SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

Table S1. Demographic characteristics of respondents

	Respondents, N (%) or median (IQR)
Specialty (N=158)	
Anesthesia intensive care	5 (3.2%)
Cardiac intensive care	12 (7.6%)
Cardiology	4 (2.5%)
Cardiothoracic surgery	6 (3.8%)
Internal medicine	14 (8.9%)
General intensive care	52 (32.9%)
Emergency medicine	12 (7.6%)
Neurointensive care	38 (24.1%)
Neurology	75 (47.5%)
Neurosurgery	4 (2.5%)
Pediatric intensive care	6 (3.8%)
Pulmonology	2 (1.3%)
Surgical intensive care	8 (5.1%)
Trauma surgery	2 (1.3%)
Other	5 (3.2%)
Dedicated intensive care training (N=157)	95 (60.5%)
Years since graduation (N=156)	12.5 (7–20)
Volume of successfully resuscitated patients (N=178)	
0	5 (2.8)
1–25	136 (76.4)
25–50	28 (15.7)
51–75	4 (2.2)
>75	5 (2.8)
Practice setting (N=158)	
Private hospital	90 (57.0%)
Public hospital	117 (74.1)
University-affiliated	73 (46.2)
Location of practice (N=158)	
Bahia	5 (3.2)

Ceará	2 (1.3)
Distrito Federal	5 (3.2)
Espírito Santo	2 (1.3)
Goiás	2 (1.3)
Mato Grosso do Sul	1 (0.6)
Minas Gerais	7 (4.4)
Pará	1 (0.6)
Paraíba	1 (0.6)
Paraná	4 (2.5)
Pernambuco	2 (1.3)
Piauí	1 (0.6)
Rio de Janeiro	41 (25.9)
Rio Grande do Sul	2 (1.3)
Santa Catarina	3 (1.9)
São Paulo	74 (46.8)
Sergipe	3 (1.9)
Tocantins	2 (1.3)

“Other” free-text specialties included: adult and pediatric palliative care, neonatal intensive care, and neurophysiology.

Table S2. Characteristics of targeted temperature management use

	Respondents, N (%)
Use of TTM at primary facility (N=156)	80 (51.3)
Target temperature (N=74)	
32-34 degrees Celsius	26 (35.1)
36 degrees Celsius	16 (21.6)
32-36 degrees Celsius	32 (43.2)
Cooling method (N=74)	
Controlled cooling and rewarming loop feedback: endovascular catheter	9 (12.2)
Controlled cooling and rewarming loop feedback: esophageal cooling catheter	13 (17.6)
Controlled cooling and rewarming loop feedback: surface cooling adhesive pads	18 (24.3)
Controlled cooling and rewarming loop feedback: nasopharyngeal catheter	3 (4.1)
Non-controlled cooling and rewarming loop feedback: nasopharyngeal catheter	1 (1.4)
Non-controlled cooling and rewarming loop feedback: cooling blanket	44 (59.5)
Ice packs	34 (45.9)
Cold saline	38 (51.4)
Fan	5 (6.8)
Duration of target temperature maintenance (N=74)	
<24 hours	3 (4.1)
24 hours	38 (51.4)
24–48 hours	29 (39.2)
>48 hours	4 (5.4)

TTM = targeted temperature management.

Table S3. Frequency of use of prognostic tools: neurologists versus non-neurologists

	Neurologists, N (%)	**Non-neurologists, N (%)**	**p-value**
CT head (N=137)			0.334
Never	2 (2.4)	0 (0.0)	
Rarely	2 (2.4)	1 (1.9)	
Not so often	6 (7.1)	7 (13.2)	
Very often	22 (26.2)	8 (15.1)	
Almost always	52 (61.9)	37 (69.8)	
MRI brain (N=134)			0.025*
Never	2 (2.4)	8 (15.7)	0.033*
Rarely	7 (8.4)	1 (2.0)	0.620
Not so often	26 (31.3)	10 (19.6)	0.620
Very often	19 (22.9)	13 (25.5)	1.000
Almost always	29 (34.9)	19 (37.3)	1.000
NSE (N=132)			0.304
Never	67 (82.7)	39 (76.5)	
Rarely	6 (7.4)	7 (13.7)	
Not so often	5 (6.2)	4 (7.8)	
Very often	3 (3.7)	0 (0.0)	
Almost always	0 (0.0)	1 (2.0)	
EEG (N=136)			0.895
Never	11 (13.3)	7 (13.2)	
Rarely	8 (9.6)	5 (9.4)	
Not so often	9 (10.8)	9 (17.0)	
Very often	19 (22.9)	11 (20.8)	
Almost always	36 (43.4)	21 (39.6)	
SSEP (N=134)			0.739
Never	46 (56.1)	30 (57.7)	
Rarely	12 (14.6)	11 (21.2)	
Not so often	15 (18.3)	6 (11.5)	
Very often	4 (4.9)	3 (5.8)	
Almost always	5 (6.1)	2 (3.8)	

Significant p-values of less than .05 are denoted with an asterisk. For significant Fisher's test results from contingency tables with greater than 2 rows, post-hoc row-wise testing was

performed, and subsequent p-values adjusted using Holm's method are listed. CT= computed tomography, MRI= magnetic resonance imaging, NSE = neuron specific enolase, EEG = electroencephalography, SSEP = somatosensory evoked potentials.

Table S4. Neurologic examination technique: intensivists versus non-intensivists

	Intensivists, N (%)	**Non-intensivists, N (%)**	**p-value**
Pupillary light reflex technique (N=110)			0.361
Light with magnifying glass	6 (9.5)	5 (10.6)	
Light with naked eye	51 (81.0)	41 (87.2)	
Pupillometer	6 (9.5)	1 (2.1)	
Corneal reflex technique (N=101)			0.152
Saline/water squirt	16 (27.1)	9 (21.4)	
Light cotton touch	36 (61.0)	32 (76.2)	
Puff of air	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	
Cotton-tip applicator with pressure	7 (11.9)	1 (2.4)	
Motor response technique (N=96)			
Trapezius squeeze	18 (30.0)	12 (33.3)	0.909
Proximal limb noxious stimulation	16 (26.7)	8 (22.2)	0.808
Sternal rub	23 (38.3)	18 (50.0)	0.365
Nipple pinch	9 (15.0)	3 (8.3)	0.526
Temporomandibular joint pressure	28 (46.7)	19 (52.8)	0.712
Nailbed pressure	45 (75.0)	30 (83.3)	0.483
Supraorbital pressure	31 (51.7)	24 (66.7)	0.220

Table S5. Perceived importance of prognostic tools: neurologists versus non-neurologists

	Neurologists, N (%)	**Non-neurologists, N (%)**	**p-value**
NSE (N=136)			0.820
Not at all important	6 (7.3)	3 (5.6)	
Somewhat important	42 (51.2)	24 (44.4)	
Very important	27 (32.9)	22 (40.7)	
Critically important	7 (8.5)	5 (9.3)	
EEG (N=137)			0.551
Not at all important	1 (1.2)	1 (1.8)	
Somewhat important	8 (9.8)	6 (10.9)	
Very important	35 (42.7)	29 (52.7)	
Critically important	38 (46.3)	19 (34.5)	
SSEP (N=133)			0.832
Not at all important	2 (2.5)	2 (3.8)	
Somewhat important	28 (34.6)	19 (36.5)	
Very important	34 (42.0)	23 (44.2)	
Critically important	17 (21.0)	8 (15.4)	
CT head (N=133)			0.333
Not at all important	2 (2.5)	2 (3.8)	
Somewhat important	13 (16.0)	14 (26.9)	
Very important	28 (34.6)	18 (34.6)	
Critically important	38 (46.9)	18 (34.6)	
MRI brain (N=139)			0.990
Not at all important	2 (2.4)	2 (3.6)	
Somewhat important	13 (15.5)	8 (14.5)	
Very important	34 (40.5)	23 (41.8)	
Critically important	35 (41.7)	22 (40.0)	
Pupillary light reflex (N=139)			0.446
Not at all important	1 (1.2)	0 (0.0)	

Somewhat important	3 (3.6)	3 (5.4)	
Very important	11 (13.3)	12 (21.4)	
Critically important	68 (81.9)	41 (73.2)	
Corneal reflex (N=140)			0.217
Not at all important	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	
Somewhat important	2 (2.4)	3 (5.4)	
Very important	14 (16.7)	15 (26.8)	
Critically important	68 (81.0)	38 (67.9)	
GCS motor response (N=140)			0.058
Not at all important	2 (2.4)	0 (0.0)	
Somewhat important	10 (11.9)	8 (14.3)	
Very important	13 (15.5)	18 (32.1)	
Critically important	59 (70.2)	30 (53.6)	
Observed myoclonus (N=139)			0.345
Not at all important	3 (3.6)	2 (3.6)	
Somewhat important	13 (15.7)	15 (26.8)	
Very important	25 (30.1)	18 (32.1)	
Critically important	42 (50.6)	21 (37.5)	

NSE = neuron specific enolase, EEG = electroencephalography, SSEP = somatosensory evoked potentials, CT = computed tomography, MRI = magnetic resonance imaging, GCS = Glasgow Coma Scale.

Table S6. Perceived importance of prognostic tools: intensivists versus non-intensivists

	Intensivists, N (%)	**Non-intensivists, N (%)**	**p-value**
NSE (N=136)			0.193
Not at all important	5 (5.9)	4 (7.8)	
Somewhat important	36 (42.4)	30 (58.8)	
Very important	36 (42.4)	13 (25.5)	
Critically important	8 (9.4)	4 (7.8)	
EEG (N=137)			0.130
Not at all important	1 (1.2)	1 (2.0)	
Somewhat important	5 (5.8)	9 (17.6)	
Very important	43 (50.0)	21 (41.2)	
Critically important	37 (43.0)	20 (39.2)	
SSEP (N=133)			0.165
Not at all important	2 (2.4)	2 (3.9)	
Somewhat important	26 (31.7)	21 (41.2)	
Very important	34 (41.5)	23 (45.1)	
Critically important	20 (24.4)	5 (9.8)	
CT head (N=133)			0.494
Not at all important	1 (1.2)	3 (5.9)	
Somewhat important	16 (19.5)	11 (21.6)	
Very important	30 (36.6)	16 (31.4)	
Critically important	35 (42.7)	21 (41.2)	
MRI brain (N=139)			0.003*
Not at all important	1 (1.1)	3 (5.8)	0.294
Somewhat important	7 (8.0)	14 (26.9)	0.024*
Very important	37 (42.5)	20 (38.5)	0.722
Critically important	42 (48.3)	15 (28.8)	0.097
Pupillary light reflex (N=139)			0.962
Not at all important	1 (1.1)	0 (0.0)	

Somewhat important	4 (4.6)	2 (3.8)	
Very important	15 (17.2)	8 (15.4)	
Critically important	67 (77.0)	42 (80.8)	
Corneal reflex (N=140)			0.318
Not at all important	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	
Somewhat important	4 (4.6)	1 (1.9)	
Very important	21 (24.1)	8 (15.1)	
Critically important	62 (71.3)	44 (83.0)	
GCS motor response (N=140)			0.713
Not at all important	1 (1.1)	1 (1.9)	
Somewhat important	13 (14.9)	5 (9.4)	
Very important	20 (23.0)	11 (20.8)	
Critically important	53 (60.9)	36 (67.9)	
Observed myoclonus (N=139)			0.556
Not at all important	4 (4.6)	1 (1.9)	
Somewhat important	15 (17.2)	13 (25.0)	
Very important	26 (29.9)	17 (32.7)	
Critically important	42 (48.3)	21 (40.4)	

Significant p-values of less than .05 are denoted with an asterisk. For significant chi-square or Fisher's test results from contingency tables with greater than 2 rows, post-hoc row-wise testing was performed, and subsequent p-values adjusted using Holm's method are listed. NSE = neuron specific enolase, EEG = electroencephalography, SSEP = somatosensory evoked potentials, CT = computed tomography, MRI = magnetic resonance imaging, GCS = Glasgow Coma Scale.

Table S7. Timing of neuroimaging

A. Neurologists versus non-neurologists

	Total, N (%)	**Neurologists, N (%)**	**Non-neurologists, N (%)**	**p-value**
Brain MRI (N=112)				0.414
Day 0 (day of arrest)	7 (6.2)	5 (6.9)	2 (5.0)	
Days 1-2	35 (31.2)	25 (34.7)	10 (25.0)	
Days 3-5	48 (42.9)	31 (43.1)	17 (42.5)	
Days 6-14	22 (19.6)	11 (15.3)	11 (27.5)	
Other	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	
Head CT (N=112)				
Immediately post-arrest	21 (18.8)	18 (25.0)	3 (7.5)	0.024*
24 hours post-arrest	45 (40.2)	32 (44.4)	13 (32.5)	0.235
48 hours post-arrest	33 (29.5)	23 (31.9)	10 (25.0)	0.520
72 hours post-arrest	30 (26.8)	15 (20.8)	15 (37.5)	0.075
Other	5 (4.5)	2 (2.8)	3 (7.5)	0.346

B. Intensivists versus non-intensivists

	Total, N (%)	**Intensivists, N (%)**	**Non-intensivists, N (%)**	**p-value**
Brain MRI (N=112)				0.074
Day 0 (day of arrest)	7 (6.2)	3 (4.4)	4 (9.1)	
Days 1-2	35 (31.2)	16 (23.5)	19 (43.2)	
Days 3-5	48 (42.9)	33 (48.5)	15 (34.1)	
Days 6-14	22 (19.6)	16 (23.5)	6 (13.6)	
Other	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	
Head CT (N=112)				
Immediately post-arrest	21 (18.8)	10 (14.7)	11 (25.0)	0.217
24 hours post-arrest	45 (40.2)	26 (38.2)	19 (43.2)	0.694
48 hours post-arrest	33 (29.5)	21 (30.9)	12 (27.3)	0.832
72 hours post-arrest	30 (26.8)	18 (26.5)	12 (27.3)	1.000
Other	5 (4.5)	4 (5.9)	1 (2.3)	0.647

C. Physicians using TTM versus physicians not using TTM

	Total, N (%)	**Physicians using TTM, N (%)**	**Physicians not using TTM, N (%)**	**p-value**
Brain MRI (N=112)				0.002*
Day 0 (day of arrest)	7 (6.2)	0 (0.0)	7 (12.1)	0.013*
Days 1-2	35 (31.2)	12 (22.2)	23 (39.7)	0.066
Days 3-5	48 (42.9)	27 (50.0)	21 (36.2)	0.181
Days 6-14	22 (19.6)	15 (27.8)	7 (12.1)	0.056
Other	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1.000
Head CT (N=112)				
Immediately post-arrest	21 (18.8)	8 (14.8)	13 (22.4)	0.341
24 hours post-arrest	45 (40.2)	14 (25.9)	31 (53.4)	0.004*
48 hours post-arrest	33 (29.5)	17 (31.5)	16 (27.6)	0.683
72 hours post-arrest	30 (26.8)	17 (31.5)	13 (22.4)	0.295
Other	5 (4.5)	3 (5.6)	2 (3.4)	0.671

Significant p-values of less than .05 are denoted with an asterisk. For the significant Fisher's test result on brain MRI data comparing physicians using TTM to physicians not using TTM, post-hoc row-wise testing was performed, and subsequent p-values adjusted using Holm's method are listed. For head CT timing, no additional free-text information was provided from respondents who selected "other." MRI = magnetic resonance imaging, CT = computed tomography, TTM = targeted temperature management.

Table S8. Defining poor prognosis by Cerebral Performance Category score

A. Neurologists versus non-neurologists

	Total, N (%)	**Neurologists, N (%)**	**Non-neurologists, N (%)**	**p-value**
CPC 2 or greater	1 (0.9)	0 (0.0)	1 (2.6)	0.248
CPC 3 or greater	69 (61.1)	44 (58.7)	25 (65.8)	
CPC 4 or greater	39 (34.5)	27 (36.0)	12 (31.6)	
CPC 5	4 (3.5)	4 (5.3)	0 (0.0)	

B. Intensivists versus non-intensivists

	Total, N (%)	**Intensivists, N (%)**	**Non-intensivists, N (%)**	**p-value**
CPC 2 or greater	1 (0.9)	1 (1.5)	0 (0.0)	1.000
CPC 3 or greater	69 (61.1)	41 (61.2)	28 (60.9)	
CPC 4 or greater	39 (34.5)	23 (34.3)	16 (34.8)	
CPC 5	4 (3.5)	2 (3.0)	2 (4.3)	

CPC = Cerebral Performance Category

Table S9. Timing of prognostic recommendations: patients without targeted temperature management

A. Neurologists versus non-neurologists

	Total, N (%)	**Neurologists, N (%)**	**Non-neurologists, N (%)**	**p-value**
Day 1 post-arrest	5 (4.5)	4 (5.6)	1 (2.6)	0.494
Day 2 post-arrest	17 (15.3)	12 (16.7)	5 (12.8)	
Day 3 post-arrest	34 (30.6)	21 (29.2)	13 (33.3)	
Day 4 post-arrest	6 (5.4)	2 (2.8)	4 (10.3)	
Day 5 post-arrest	11 (9.9)	6 (8.3)	5 (12.8)	
Day 6 post-arrest or later	38 (34.2)	27 (37.5)	11 (28.2)	

B. Intensivists versus non-intensivists

	Total, N (%)	**Intensivists, N (%)**	**Non-intensivists, N (%)**	**Adjusted p-value**	**p-value**
Day 1 post-arrest	5 (4.5)	1 (1.5)	4 (9.1)	0.325	0.016
Day 2 post-arrest	17 (15.3)	9 (13.4)	8 (18.2)	0.800	
Day 3 post-arrest	34 (30.6)	24 (35.8)	10 (22.7)	0.618	
Day 4 post-arrest	6 (5.4)	5 (7.5)	1 (2.3)	0.800	
Day 5 post-arrest	11 (9.9)	10 (14.9)	1 (2.3)	0.284	
Day 6 post-arrest or later	38 (34.2)	18 (26.9)	20 (45.5)	0.325	

Adjusted p-values, corrected for multiple comparisons using Holm's method, represent the results of post-hoc row-wise testing given a significant Fisher's test result. TTM = targeted temperature management.

C. Physicians using TTM versus physicians not using TTM

	Total, N (%)	Physicians using TTM, N (%)	Physicians not using TTM, N (%)	p-value
Day 1 post-arrest	5 (4.5)	1 (1.9)	4 (6.9)	0.132
Day 2 post-arrest	17 (15.3)	7 (13.2)	10 (17.2)	
Day 3 post-arrest	34 (30.6)	17 (32.1)	17 (29.3)	
Day 4 post-arrest	6 (5.4)	5 (9.4)	1 (1.7)	
Day 5 post-arrest	11 (9.9)	8 (15.1)	3 (5.2)	
Day 6 post-arrest or later	38 (34.2)	15 (28.3)	23 (39.7)	

TTM = targeted temperature management

Table S10. Timing of prognostic recommendations: patients treated with targeted temperature management

A. Neurologists versus non-neurologists

	Total, N (%)	Neurologists, N (%)	Non-neurologists, N (%)	p-value
Day 1 post-arrest	2 (3.7)	1 (3.1)	1 (4.5)	
Day 2 post-arrest	4 (7.4)	4 (12.5)	0 (0.0)	
Day 3 post-arrest	4 (7.4)	2 (6.2)	2 (9.1)	
Day 4 post-arrest	4 (7.4)	3 (9.4)	1 (4.5)	
Day 5 post-arrest	5 (9.3)	1 (3.1)	4 (18.2)	
Day 6 or later post-arrest	5 (9.3)	4 (12.5)	1 (4.5)	
Day 1 post-rewarming	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	
Day 2 post-rewarming	6 (11.1)	3 (9.4)	3 (13.6)	0.482
Day 3 post-rewarming	6 (11.1)	4 (12.5)	2 (9.1)	
Day 4 post-rewarming	4 (7.4)	1 (3.1)	3 (13.6)	
Day 5 post-rewarming	3 (5.6)	2 (6.2)	1 (4.5)	
Day 6 post-rewarming or later	11 (20.4)	7 (21.9)	4 (18.2)	

B. Intensivists versus non-intensivists

	Total, N (%)	Intensivists, N (%)	Non-intensivists, N (%)	p-value
Day 1 post-arrest	2 (3.7)	1 (2.4)	1 (8.3)	
Day 2 post-arrest	4 (7.4)	3 (7.1)	1 (8.3)	
Day 3 post-arrest	4 (7.4)	3 (7.1)	1 (8.3)	
Day 4 post-arrest	4 (7.4)	3 (7.1)	1 (8.3)	
Day 5 post-arrest	5 (9.3)	5 (11.9)	0 (0.0)	0.919
Day 6 or later post-arrest	5 (9.3)	3 (7.1)	2 (16.7)	
Day 1 post-rewarming	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	

Day 2 post-rewarming	6 (11.1)	5 (11.9)	1 (8.3)	
Day 3 post-rewarming	6 (11.1)	4 (9.5)	2 (16.7)	
Day 4 post-rewarming	4 (7.4)	3 (7.1)	1 (8.3)	
Day 5 post-rewarming	3 (5.6)	3 (7.1)	0 (0.0)	
Day 6 post-rewarming or later	11 (20.4)	9 (21.4)	2 (16.7)	

TTM = targeted temperature management.