Zégre-Hemsey JK, Bogle B, Cunningham CJ, Snyder K and Rosamond W. Delivery of Automated External Defibrillators (AED) by Drones: Implications for Emergency Cardiac Care. *Current Cardiovascular Risk Reports*. 2018;12.
41. Van de Voorde P, Gautama S, Momont A, Ionescu CM, De Paepe P and Fraeyman N. The drone ambulance [A-UAS]: golden bullet or just a blank? *Resuscitation*. 2017;116:46–48. [PubMed: 28487253]
42. Pulver A, Wei R and Mann C. Locating AED Enabled Medical Drones to Enhance Cardiac Arrest Response Times. *Prehospital Emergency Care*. 2016;20:378–89. [PubMed: 26852822]
43. Boutillier JJ, Brooks SC, Janmohamed A, Byers A, Buick JE, Zhan C, Schoellig AP, Cheskes S, Morrison LJ and Chan TCY. Optimizing a Drone Network to Deliver Automated External Defibrillators. *Circulation*. 2017;135:2454–2465. [PubMed: 28254836]
44. Hatakeyama T, Nishiyama C, Shimamoto T, Kiyohara K, Kiguchi T, Chida I, Izawa J, Matsuyama T, Kitamura T, Kawamura T and Iwami T. A Smartphone Application to Reduce the Time to Automated External Defibrillator Delivery After a Witnessed Out-of-Hospital Cardiac Arrest: A Randomized Simulation-Based Study. *Simulation in Healthcare*. 2018;13:387–393. [PubMed: 29659413]
45. Leary M, Almodovar A Jr., Buckler DG, Bhardwaj A, Blewer AL and Abella BS. Using an Immersive Virtual Reality System to Assess Lay Provider Response to an Unannounced Simulated Sudden Cardiac Arrest in the Out-of-Hospital Setting. *Simulation in Healthcare* 2019;14:82–89. [PubMed: 30407959]
46. Tsai BM, Sun JT, Hsieh MJ, Lin YY, Kao TC, Chen LW, Ma MH and Wen-Chu C. Optimal paramedic numbers in resuscitation of patients with out-of-hospital cardiac arrest: A randomized controlled study in a simulation setting. *PloS One*. 2020;15:e0235315. [PubMed: 32634172]
47. Sondheim SE, Devlin J, Seward WHt, Bernard AW, Feinn RS and Cone DC. Recording Out-of-Hospital Cardiac Arrest Treatment via a Mobile Smartphone Application: A Feasibility Simulation Study. *Prehospital Emergency Care*. 2019;23:284–289. [PubMed: 30130413]
48. Wei Y, Pek PP, Doble B, Finkelstein EA, Wah W, Ng YY, Cheah SO, Chia MYC, Leong BSH, Gan HN, Mao DRH, Tham LP, Fook-Chong S and Ong MEH. Strategies to improve survival outcomes of out-of-hospital cardiac arrest (OHCA) given a fixed budget: A simulation study. *Resuscitation*. 2020;149:39–46. [PubMed: 32027981]




Figure 1. Schematic of an OHCA simulation test, with example seeker search paths without (Search 1) and with (Search 2) verbal direction.




Figure 2. Example search path for AED in fixed locations, without (Search 1; Panel 1) and with (Search 2; Panel 2) verbal direction to closest AED location, Zone B.
Under Armor, Inc. MapMyWalk. 2019.

Characteristics of OHCA simulation test zones and fixed AEDs in the surrounding area

Table 1.

Zone	Fixed AEDs in 600-foot radius of event site (n)				TOTAL	Average distance to any AED in zone (feet)	Distance to closest AED (feet)
	Publicly accessible at all times	Publicly accessible during business hours only	Restricted access at all times				
A - Courtyard of dormitory complex	0	1	0	1	512	512	
B - Main campus quadrangle	1	3	1	5	488	316	
C - Intermural athletic fields	3	4	0	7	353	116	
D - Plaza adjacent to Student Union	1	6	0	7	254	138	
E - Sidewalk next to sports arena	1	4	3	8	441	269	

Median (interquartile range) elapsed time in minutes:seconds of AED delivery from search for AED in fixed locations for Search 1 and Search 2, by test zone.

Table 2.

	Zone A N=7	Zone B N=7	Zone C N=7	Zone D N=7	Zone E N=7
Arrest to Search Start	1:37 (1:31-1:44)	1:35 (1:28-1:44)	1:21 (1:10-1:25)	1:30 (1:07-1:31)	1:31 (1:28-1:46)
Search 1					
Search start to AED Found	3:28 (2:50-4:15)	2:59 (1:03-6:02)	2:12 (1:28-4:51)	0:39 (0:35-1:31)	3:59 (3:10-5:26)
AED Found to AED Delivery	1:33 (1:13-1:56)	1:00 (0:44-1:30)	0:59 (0:54-1:23)	0:22 (0:15-0:25)	2:06 (1:56-2:22)
Total: Arrest to delivery	7:00 (4:49-7:44)	5:46 (3:12-9:05)	4:35 (3:47-7:29)	2:56 (2:18-3:18)	7:56 (6:44-8:45)
Search 2					
Search start to AED Found	0:56 (0:45-1:34)	0:50 (0:41-1:02)	1:16 (1:00-1:37)	0:18 (0:15-0:23)	1:15 (1:00-1:35)
AED Found to AED Delivery	0:52 (0:49-1:14)	0:51 (0:41-1:13)	1:00 (0:52-1:16)	0:16 (0:15-0:18)	1:33 (1:12-1:50)
Total: Arrest to delivery	3:18 (3:07-4:33)	3:03 (3:02-4:20)	3:30 (3:24-4:10)	2:03 (1:53-2:07)	4:19 (3:43-5:04)
Difference in median total time *	3:42 (p=0.02)	2:43 (p=0.09)	1:05 (p=0.08)	0:53 (p=0.14)	03:37 (p<0.01)

* Search 1 total time – Search 2 total time; Mann-Whitney p-value, 2-sided, $\alpha=0.05$