

COMMENTARY

Open Access



The end of balloons? Our take on the UK-REBOA trial

Jostein Rødseth Brede^{1,2,3*} and Marius Rehn^{2,4,5}

Abstract

Background Resuscitative endovascular balloon occlusion of the aorta (REBOA) is increasingly used. The recently published UK-REBOA trial aimed to investigate patients suffering haemorrhagic shock and randomized to standard care alone or REBOA as adjunct to standard care and concludes that REBOA may increase the mortality.

Main body In this commentary we try to balance the discussion on use of REBOA and address limitations in the UK-REBOA trial that may have influenced the outcome of the study.

Conclusion The situation is complex, and the patients are in extremis. In summary, we do not think this is the end of balloons.

Keywords Resuscitative endovascular balloon occlusion of the aorta, REBOA, Aortic occlusion, UK-REBOA trial, Non-compressible haemorrhage

Background

Resuscitative endovascular balloon occlusion of the aorta (REBOA) is increasingly used, with haemorrhagic shock as the most common indication [1]. The idea is intuitive, proximal aortic occlusion will limit blood flow to site of injury thereby limiting major haemorrhage. However, REBOA in trauma care is not without controversy, there are believers and non-believers and complications are reported [2, 3]. The authors of this editorial have been involved in REBOA-research in cardiac arrest for years with a subsequent risk for being biased.

Regardless, the recent publication of the UK-REBOA trial [4] warrants balanced discussion. Firstly, the authors should be commended, as the planning, preparation and execution of a clinical randomised controlled trial (RCT) in such a demanding setting is a monumental effort. Conducting trials with randomised design is pivotal to provide more solid evidence for early resuscitation efforts.

Main text

The UK-REBOA trial aimed to investigate patients suffering haemorrhagic shock and randomized to standard care alone (SC) or REBOA as adjunct to standard care. The study (and subsequently commentators on social media platforms such as Twitter/X) concludes that REBOA may increase the mortality [5], since after 90 days, 54% of the REBOA patients and 42% of the SC patients had died (Odds Ratio 1.58). Other sources with significant first-hand experience with REBOA [6, 7] and a related editorial in JAMA [8] tried to paint a more nuanced picture of the results.

The study leaves numerous points to discuss and to cut it short, we do not necessarily agree with the study's conclusion.

*Correspondence:

Jostein Rødseth Brede

Jostein.brede@norskluftambulanse.no

¹ Department of Emergency Medicine and Pre-Hospital Services, St. Olav's University Hospital, Prinsesse Kristinas Gate 3, 7006 Trondheim, Norway

² Department of Research and Development, Norwegian Air Ambulance Foundation, Oslo, Norway

³ Department of Anaesthesiology and Intensive Care Medicine, St. Olav's University Hospital, Trondheim, Norway

⁴ Division of Prehospital Services, Air Ambulance Department, Oslo University Hospital, Oslo, Norway

⁵ Institute of Clinical Medicine, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway



© The Author(s) 2023. **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>. The Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication waiver (<http://creativecommons.org/publicdomain/zero/1.0/>) applies to the data made available in this article, unless otherwise stated in a credit line to the data.

Just 90 out of the intended 120 patients were included, with 44 patients in the SC group and 46 in the REBOA group. Randomization is a means to obtain matching study groups, but given that the trial was stopped early, the groups may not actually be comparable. A sensitivity analysis was performed to adjust for differences, without significant effects. Still, there are some striking differences between the groups that may not have been included into the analysis.

All patients were critically injured, with a median injury severity score of 41. Twenty-three percent of the patients were in cardiac arrest at some point, demonstrating the severity of the situation and realistically poor prognosis, as cardiac arrest following trauma has devastatingly low survival [9]. The REBOA group had in general lower systolic BP than the SC group making it questionable whether these patients may have survived, regardless of advanced resuscitation.

The abbreviated injury scales in the groups were similar, except for head injury where the REBOA group scored higher. Traumatic brain injury itself is associated with mortality [10]. Further, REBOA may increase blood pressure proximal to the occlusion as demonstrated in both human [11] and animal studies [12–15], carrying that cerebral haemorrhage plus REBOA is likely harmful.

Only 19 (41%) patients received aortic occlusion in the REBOA group and arterial access failed in 8 (17%) patients. Two (5%) patients in the SC group received REBOA, without explanation for the cross-over. Hence, this is a very low number for a strong worded conclusion.

However, this is not the most concerning finding. It's the matter of minutes. We recognise that this is not the authors fault, but more a systematic health care limitation. Prehospital times were long, with a median of 90 min from injury to hospital arrival. As prehospital physicians, we understand that prehospital time may be prolonged due to weather, difficulties to extract trauma patients etc., but 90 min from injury to admission, without haemorrhage control, will surely influence outcome. The time from randomization in the emergency room to 'definitive haemorrhagic controlling procedure' was 64 min in the SC and 83 min in the REBOA group. The interquartile range in the REBOA group was 56 to concerning 156 min. This leaves the patient with hours of bleeding prior to being subject to a haemorrhage controlling procedure. Such time expenditure is neither the study nor the REBOA procedure's fault, but a characteristic of the health care system investigated.

Further, 32 min to perform REBOA is a surprisingly high procedure time, considered this is performed in the emergency room with adequate ambient lighting and

temperature, multiple available personnel and equipment. In the setting of out-of-hospital cardiac arrest, REBOARREST trial participants use approximately 12 min on the REBOA procedure (one physician and one paramedic) [16, 17], which includes the necessary time to unpack the equipment and prepare the patient. Both studies perform the intervention in a low-flow state. A rigorous training, and re-training, program is important to maintain low procedure times. However, a simulated setting will never equal real life. The paper describe that all operators were well trained in the procedure, but the study includes only 19 REBOA balloons distributed upon several hospitals and operators over 4,5 years. This is fewer procedures than some trauma centres perform annually and will potentially limit the learning curve of both operators and teams. It is demonstrated that survival is higher in centres with high vs low REBOA procedure volume [18]. Hence, unsurprisingly no difference was found after the principal stratum analysis for learning curve effect and adds to our perception that this trial demonstrates the real-life challenge to obtain arterial access.

Conclusions

Obviously, these patients are in extremis and the situation is complex. With all the abovementioned limitations, we believe that it is wrong to solely credit (or discredit) REBOA for the results. To successfully salvage the critically injured patient, we need to improve the sum of marginal gains. Short prehospital time and procedural competence are two obvious factors of importance. In the UK-REBOA trial most patients did not receive a definitive haemorrhagic controlling procedure and exsanguinated. Hence, we think that the UK-REBOA trial does not describe the true effect of REBOA. We still consider REBOA as a potential bridge to therapy, but emphasize that it is important to avoid delay in time to definitive surgery [19–21]. More than half an hour used on the REBOA procedure, after admission to hospital, will likely not benefit the patient. Further studies, with rigorous training and re-training for rapid femoral arterial access and with accurate patient selection should be performed—in high-volume centres.

Additionally, this harmonizes with our comment published earlier [22] where we claim that trauma may neither be the only nor the best indication for REBOA. Many patients suffering major haemorrhage have non-traumatic aetiology and in Norway these constitute the vast majority [23, 24]. REBOA may be beneficial for selected patients suffering cardiac arrest [17] and may be even more beneficial for women with post-partum haemorrhage [22, 25, 26].

In summary, we do not think this is the end of balloons. We salute the investigators for their efforts and challenge others to assess REBOA in non-traumatic haemorrhage.

Abbreviations

REBOA	Resuscitative endovascular balloon occlusion of the aorta
RCT	Randomized controlled trial
SC	Standard care

Acknowledgements

Not applicable.

Author contributions

JRB drafted the manuscript. MR reviewed the manuscript. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding

Not applicable.

Availability of data and materials

Not applicable.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Not applicable.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no financial competing interest. JRB and MR are both involved in REBOA research in cardiac arrest. Both authors are partially employed in the Norwegian Air Ambulance Foundation for research purposes.

Received: 24 October 2023 Accepted: 25 October 2023

Published online: 31 October 2023

References

- Brenner M, Bulger EM, Perina DG, Henry S, Kang CS, Rotondo MF, et al. Joint statement from the American College of Surgeons Committee on Trauma (ACS COT) and the American College of Emergency Physicians (ACEP) regarding the clinical use of Resuscitative Endovascular Balloon Occlusion of the Aorta (REBOA). *Trauma Surg Acute Care Open*. 2018;3(1):154.
- RibeiroJunior MAF, Feng CYD, Nguyen ATM, Rodrigues VC, Bechara GEK, de-Moura RR, et al. The complications associated with Resuscitative Endovascular Balloon Occlusion of the Aorta (REBOA). *World J Emerg Surg*. 2018;13(1):20.
- Joseph B, Zeeshan M, Sakran JV, Hamidi M, Kulvatunyou N, Khan M, et al. Nationwide analysis of resuscitative endovascular balloon occlusion of the aorta in civilian trauma. *JAMA Surg*. 2019;154(6):500–8.
- Jansen JO, Hudson J, Cochran C, MacLennan G, Lendum R, Sadek S, et al. Emergency Department resuscitative endovascular balloon occlusion of the aorta in trauma patients with exsanguinating hemorrhage: the UK-REBOA randomized clinical trial. *JAMA*. 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2023.20850> [Internet]. Twitter. 2023 [cited 18 September 2023]. Tilgjengelig på: <https://twitter.com/karimbrohi/status/1668900543270404096>.
- Karim Brohi [@karimbrohi]. UK-REBOA results: REBOA increased mortality at 90 days and at all interim time points. REBOA increased deaths due to bleeding at 3 hours and 90 days. REBOA substantially delayed time to definitive haemorrhage control. #ccr23 <https://t.co/yGPoDTJC0Z> [Internet]. Twitter. 2023 [cited 18 September 2023]. Tilgjengelig på: <https://twitter.com/karimbrohi/status/1668900543270404096>.
- Qasim Z, JC: the UK-REBOA trial. Has the balloon popped? St Emlyn's [Internet]. St. Emlyn's. 2023 [cited 18 September 2023]. <https://www.stemlynsblog.org/jc-the-uk-reboa-trial-has-the-balloon-popped-st-emlyns/>.
- Roy J. Front line medical technologies; 2023 [cited 16 October 2023]. SPOTLIGHT: the UK REBOA Trial: too many questions, not enough answers—Frontline. <https://frontlinemedtech.com/spotlight-the-uk-reboa-trial-too-many-questions-not-enough-answers/>.
- Tisherman SA, Brenner ML. Contemporary adjuncts to hemorrhage control. *JAMA*. 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2023.16135>.
- Wolthers SA, Jensen TW, Breindahl N, Milling L, Blomberg SN, Andersen LB, et al. Traumatic cardiac arrest—a nationwide Danish study. *BMC Emerg Med*. 2023;23(1):69.
- Fleminger S, Ponsford J. Long term outcome after traumatic brain injury. *BMJ*. 2005;331(7530):1419–20.
- Brede JR, Skjærseth E, Klepstad P, Nordseth T, Krüger AJ. Changes in peripheral arterial blood pressure after resuscitative endovascular balloon occlusion of the aorta (REBOA) in non-traumatic cardiac arrest patients. *BMC Emerg Med*. 2021;21(1):157.
- Nozari A, Rubertsson S, Wiklund L. Improved cerebral blood supply and oxygenation by aortic balloon occlusion combined with intra-aortic vasopressin administration during experimental cardiopulmonary resuscitation. *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand*. 2000;44(10):1209–19.
- Nozari A, Rubertsson S, Wiklund L. Intra-aortic administration of epinephrine above an aortic balloon occlusion during experimental CPR does not further improve cerebral blood flow and oxygenation. *Resuscitation*. 2000;44(2):119–27.
- Nozari A, Rubertsson S, Gedeborg R, Nordgren A, Wiklund L. Maximisation of cerebral blood flow during experimental cardiopulmonary resuscitation does not ameliorate post-resuscitation hypoperfusion. *Resuscitation*. 1999;40(1):27–35.
- Gedeborg R, Hans C, Rubertsson S, Wiklund L. Cerebral ischaemia in experimental cardiopulmonary resuscitation—comparison of epinephrine and aortic occlusion. *Resuscitation*. 2001;50(3):319–29.
- Rødseth BJ, Thomas L, Pål K, Aardal SE, Trond N, Edmund S. Feasibility of pre-hospital resuscitative endovascular balloon occlusion of the aorta in non-traumatic out-of-hospital cardiac arrest. *J Am Heart Assoc*. 2019;8(22):e014394.
- Brede JR, Skulberg AK, Rehn M, Thorsen K, Klepstad P, Tylleskär I, et al. REBOARREST, resuscitative endovascular balloon occlusion of the aorta in non-traumatic out-of-hospital cardiac arrest: a study protocol for a randomised, parallel group, clinical multicentre trial. *Trials*. 2021;22(1):511.
- Gorman E, Nowak B, Klein M, Inaba K, Morrison J, Scalea T, et al. High resuscitative endovascular balloon occlusion of the aorta procedural volume is associated with improved outcomes: an analysis of the AORTA registry. *J Trauma Acute Care Surg*. 2021;91(5):781–9.
- Tisherman SA, Schmicker RH, Brasel KJ, Bulger EM, Kerby JD, Minei JP. Detailed description of all deaths in both the shock and traumatic brain injury hypertonic saline trials of the resuscitation outcomes consortium. *Ann Surg mars*. 2015;261(3):586.
- Barbosa RR, Rowell SE, Fox EE, Holcomb JB, Bulger EM, Phelan HA, et al. Increasing time to operation is associated with decreased survival in patients with a positive FAST exam requiring emergent laparotomy. *J Trauma Acute Care Surg*. 2013;75(10):S48–52.
- Latif RK, Clifford SP, Baker JA, Lenhardt R, Haq MZ, Huang J, et al. Traumatic hemorrhage and chain of survival. *Scand J Trauma Resusc Emerg Med*. 2023;31(1):25.
- Brede JR, Søvik E, Rehn M. Resuscitative endovascular balloon occlusion of the aorta: the postpartum haemorrhage perspective. *Crit Care*. 2022;26(1):57.
- Godø BN, Brede JR, Krüger AJ. Needs assessment of resuscitative endovascular balloon occlusion of the aorta (REBOA) in patients with major haemorrhage: a cross-sectional study. *Emerg Med J*. 2022;39(7):521–6.
- Hoehn MR, Hansraj NZ, Pasley AM, Brenner M, Cox SR, Pasley JD, et al. Resuscitative endovascular balloon occlusion of the aorta for non-traumatic intra-abdominal hemorrhage. *Eur J Trauma Emerg Surg Off Publ Eur Trauma Soc*. 2019;45(4):713–8.
- Kamijo K, Nakajima M, Shigemi D, Kaszynski RH, Ohbe H, Goto T, et al. Resuscitative endovascular balloon occlusion of the aorta for life-threatening postpartum hemorrhage: a nationwide observational study in Japan. *J Trauma Acute Care Surg*. 2022;93(3):418–23.

26. Stensaeth KH, Sovik E, Haig INY, Skomedal E, Jorgensen A. Fluoroscopy-free Resuscitative Endovascular Balloon Occlusion of the Aorta (REBOA) for controlling life threatening postpartum hemorrhage. PLoS ONE. 2017;12(3): e0174520.

Publisher's Note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Ready to submit your research? Choose BMC and benefit from:

- fast, convenient online submission
- thorough peer review by experienced researchers in your field
- rapid publication on acceptance
- support for research data, including large and complex data types
- gold Open Access which fosters wider collaboration and increased citations
- maximum visibility for your research: over 100M website views per year

At BMC, research is always in progress.

Learn more biomedcentral.com/submissions

