

Cut-off point for switching from non-invasive ventilation to intubation in severe ARDS. Fifty shades of grey?

Luc Quintin

Department of Physiology, University of Lyon, Lyon, France

Key words: acute respiratory distress syndrome, severe ARDS, non-invasive ventilation

Sir, I would like to thank Drs Skoczynski and Esquinas for their comments. Firstly, let us turn to their secondary points:

1. The initial intention was to pre-oxygenate a severely hypoxic patient before tracheal intubation [1] with a Respronics ventilator in the emergency department (ED), not to manage the whole case under non-invasive ventilation (NIV) with an Evita 4 XL ventilator in the Critical Care Unit (CCU). Nevertheless, the ventilatory discoordination disappeared almost immediately following the initiation of NIV, calling for an *iterative* re-assessment of preconceived strategy.
2. This case was *not* acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS), but acute hypoxemic non-hypercapnic respiratory failure: the opacities required by the Berlin definition could not be seen on the chest x-ray taken minutes after admission to the ED.
3. Although the patient was conscious, cooperative and drowsy (Glasgow 14), he was fully able to answer questions, and denied repeatedly having inhaled heroin. Esquinas [2] reported intubation with Glasgow ≤ 11 . Thus, unconsciousness is irrelevant.
4. The arrhythmia was not sinus tachycardia, but supraventricular arrhythmia: no P waves were observed on the oscilloscope using a *high*-speed display. Nevertheless, arrhythmia was, presumably, a consequence of hypoxia, a trivial issue not further discussed in the report [3]. Magnesium followed by amiodarone was aimed at isolating, as early as possible upon presentation, a «pure» ventilatory distress vs. a combined ventilatory and circulatory distress. Lung toxicity of a single dose of 450 mg of amiodarone awaits documentation.
5. The interface was a standard oro-nasal mask.
6. High PEEP (up to 20 cm H₂O) generated neither leak nor clinical gastric overdistension, in *this* patient. I recently

handled acute hypoxia (SaO₂ = 39%) due to postoperative atelectasis, with PEEP increased over 2 h from 5 to 24 cm H₂O (Drager Evita 4XL, low pressure support: PS to Pplat < 30 cm H₂O, FiO₂ = 1), allowing the pneumologist to perform a bronchoscopy under spontaneous ventilation (SaO₂ = 100% when beginning bronchoscopy), without leaks or gastric distension. The reader will decide whether this is again deliberate malpractice or careful, minute by minute, observation.

7. A high tidal volume (Vt) under PS is no trivial issue [4]. At variance with high PS in the setting of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) [5], minimal PS (≤ 8 cm) to compensate for the valves and tubing [6] will generate a low Vt: following the setting up of a high PEEP the lung operates on the highest slope of the pressure-volume curve [7]. The observed Vt was 250–500 mL (not 800–1200 mL as stated by Skoczynski), compatible with permissive hypercapnia (46–69 mm Hg) in a quiet patient with respiratory drive depressed by heroin. This technique was delineated earlier [8]. Guldner proposed similar analysis in animals [9]: see note added in proof [3].
8. Skoczynski and Esquinas question the use of excessively high FiO₂ (FiO₂ = 1). However, the definition of excessive use of O₂ is an FiO₂ > 0.5 when SaO₂ is > 92%, for up to 12–30 h, and excluding the “first 6 h of shock” [10]. Given a P/F ≈ 57 , in the ED, the patient received FiO₂ = 1, *en route* toward intubation and controlled mechanical ventilation. As SaO₂ remained < 90% for at least ≈ 5 h, this does not fit with excessively high FiO₂. Subsequently, FiO₂ was reduced to 0.4 within ≈ 10 h. As severe hypoxia (PaO₂ = 19–36 mm Hg) is compatible with life in elite climbers [11], the question may be posed whether benign neglect should be extended to an unstable patient presenting with acute cardio-ventilatory distress (P/F ≈ 57 on zero PEEP, 30 L min⁻¹ on high O₂ concentration mask; P/F = 75 on PEEP = 15 after 2 h on NIV). Moreover, should SaO₂ = 88–92% be aimed at in the present patient, as proposed in a fully *stabilized* patient [12]?

The modified NIH table [13] (tab. 1) uses high PEEP-low FiO₂ in *stabilized intubated mechanically ventilated patients* (SaO₂ ≈ 88 –95%), at variance with the questionable combination of high FiO₂-low PEEP [10, 12]:

Accordingly, in a non-intubated unstabilized patient, PEEP was increased up to 20 cm H₂O over 4 h, while FiO₂ was

Należy cytować wersję: Quintin L: Cut-off point for switching from non-invasive ventilation to intubation in severe ARDS. Fifty shades of grey? Anaesthesiol Intensive Ther 2016; 48: 62–64. doi: 10.5603/AIT.2016.0011.

Table 1. High PEEP group (after protocol change to use high PEEP; reproduced from [13])

FiO ₂	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.5–0.8	0.8	0.9	1.0
PEEP	12	14	14	16	16	18	20	22	22	22–24

lowered to 0.4 over 8 h, after stabilization : “the practice of using higher FiO₂ cannot be considered unreasonable under these settings” [10].

The effect of O₂ on the respiratory rate (RR) as a function of PaO₂ under spontaneous ventilation-PS [14] in the setting of ARDS, is to be taken into account to lower the work of breathing, at variance with COPD. Therefore, setting a 88–92% goal in the setting of invasive controlled mechanical ventilation in ARDS in stabilized intubated patients [12] does not apply to the early use of high PEEP-spontaneous ventilation in an unstabilized patient under NIV.

As to the question whether high FiO₂ acts synergistically with other insults to worsen alveolar damage, a “safe level and duration of O₂ exposure has not been established even in normal humans” [12]. Accordingly, a cut-off point of FiO₂ ≤ 0.6 for 8 h 45 could not be retrieved from the reference [12] provided by Skoczynski and Esquinas. Avoiding the closing-opening of alveoli (atelectrauma) with high PEEP presumably avoided inflammation and terminated swiftly the disease. Any synergistic effect of high FiO₂ and inflammation appears irrelevant, given the short time course of the disease.

Can 9 to 10 h be considered a swift recovery? To my surprise, the intensivist in charge on day 2 terminated the NIV at 08 h 30 am. In the setting of ARDS, P/F increases over 72 h or more [15, 16]. Thus, the reader may decide whether a recovery time over 10 h is swift or not (day 1, 10 pm : P/F ≈ 57 on zero-PEEP, high O₂ concentration mask; day 2, 08 45 am: P/F = 240, PEEP = 15, FiO₂ = 0.4).

Secondly, how far should NIV go without being detrimental? Let’s consider Esquinas’ data: a) «in the NIV group, P/F and RR became significantly higher and lower 3–4 hours after randomization» (Fig. 3 in [2]). b) the avoidance of intubation is reported in 54% of the patients with a P/F = 116 ± 38 [17]: given the standard deviation, some of his patients had a low P/F ≈ 40–60, as in our report [3]. Indeed, Pichot [3] observed the phenomenon described by Esquinas [2, 17]. Nevertheless, the use of NIV in acute respiratory failure demands caution [18]. Firstly, in the setting of severe ARDS (P/F = 126), 84% of the patients needed intubation [19]. Does this imply that the remaining 16% should be intubated upfront or should they simply observed even more closely to proceed to intubation if appropriate? Secondly, following extubation after respiratory failure, NIV is associated with a 10 h delay re-intubation and a higher mortality (NIV: 38%; standard treatment + reintubation: 22%) [20]. Thus, NIV should not be used (except perhaps in COPD or immuno-compromised patients, or as a bridge to intubation). A sober interpretation

only implies that patients presenting a second exacerbation of acute respiratory failure after extubation should be very closely re-assessed, e.g. at least hourly, and their trachea intubated early, as needed, should NIV fail. Individualized minute-by-minute observation in one considered patient (3) does not necessarily agree with epidemiologic findings [20]. Altogether, NIV is detrimental when extended too far. Indeed, one referee complimented our non-invasive management: “avoid tracheal tubes, minimize sedation, prevent ventilator-induced lung injury and nosocomial infections” [21]. Conversely, another referee considered this [3] management as malpractice (P 140, I 7). Again, the reader will decide whether our concluding insistence on minute by minute re-assessment in a highly restricted subset [3] was conservative enough.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Conflict of interest: Luc Quintin holds a US patent 8 703 697, April 22 2014: Method for treating early severe diffuse acute respiratory distress syndrome.

References:

1. Baillard C, Fosse JP, Sebbane M et al.: Noninvasive ventilation improves preoxygenation before intubation of hypoxic patients. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2006; 174: 171–177.
2. Ferrer M, Esquinas A, Leon M, Gonzalez G, Alarcon A, Torres A: Noninvasive ventilation in severe hypoxemic respiratory failure: a randomized clinical trial. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2003; 168: 1438–1444.
3. Pichot C, Petitjeans F, Ghignone M, Quintin L: Swift recovery of severe acute hypoxemic respiratory failure under non-invasive ventilation. *Anaesthesiol Intensive Ther* 2015; 47: 138–142. doi: 10.5603/AIT.a2014.0053.
4. Freebairn R, Hickling KG: Spontaneous breathing during mechanical ventilation in ARDS. *Crit Care Shock* 2005; 8: 61–66.
5. Brochard L, Harf A, Lorino H, Lemaire F: Inspiratory pressure support prevents diaphragmatic fatigue during weaning from mechanical ventilation. *Am Rev Respir Dis* 1989; 139: 513–521.
6. L’Her E, Deye N, Lellouche F et al.: Physiologic effects of noninvasive ventilation during acute lung injury. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2005; 172: 1112–1128.
7. Katz JA, Marks JD: Inspiratory work with and without continuous positive airway pressure in patients with acute respiratory failure. *Anesthesiology* 1985; 63: 598–607.
8. Galland C, Ferrand FX, Cividjian A et al.: Swift recovery of severe hypoxemic pneumonia upon morbid obesity. *Acta Anaesthesiol Belg* 2014; 65: 109–117.
9. Guldner A, Pelosi P, Gama de Abreu M: Spontaneous breathing in mild and moderate versus severe acute respiratory distress syndrome. *Curr Opin Crit Care* 2014; 20: 69–76.
10. Rachmale S, Li G, Wilson G, Malinchoc M, Gajic O: Practice of excessive F(IO(2)) and effect on pulmonary outcomes in mechanically ventilated patients with acute lung injury. *Respir Care* 2012; 57: 1887–1893.
11. Grocott MP, Martin DS, Levett DZ et al.: Arterial blood gases and oxygen content in climbers on Mount Everest. *N Engl J Med* 2009; 360: 140–149. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa0801581.
12. Aggarwal NR, Brower RG: Targeting normoxemia in acute respiratory distress syndrome may cause worse short-term outcomes because of oxygen toxicity. *An Am Thorac Soc* 2014; 11: 1449–1453. doi: 10.1513/AnnalsATS.201407-297PS.

13. Brower RG, Lanken PN, MacIntyre N et al.: Higher versus lower positive end-expiratory pressures in patients with the acute respiratory distress syndrome. *N Engl J Med* 2004; 351: 327–336.
14. Pesenti A, Rossi N, Calori A, Foti G, Rossi GP: Effects of short-term oxygenation changes on acute lung injury patients undergoing pressure support ventilation. *Chest* 1993; 103: 1185–1189.
15. Villar J, Perez-Mendez L, Lopez J et al.: An early PEEP/FIO₂ trial identifies different degrees of lung injury in patients with acute respiratory distress syndrome. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2007; 176: 795–804.
16. Talmor D, Sarge T, Malhotra A et al.: Mechanical ventilation guided by esophageal pressure in acute lung injury. *N Engl J Med* 2008; 359: 2095–2104. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa0708638.
17. Antonelli M, Conti G, Esquinas A et al.: A multiple-center survey on the use in clinical practice of noninvasive ventilation as a first-line intervention for acute respiratory distress syndrome. *Crit Care Med* 2007; 35: 18–25.
18. Esteban A, Anzueto A, Frutos F et al.: Characteristics and outcomes in adult patients receiving mechanical ventilation: a 28-day international study. *JAMA* 2002; 287: 345–355.
19. Thille AW, Contou D, Fragnoli C, Cordoba-Izquierdo A, Boissier F, Brun-Buisson C: Non-invasive ventilation for acute hypoxemic respiratory failure: intubation rate and risk factors. *Crit Care* 2013; 17: R269.
20. Esteban A, Frutos-Vivar F, Ferguson ND et al.: Noninvasive positive-pressure ventilation for respiratory failure after extubation. *N Engl J Med* 2004; 350: 2452–2460.
21. Terragni PP, Birocco A, Faggiano C, Ranieri VM: Extracorporeal CO₂ removal. *Contrib Nephrol* 2010; 165: 185–196. 10.1159/000313758.

Adres do korespondencji:

Luc Quintin MD, PhD
Physiologie
Campus de la Doua
8 Rue R Dubois
69 622 Villeurbanne, France
e-mail: lucquintin@yahoo.com

Anestezjologia Intensywna Terapia
2016, tom 48, numer 1, 68–70
ISSN 0209–1712
www.ait.viamedica.pl

Rola Argentyńskiej Federacji Stowarzyszeń Anestezji, Analgezji i Reanimacji w ochronie statusu ekonomicznego jej członków

The role of Argentine Federation of Associations of Anaesthesia, Analgesia and Reanimation

Wojciech Stanisław Pietrzyk

Szpital Kielecki św. Aleksandra w Kielcach

Dzięki wcześniejszym przyjaźniom z argentyńskimi anezjologami — a w szczególności znajomości z dr. Pedro Klingerem, z którym pracowałem wcześniej na Ibzie w Hiszpanii — i ich zaproszeniu do uczestnictwa w 15. Światowym Kongresie Anezjologów (WCA), mogłem zapoznać się z organizacją opieki anezjologicznej Argentynie. Także i w tym roku miałem przyjemność odwiedzić ten wspaniały kraj i gościć w domach moich argentyńskich przyjaciół, w tym mającej polskie korzenie specjalistki anezjologii dr Marisy Bard. Argentyna jako kraj imigrantów, przyjął wielu Polaków, których potomkowie osiągnęli niekiedy znaczącą pozycję w świecie medycznym.

Choć powierzchnia Argentyny jest wielokrotnie większa niż Polski, kraje te łączy wiele podobieństw, jak na przykład wielkość populacji. Wielu argentyńskich anezjologów, tak jak wielu Polaków wyspecjalizowanych w tej dziedzinie, pracuje stale lub czasowo za granicą.

W samej Argentynie, według danych ustnych z roku 2012, praktykuje około 3800 specjalistów anezjologii, z czego około 3750 należy do Argentyńskiej Federacji Stowarzyszeń Anestezji, Analgezji i Reanimacji (FAAAAR, *Federación Argentina de Asociaciones de Anestesia, Analgesia y Reanimación*). Z kolei według Rocznika Statystycznego 2012 liczba specjalistów anezjologii i intensywnej terapii w Polsce wynosi 3414 i plasuje nasz kraj na 5. miejscu wśród innych specjalności. Biorąc jednak pod uwagę istotne nakłady finansowe Ministerstwa Zdrowia na rezydentury z anezjologii, można przyjąć, że liczba anezjologów w kraju wkrótce znacząco się zwiększy.

W Argentynie, gdzie szkoleniem specjalizacyjnym anezjologów zajmuje się FAAAAR, liczba specjalistów jest dostosowywana do potrzeb rynku usług ochrony zdrowia. Było to zresztą przyczyną małego skandalu w trakcie otwarcia 15. WCA w Buenos Aires. Trudna do zdefiniowania politycznie grupa demonstrantów protestowała przed wejściem do centrum kongresowego przeciwko „monopolowi” FAAAAR w kształtowaniu „mafijnej” pozycji anezjologii w strukturze argentyńskiej ochrony zdrowia. Towarzyszyło temu dosłowne „zasypianie” uczestników zdążających na uroczyste otwarcie przez maszyny rozpylające tysiącami ulotek informujących o olbrzymich dochodach anezjologów i ich Stowarzyszenia. Do tego z zainstalowanych wielkich głośników słyhać było ścieżkę dźwiękową z filmu „Ojciec chrzestny” Coppoli. Bez wątplenia profesjonalnie zorganizowana grupa demonstrantów osiągnęła swój cel — zaintrygowała wielu zagranicznych anezjologów, w tym i mnie, do pogłębienia tematu.

Należy cytować anglojęzyczną wersję: Pietrzyk WS: The role of Argentine Federation of Associations of Anaesthesia, Analgesia and Reanimation. *Anaesthesiol Intensive Ther* 2016; 48: 64–66. doi: 10.5603/AIT.2016.0012.