

PRACTICE INNOVATIONS IN EMERGENCY MEDICINE

Open Access



Urgent hyperbaric oxygen therapy for suicidal carbon monoxide poisoning: from a preliminary survey to a proposal for an integrated somatic-psychiatric protocol

Alessandra Costanza^{1,2*} , Julia Ambrosetti^{3†}, Philippe Spagnoli⁴, Andrea Amerio^{5,6,7}, Andrea Aguglia^{5,6}, Gianluca Serafini^{5,6}, Mario Amore^{5,6}, Guido Bondolfi^{1,8}, François Sarasin^{1,9} and Rodrigue Pignel⁴

Abstract

A considerable number of patients who made a carbon monoxide (CO) suicidal attempt are treated with urgent hyperbaric oxygen therapy (HBOT). For these patients at potential persistent risk of suicide, the hyperbaric chamber is a dangerous environment and their management a complex challenge for the Emergency Department (ED) and Hyperbaric Medicine Unit (UMH) teams. We aimed to (1) identify cases of intentional CO poisoning treated with urgent HBOT in the UMH of the University Hospitals of Geneva (HUG) during 2011–2018 and (2) test a proposed operational and integrated somatic-psychiatric protocol based on acquired experience. A total of 311 patients with CO poisoning were treated using urgent HBOT, for which poisoning was assumed suicidal in 40 patients (12.9%). This percentage appears greater than in other European countries. Both the excess of cases of intentional CO poisonings and difficulties encountered in their management resulted in the implementation of an operational and integrated somatic-psychiatric protocol addressing the entire patient's clinical trajectory, from the admission at ED-HUG to the treatment at the UMH-HUG. The established institutional protocol includes (1) clinical evaluation, (2) suicide risk assessment, and (3) safety measures. This is the first report—at our best knowledge—of a protocol detailing a practical procedure algorithm and focusing on multidisciplinary and mutual collaboration between the medical-nursing teams at the ED, psychiatric ED, and UMH. Improvements in patient's safety and care team's sense of security were observed. In conclusion, the opportunity to refer to a standardized protocol was beneficial in that it offers both reduced risks for suicidal patients and reduced stress for care teams operating in very acute and complex situations. Further studies are needed.

Keywords: Hyperbaric medicine, Emergency medicine, Emergency psychiatry, Risk management, Suicide, Suicidal behavior, Suicide attempt, Intentional carbon monoxide intoxication

* Correspondence: alessandra.costanza@unige.ch

†Alessandra Costanza and Julia Ambrosetti contributed equally to this work.

¹Department of Psychiatry, Faculty of Medicine, University of Geneva (UNIGE), Geneva, Switzerland

²Department of Psychiatry, ASO Santi Antonio e Biagio e Cesare Arrigo Hospital, Alessandria, Italy

Full list of author information is available at the end of the article



© The Author(s). 2020 **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.

Background

Carbon monoxide (CO) is one of the leading causes of morbidity and mortality of toxic origin [1]. About 40–70% of American CO poisonings are intentional, whereas the majority of European cases are accidental [2]. Although suicide is the fourth leading cause of early death in Switzerland, CO-specific epidemiologic data is sparse [3, 4, 5].

Severe CO poisoning can result in delayed encephalopathy, causing long-term neuropsychiatric symptoms, such as cognitive decline, personality changes, and affective disorders [6]. Although urgent hyperbaric oxygen therapy (HBOT) is not generally considered superior to normobaric oxygen therapy to prevent these sequelae [7], a number of CO poisonings, including intentional poisonings, are treated with HBOT.

CO poisoning represents a challenge for the staff of the Department of Emergency (ED). Among suicidal patients, this diagnosis is complicated by frequent simultaneous consumption of alcohol and drugs. Although the risk of repeating a suicide attempted in a hyperbaric chamber is low (especially for monoplace chambers versus multiplace chambers), the hyperbaric chamber is a hazardous environment for these patients, potentially still presenting an acute suicide risk, because of the presence of cables, devices, and other medical equipment (Fig. 1). Finally, in contrast to the standard decompression protocol (requiring at least 15 min), the necessity of applying a faster decompression procedure (requiring 3 min) in cases of acute psychomotor agitation—not rare in these patients—increases the risk of decompression sickness [2, 7, 8].

The aims of this text were to (1) determine if there are sufficient numbers of patients to support adoption of an operational and integrated somatic-psychiatric protocol for patients who made a suicide attempt (SA) by CO poisoning, based on acquired experience, and (2) outline details of this proposed protocol and begin to test its efficacy by implementation in the clinic.

Methods

Case identification

Annual numbers of patients with CO poisoning admitted at the ED-HUG and requiring urgent HBOT in the UMH-HUG from January 2011 to December 2018 were retrospectively collected. The percentage of intentional poisoning was calculated to determine whether there were a sufficient number of patients with adverse events to justify adoption of a protocol. Confidential/sensitive personal health information was not collected. As attested in the statement of 17 July 2020, this project did not need to be reviewed by the Geneva Cantonal of the Research Ethics Commission (CCER), because its aims are outside of the scope of the law. This Act applies to research concerning human diseases and concerning the structure and the function of the human body as defined in the Art. 2 of the Human Research Act (HRA) [9].

Proposed protocol

Both the excess of cases of intentional CO poisonings and difficulties encountered in their management resulted in the implementation of an operational and integrated somatic-psychiatric protocol addressing the entire patient's clinical trajectory, from the admission at ED to the treatment at the UMH. This project was facilitated by the geographical proximity in the HUG of the ED, the psychiatric ED, and the UMH. The established protocol includes (1) clinical evaluation, (2) suicide risk assessment, and (3) safety measures (Fig. 2).

Suicide risk was assessed by the Risk, Urgency, and Dangerousness (RUD) scale [10]. Evaluation of these parameters results in four RUD profiles for suicidal behavior (high, medium, weak, absent) with consequential clinical attitudes.

Psychopharmacological indications to be adopted in cases of major anxiety or psychomotor agitation (Fig. 2) follow the dedicated HUG protocol [11]. The latter is based on the consensus statement of the American Association for Emergency Psychiatry [12]. First-line therapy is orally administered 2 mg lorazepam combined with 5–10 mg sublingual olanzapine (2–5 mg haloperidol




Fig. 1 The interior of a multiplace hyperbaric chamber




Fig. 2 The operational integrated somatic-psychiatric protocol for the management of suicidal patients requiring urgent hyperbaric oxygen treatment. ATA, atmosphere absolute; CO, carbon monoxide; COHb, carboxyhemoglobin; ECG, electrocardiogram; fHb, free hemoglobin; HBOT, hyperbaric oxygen therapy; HUG, University Hospitals of Geneva; RUD, Risk, Urgency, and Dangerousness scale; UMH, Hyperbaric Medicine Unit

if olanzapine is unavailable). As a last resort, intramuscular 2 mg lorazepam and 5 mg haloperidol are used (2.5 mg midazolam if lorazepam is unavailable). These regimens can be repeated following a 20–30-min interval in patients with persistent agitation and only following somatic reassessment. Regular supervision is required every 30 min after sedation including monitoring of vital signs (Glasgow Coma Scale, arterial pressure, heart rate, oxygen saturation, blood glucose). Lack of a response should lead to consideration of sedation under airway protection by an anesthetist. These indications should be adapted to the patients’ clinical characteristics, including reducing treatment dosage in the elderly, and the sole or

priority use of benzodiazepines in case of documented/suspected pregnancy, alcohol and substance abuse, alcohol and substance withdrawal, concomitant methadone therapy, and prolonged QTc history.

Results and discussion

A total of 311 patients were treated for CO poisoning over the period 2011–2018. They received hyperbaric oxygen alternating with a 5-min break (to reduce risk of oxygen neurotoxicity) at 2.5 ATA over the course of 3 sessions (2.5, 1.5, and 1.5 h) within the first 24 h. Intentional poisoning was observed in 12.9% (*n* = 40) of cases, with most occurrences in 2012 (23.3%, *n* = 7) and

the least in 2017 (7.4%, *n* = 4) (Table 1). The percentage of intentional CO poisoning treated using urgent HBOT appears greater in our sample compared to other European countries. For example, intentional CO poisonings in the UMH of Marseille were estimated at 1% of all treated CO poisonings (Dr. M. Coulange, Centre Hyperbare St. Marguerite, unpublished data). Comparative studies between the UMH various sites inside and outside of Switzerland are needed.

Before the implementation of this protocol (years 2011–2013), 14 patients were treated for intentional CO intoxication, which included 4 cases of severe psychomotor agitation requiring a psychiatrist’s intervention. Subsequently, after the implementation of the protocol (years 2014–2018), 26 patients were treated for intentional CO intoxication, which included 2 cases of mild-moderate psychomotor agitation requiring a psychiatrist’s intervention. The risk of committing suicide in a hyperbaric chamber is very low, and this is especially true for monoplace chambers. Nonetheless, we documented 3 cases of a renewed suicide attempt within the multiplace hyperbaric chamber between 2011 and 2013, and no cases afterwards. Although these numbers are not high enough for a rigorous statistical analysis, the trends do suggest that patients may be benefiting from this protocol in terms of reduced severity of psychomotor agitation and lower number of renewed SA.

Improvements in patient’s safety and the UMH team’s sense of security were observed through semi-structured interviews with staff. Before the protocol’s introduction, four cases of severe psychomotor agitation were treated with the intervention of a psychiatrist and there were three cases of a renewed suicide attempt within the hyperbaric chamber. However, at this time, the psychiatrist was not made aware of the risks associated with the hyperbaric chamber nor HBOT procedures. We believe that a more rapid intervention and implementation

of the protocol, including administering psychopharmacologic drugs into the chamber, could have negated worsening of the psychomotor agitation. No further incidents occurred after the protocol’s implementation. Concerning subjective impressions of the UMH team, globally, the opportunity to refer to a clear multidisciplinary standardized protocol during acute and complex situations was reported. Some examples of responses of operators during semi-structured interviews were as follows: they could dispose of clear indication during emergencies; when they called for the psychiatrist, the latter was aware of this protocol and he could immediately operate; they prepared with the aid of the psychiatrist a stock of potential necessary psychopharmacological drugs, so the latter were immediately ready when necessary; even if an accident occurred, they know that they follow institutional procedures; finally, they know that they can benefit from debriefing seances with the psychiatrist for complex situations.

These observations suggest that an institutional somatic-psychiatric protocol can be beneficial as it offers both a decreased risk for these suicidal patients and reduced stress for the care teams. Practice recommendations in the diagnosis, management, and prevention of CO poisoning are available [7, 13], but—at our best knowledge—this is the first report of a multidisciplinary protocol detailing clinical procedures, suicide risk assessment, and safety measures focusing on mutual collaboration between the medical-nursing teams at the ED, psychiatric ED, and UMH.

Limitations

Our work has several limitations. First, the lack of socio-demographic and diagnostic information in this preliminary survey did not allow for identification of confounding factors. Second, formal comparisons between the UMH various sites inside and outside of Switzerland were not made. Third, the only empirical observations on the outcomes of the proposed protocol in the absence of statistical data support did not permit objective measures of improvements in utility and safeness [14].

Conclusions

In conclusion, we have formulated a multidisciplinary coordinated approach to address SA made by CO poisoning. The descriptive data collected thus far suggests that a somatic-psychiatric protocol can be helpful as it offers both a decreased risk for the suicidal patient and reduced stress for the care teams. It will serve as a framework for future quantitative studies.

Abbreviations

CO: Carbon monoxide; ED: Emergency Department; HBOT: Hyperbaric oxygen therapy; HUG: University Hospitals of Geneva; QTc: Corrected QT interval; RUD: Risk, Urgency, and Dangerousness; UMH: Hyperbaric Medicine Unit

Table 1 Accidental and intentional carbon monoxide (CO) poisonings treated using hyperbaric oxygen therapy (HBOT) at the Hyperbaric Medicine Unit of the University Hospitals of Geneva (HUG)

Year	Total CO poisonings	Intentional CO poisonings	
	Patients (<i>n</i> = 311)	Patients (<i>n</i> = 40)	Percentage (12.9%)
2011	<i>n</i> = 22	<i>n</i> = 5	22.7%
2012	<i>n</i> = 30	<i>n</i> = 7	23.3%
2013	<i>n</i> = 16	<i>n</i> = 2	12.5%
2014	<i>n</i> = 48	<i>n</i> = 5	10.5%
2015	<i>n</i> = 40	<i>n</i> = 4	10.0%
2016	<i>n</i> = 44	<i>n</i> = 4	9.1%
2017	<i>n</i> = 54	<i>n</i> = 4	7.4%
2018	<i>n</i> = 57	<i>n</i> = 9	15.8%

Acknowledgements

We are deeply grateful to Dr. Mirko Lombardo for his precious technical support and Dr. Sara De Vita for her graphical contribution.

Authors' contributions

A.C. and J.A. drafted the primary manuscript, contributed to the conceptualization of the study, and participated to the study selection/data collection; P.S. made the primary study selection/data collection and contributed to the conceptualization of the study; A.Am. and A.Ag. revised both the primary manuscript and the study selection/data collection; G.S., M.A., G.B., F.S., and R.P. revised the manuscript and supervised all the work. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding

This work did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Availability of data and materials

The datasets generated for this study are available on request to the corresponding author.

Ethics approval and consent to participate

This survey did not involve the collection or use of confidential or sensitive personal health information, but exclusively concerned the annual number of patients with CO poisoning and the percentage of patients with intentional poisoning. Ethics approval was not required under the Geneva jurisdiction for reporting the data presented in this study. The present study was conducted in compliance with the Helsinki Declaration of 1975, as revised in October 2013.

Consent for publication

Not applicable

Competing interests

All authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Author details

¹Department of Psychiatry, Faculty of Medicine, University of Geneva (UNIGE), Geneva, Switzerland. ²Department of Psychiatry, ASO Santi Antonio e Biagio e Cesare Arrigo Hospital, Alessandria, Italy. ³Emergency Department and Psychiatry Department, Emergency Psychiatric Unit (UAUP), Geneva University Hospitals (HUG), Geneva, Switzerland. ⁴Emergency Department, Hyperbaric Medicine Unit, Geneva University Hospitals (HUG), Geneva, Switzerland. ⁵Department of Neuroscience, Rehabilitation, Ophthalmology, Genetics, Maternal and Child Health (DINOEMI), Section of Psychiatry, University of Genoa, Genoa, Italy. ⁶IRCCS Ospedale Policlinico San Martino, Genoa, Italy. ⁷Department of Psychiatry, Tufts University, Boston, USA. ⁸Department of Psychiatry, Service of Liaison Psychiatry and Crisis Intervention (SPLIC), Geneva University Hospitals (HUG), Geneva, Switzerland. ⁹Emergency Department, Emergency Medicine Unit, Geneva University Hospitals (HUG), Geneva, Switzerland.

Received: 4 July 2020 Accepted: 21 November 2020

Published online: 02 December 2020

References

1. Prockop LD, Chichkova RI. Carbon monoxide intoxication: an updated review. *J Neurol Sci*. 2007;262:122–30.
2. Schaub E, Pellegrini M, Pugin D. Carbon monoxide poisoning: an update for 2009. *Rev Med Suisse*. 2009;5:1606–9.
3. Ostertag L, Golay P, Dorogi Y, Brovelli S, Bertran M, Cromec I, et al. The implementation and first insights of the French-speaking Swiss programme for monitoring self-harm. *Swiss Med Wkly*. 2019;149:w20016.
4. Costanza A, Mazzola V, Radomska M, Amerio A, Aguglia A, Prada P, et al. Who consult an adult psychiatric emergency department? Pertinence of admissions and opportunities for telepsychiatry. *Medicina*. 2020a;56:295.
5. Costanza A, Amerio A, Radomska M, Ambrosetti J, Di Marco S, Prelati M, Aguglia A, Serafini G, Amore M, Bondolfi G, Michaud L, Pompili M. Suicidality assessment of the elderly with physical illness in the Emergency Department. *Front Psychiatry*. 2020b;11:558974.

6. Borras L, Constant E, De Timary P, Huguete P, Khazaal Y. Long-term psychiatric consequences of carbon monoxide poisoning: a case report and literature review. *Rev Med Interne*. 2009;30:43–8.
7. American College of Emergency Physicians Clinical Policies Subcommittee (Writing Committee on Carbon Monoxide Poisoning: Wolf SJ, Maloney GE, Shih RD, Shy BD, Brown MD). Clinical policy: critical issues in the evaluation and management of adult patients presenting to the emergency department with acute carbon monoxide poisoning. *Ann Emerg Med* 2017; 69: 98–107.
8. Ng PCY, Long B, Koyfman A. Clinical chameleons: an emergency medicine focused review of carbon monoxide poisoning. *Intern Emerg Med*. 2018;13: 223–9.
9. World Medical Association. World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki: ethical principles for medical research involving human subjects. *JAMA*. 2013;310:2191–4.
10. Séguin M, Terra JL. [Suicidal crisis intervention training: trainer's manual]. Document de la Direction Générale de la Santé, Ministère de la Santé et de la Protection Sociale, Université du Québec et Outaouais (UQO). 2004.
11. de Nérès M, Costanza A, Besson M, Greiner C, Prada P, Ambrosetti J. Suicidal crisis and suicide prevention: psychopharmacological aspects. *Rev Med Suisse*. 2020;16:314–7.
12. Wilson MP, Pepper D, Currier GW, Holloman GH Jr, Feifel D. The psychopharmacology of agitation: consensus statement of the American Association for Emergency Psychiatry project BETA psychopharmacology workgroup. *West J Emerg Med*. 2012;13:26–34.
13. Hampson NB, Piantadosi CA, Thom SR, Weaver LK. Practice recommendations in the diagnosis, management, and prevention of carbon monoxide poisoning. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2012;186:1095–101.
14. Amerio A, Starace F, Costanza A, Serafini G, Aguglia A, Odone A, et al. Putting Codman's lesson to work: measuring and improving the quality of Italian mental health care. *Acta Psychiatr Scand*. 2020;141:91–2.

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



Terms and Conditions

Springer Nature journal content, brought to you courtesy of Springer Nature Customer Service Center GmbH (“Springer Nature”).

Springer Nature supports a reasonable amount of sharing of research papers by authors, subscribers and authorised users (“Users”), for small-scale personal, non-commercial use provided that all copyright, trade and service marks and other proprietary notices are maintained. By accessing, sharing, receiving or otherwise using the Springer Nature journal content you agree to these terms of use (“Terms”). For these purposes, Springer Nature considers academic use (by researchers and students) to be non-commercial.

These Terms are supplementary and will apply in addition to any applicable website terms and conditions, a relevant site licence or a personal subscription. These Terms will prevail over any conflict or ambiguity with regards to the relevant terms, a site licence or a personal subscription (to the extent of the conflict or ambiguity only). For Creative Commons-licensed articles, the terms of the Creative Commons license used will apply.

We collect and use personal data to provide access to the Springer Nature journal content. We may also use these personal data internally within ResearchGate and Springer Nature and as agreed share it, in an anonymised way, for purposes of tracking, analysis and reporting. We will not otherwise disclose your personal data outside the ResearchGate or the Springer Nature group of companies unless we have your permission as detailed in the Privacy Policy.

While Users may use the Springer Nature journal content for small scale, personal non-commercial use, it is important to note that Users may not:

1. use such content for the purpose of providing other users with access on a regular or large scale basis or as a means to circumvent access control;
2. use such content where to do so would be considered a criminal or statutory offence in any jurisdiction, or gives rise to civil liability, or is otherwise unlawful;
3. falsely or misleadingly imply or suggest endorsement, approval, sponsorship, or association unless explicitly agreed to by Springer Nature in writing;
4. use bots or other automated methods to access the content or redirect messages
5. override any security feature or exclusionary protocol; or
6. share the content in order to create substitute for Springer Nature products or services or a systematic database of Springer Nature journal content.

In line with the restriction against commercial use, Springer Nature does not permit the creation of a product or service that creates revenue, royalties, rent or income from our content or its inclusion as part of a paid for service or for other commercial gain. Springer Nature journal content cannot be used for inter-library loans and librarians may not upload Springer Nature journal content on a large scale into their, or any other, institutional repository.

These terms of use are reviewed regularly and may be amended at any time. Springer Nature is not obligated to publish any information or content on this website and may remove it or features or functionality at our sole discretion, at any time with or without notice. Springer Nature may revoke this licence to you at any time and remove access to any copies of the Springer Nature journal content which have been saved.

To the fullest extent permitted by law, Springer Nature makes no warranties, representations or guarantees to Users, either express or implied with respect to the Springer nature journal content and all parties disclaim and waive any implied warranties or warranties imposed by law, including merchantability or fitness for any particular purpose.

Please note that these rights do not automatically extend to content, data or other material published by Springer Nature that may be licensed from third parties.

If you would like to use or distribute our Springer Nature journal content to a wider audience or on a regular basis or in any other manner not expressly permitted by these Terms, please contact Springer Nature at

onlineservice@springernature.com