











How do we increase oxygenation

Oxygen in

- mean alveolar pressure
 - TV
 - $\boldsymbol{\cdot}$ Increased Inspiratory time
 - PAUSE/I:E/
 - PEEP
- PEEP
 - Re-open alveoli and 🗆 shunt

- RECRUITMENT

- Re-open alveoli and □ shunt
- Prone Positioning



Obara H et al. Thorax, 1979, 34, 479–485 Alterations to the bronchial and bronchiolar surfaces of adult mice after exposure to high concentrations of oxygen



































Lowered TV & Plateau Pressures

- First cases of intentional permissive hypercarbia/ hypoventilation in Christchurch Intensive Care, NZ.
- Described limited tidal volumes, limited airway pressures to protect against barotrauma /volutrauma in ARDS, with apparent survival benefits.



Hickling K, et al . Low mortality associated with low volume pressure limited ventilation with permissive hypercapnia in severe adult respiratory distress syndrome Intensive Care Medicine . 1990; 16, 372-7

25



Lung Protective Ventilation

Recommended that patients be ventilated with low tidal volumes (4-8 mL/kg of predicted body weight)

27

HAWKE'S BAY







Lung Protective Ventilation

Recommended that patients be ventilated with low tidal volumes (4–8 mL/kg of predicted body weight)

Lung protective ventilation includes the use of 'high' PEEP but this has a less defined benefit in ARDS management

31

HAWKE'S BAY



No single PEEP strategy has proven to be ideal, Trials have outlined various PEEP titration strategies "Consensus" surrounding the idea of limiting over-distention of lung parenchyma while providing maximum number of open alveoli.

33

HAWKE'S BAY







To increase oxygenation

Oxygen in

HAWKE'S BAY

- \square \square mean alveolar pressure
 - TV
 - Increased Inspiratory time PAUSE/I:E/
 - PEEP
- PEEP
 - Re-open alveoli and □ shunt
- RECRUITMENT
 - Re-open alveoli and \Box shunt
- Prone Positioning

• BUT

- Increasing
 - TV
 - PAUSE
 - Inspiratory time
- Decreases Venous return
 - Decrease Cardiac Output
- Potential for
 - over distension
 - gas trapping
 - Increased shear stress

37





















Neuromuscular blockade

 potentially benefit patients with ARDS by reducing lung injury caused by patient-ventilator dys-synchrony and strong spontaneous respiratory effort.

The ACURASYS trial revealed that NMB improved 90-day mortality & increased ventilator free days

In contrast the ROSE trial revealed no significant endpoint difference.

Meta-analysis : NMB Patients were

- less physically active
- had increased cardiovascular events.
- reduced risk of barotrauma
- improved oxygenation
- without any worsening of ICU acquired weakness

Pressure v Volume Modes

• With NMJB

HAWKE'S BAY

- Volume Assist/Control or SIMV (vol) = CMV
- Pressure Assist/Control/BiPAP /APRV or SIMV (press) = PCV
 - Some Modes titrate pressure to compliance& resistance (ASV, PRVC)

If NMBA increases respiratory compliance

- addition of NMJB in volume mode may decrease alveolar pressures.
- addition of NMJB in Pressure controlled mode may decrease airway pressures for the same volume.
 - larger tidal volumes,
 - increasing alveolar distension.

NMBA with pressure ventilation has the potential for increased ventilator-associated lung injury through volutrauma.

Freebairn R "How relaxed should we be about ARDS". Crit Care Med. 2004 Jan;32 (1):296.











Recruitability?

Increased EELV may

- not be recruitment of previously nonaerated lung units,
- But further distension of previously open lung units.
- While EELV alone may not be sufficient to assess PEEP response, identifying recruited volume created by additional PEEP have more relevance. EELV combined with measurement of compliance may be useful
- Freebairn R, Mistry R, Park M. Positive End Expiratory Pressure. In: Freebairn R, Kulkarni A, editors. Evidence Based Core topics in Critical Care Medicine 2019. 1. New Delhi, India: JAYPEE BROTHERS MEDICAL PUBLISHERS; 2019. p. 303-10
- Chiumello, D., et al (2016). Lung recruitment assessed by respiratory mechanics and computed tomography in patients with acute respiratory distress syndrome: What is the relationship? *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine*, 193(11), 1254–1263.









HAWKE'S BAY District Reality Board				
P	V curv	e <mark>Recru</mark> i	itment	
24 Patie Adverse	ents , All with Events: Hypotension 7 Bradycardia 3 Pneumothora>	severe ARDS 7 6/ pneumomed 5 35 45 secor	iastinum 0 nd s)	
		, 55, 15, 5000	101 37	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Prior	1minute	5 minutes	30 minutes
Oxygen sat	Prior 88	1 minute 86	5 minutes	30 minutes 92
Oxygen sat MAP	Prior 88 70	1 minute 86 64	5 minutes 93 72	30 minutes 92 74
Oxygen sat MAP PEEP Change	Prior 88 70 0	1 minute 86 64 0	5 minutes 93 72 -2	30 minutes 92 74 -3
Oxygen sat MAP PEEP Change FiO2	Prior 88 70 0 0.6	1 minute 86 64 0 0.6	5 minutes 93 72 -2 0.55	30 minutes 92 74 -3 0.5



Patients s. Lower PEEP strategy Pes-guided 49 Higher PEEP without LRM 1,162 Higher PEEP with brief LRM 1,335 Higher PEEP with prolonged LRM 1,900 vs. Higher PEEP with brief LRM 0 Higher PEEP with brief LRM 0 Additional comparisons Higher PEEP with prolonged vs. brief LRM 0 es-guided vs. Higher PEEP with brief LRM 0	Trials 1 — 4 8 1 0 0 0 0		0.77 (0.48, 1.22) 0.77 (0.60, 0.96) 0.83 (0.67, 1.02) 1.06 (0.89, 1.22) 1.00 (0.65, 1.54) 1.07 (0.79, 1.48) 1.37 (1.04, 1.81)	-0.09 (-0.21, 0.09) -0.09 (-0.16, -0.01) -0.07 (-0.13, 0.01) 0.02 (-0.04, 0.09) 0.00 (-0.11, 0.16) 0.02 (-0.08, 0.12) 0.11 (0.01, 0.21)	RR < 1.0 0.87 0.99 0.96 0.23 0.50 0.32 0.01	RR > 1.0 0.13 0.01 0.04 0.77 0.50 0.68 0.99	ARR > 1% 0.84 0.98 0.94 0.15 0.44 0.25 0.01	Mod Hi Mod Lo Mod
vs. Lower PEEP strategy Pes-guided 49 Higher PEEP with brief LRM 1,162 Higher PEEP with brief LRM 1,335 Higher PEEP with prolonged LRM 1,900 vs. Higher PEEP with brief LRM 1,900 vs. Higher PEEP with brief LRM 0 Pes-guided 200 Higher PEEP with brief LRM 0 Perser PEEP with prolonged LRM 0 Pes-guided vs. Higher PEEP with brief LRM 0	1 — 4 8 1 0 0		0.77 (0.48, 1.22) 0.77 (0.60, 0.96) 0.83 (0.67, 1.02) 1.06 (0.89, 1.22) 1.00 (0.65, 1.54) 1.07 (0.79, 1.48) 1.37 (1.04, 1.81)	-0.09 (-0.21, 0.09) -0.09 (-0.16, -0.01) -0.07 (-0.13, 0.01) 0.02 (-0.04, 0.09) 0.00 (-0.11, 0.16) 0.02 (-0.08, 0.12) 0.11 (0.01, 0.21)	0.87 0.99 0.23 0.50 0.32 0.01	0.13 0.01 0.04 0.77 0.50 0.68 0.99	0.84 0.98 0.94 0.15 0.44 0.25 0.01	Mode Hi Mode Lo Mode Lo
Pes-guided 49 Higher PEEP with brief LRM 1,162 Higher PEEP with brief LRM 1,335 Higher PEEP with prolonged LRM 1,900 vs. Higher PEEP with brief LRM 1,900 vs. Higher PEEP with brief LRM 0 Pes-guided 0 Higher PEEP with prolonged LRM 0 Pes-guided vs. Higher PEEP with brief LRM 0	1 — 4 8 1 0 0		0.77 (0.48, 1.22) 0.77 (0.60, 0.96) 0.83 (0.67, 1.02) 1.06 (0.89, 1.22) 1.00 (0.65, 1.54) 1.07 (0.79, 1.48) 1.37 (1.04, 1.81)	-0.09 (-0.21, 0.09) -0.09 (-0.16, -0.01) -0.07 (-0.13, 0.01) 0.02 (-0.04, 0.09) 0.00 (-0.11, 0.16) 0.02 (-0.08, 0.12) 0.11 (0.01, 0.21)	0.87 0.99 0.23 0.50 0.32 0.01	0.13 0.01 0.04 0.77 0.50 0.68 0.99	0.84 0.98 0.94 0.15 0.44 0.25 0.01	Modi Hi Modi Lo Modi
Higher PEEP without LRM 1,162 Higher PEEP with brief LRM 1,335 Higher PEEP with prolonged LRM 1,900 <i>ss. Higher PEEP without LRM strategy</i> Pes-guided Pes-guided 200 Higher PEEP with brief LRM 0 Pes-guided vs. Higher PEEP with brief LRM 0 Pes-guided vs. Higher PEEP with brief LRM 0	4 4 8 1 0 0	+++	0.77 (0.60, 0.96) 0.83 (0.67, 1.02) 1.06 (0.89, 1.22) 1.00 (0.65, 1.54) 1.07 (0.79, 1.48) 1.37 (1.04, 1.81)	-0.09 (-0.16, -0.01) -0.07 (-0.13, 0.01) 0.02 (-0.04, 0.09) 0.00 (-0.11, 0.16) 0.02 (-0.08, 0.12) 0.11 (0.01, 0.21)	0.99 0.96 0.23 0.50 0.32 0.01	0.01 0.04 0.77 0.50 0.68 0.99	0.98 0.94 0.15 0.44 0.25 0.01	Hi Modi Lo Modi Lo
Higher PEEP with brief LRM 1,335 Higher PEEP with prolonged LRM 1,900 vs. Higher PEEP with brief LRM 200 Higher PEEP with brief LRM 0 Pees-guided 0 Additional comparisons 1 Higher PEEP with brief LRM 0 Pees-guided vs. Higher PEEP with brief LRM 0	4 8 1 0 0		0.83 (0.67, 1.02) 1.06 (0.89, 1.22) 1.00 (0.65, 1.54) 1.07 (0.79, 1.48) 1.37 (1.04, 1.81)	-0.07 (-0.13, 0.01) 0.02 (-0.04, 0.09) 0.00 (-0.11, 0.16) 0.02 (-0.08, 0.12) 0.11 (0.01, 0.21)	0.96 0.23 0.50 0.32 0.01	0.04 0.77 0.50 0.68 0.99	0.94 0.15 0.44 0.25 0.01	Mode Lo Mode Lo
Higher PEEP with prolonged LRM 1,900 vs. Higher PEEP without LRM strategy 200 Higher PEEP with brief LRM 0 Higher PEEP with brief LRM 0 Higher PEEP with prolonged LRM 0 Additional comparisons 1 Higher PEEP with prolonged vs. brief LRM 0 Pes-guided vs. Higher PEEP with brief LRM 0	8 1 0 0		1.06 (0.89, 1.22) 1.00 (0.65, 1.54) 1.07 (0.79, 1.48) 1.37 (1.04, 1.81)	0.02 (-0.04, 0.09) 0.00 (-0.11, 0.16) 0.02 (-0.08, 0.12) 0.11 (0.01, 0.21)	0.23 0.50 0.32 0.01	0.77 0.50 0.68 0.99	0.15 0.44 0.25 0.01	Lo Mode Lo Mode
st. Higher PEEP without LRM strategy Yes-guided 200 ligher PEEP with brief LRM 0 sigher PEEP with prolonged LRM 0 tdditional comparisons 1 ligher PEEP with prolonged vs. brief LRM 0 ves-guided vs. Higher PEEP with brief LRM 0	1 0 0		1.00 (0.65, 1.54) 1.07 (0.79, 1.48) 1.37 (1.04, 1.81)	0.00 (-0.11, 0.16) 0.02 (-0.08, 0.12) 0.11 (0.01, 0.21)	0.50 0.32 0.01	0.50 0.68 0.99	0.44 0.25 0.01	Modi Lo Modi
Yes-guided 200 igner PEEP with brief LRM 0 igner PEEP with prolonged LRM 0 tdditional comparisons 0 igner PEEP with prolonged vs. brief LRM 0 ves-guided vs. Higher PEEP with brief LRM 0	1 0 0		1.00 (0.65, 1.54) 1.07 (0.79, 1.48) 1.37 (1.04, 1.81)	0.00 (-0.11, 0.16) 0.02 (-0.08, 0.12) 0.11 (0.01, 0.21)	0.50 0.32 0.01	0.50 0.68 0.99	0.44 0.25 0.01	Modi Lo Modi
ligher PEEP with brief LRM 0 ligher PEEP with prolonged LRM 0 kdditional comparisons 0 ligher PEEP with prolonged vs. brief LRM 0 Pes-guided vs. Higher PEEP with brief LRM 0	0 0		- 1.07 (0.79, 1.48) - 1.37 (1.04, 1.81)	0.02 (-0.08, 0.12) 0.11 (0.01, 0.21)	0.32 0.01	0.68 0.99	0.25 0.01	Lo Mod
ligher PEEP with prolonged LRM 0 kdditional comparisons 0 ligher PEEP with prolonged vs. brief LRM 0 Pas-guided vs. Higher PEEP with brief LRM 0	0		L 1.37 (1.04, 1.81)	0.11 (0.01, 0.21)	0.01	0.99	0.01	Mode
Additional comparisons Higher PEEP with prolonged vs. brief LRM 0 Pes-guided vs. Higher PEEP with brief LRM 0	0							
Higher PEEP with prolonged vs. brief LRM 0 Pes-guided vs. Higher PEEP with brief LRM 0	0							
Pes-guided vs. Higher PEEP with brief LRM 0	٥	-	— 1.27 (0.97, 1.64)	0.09 (-0.01, 0.18)	0.04	0.96	0.03	Lo
De la la la pere la la la pere	v		- 0.93 (0.55, 1.54)	-0.02 (-0.16, 0.17)	0.61	0.39	0.57	Lo
es-guidea vs. Higher PEEP with prolonged LHM 0	0		0.73 (0.45, 1.19)	-0.11 (-0.25, 0.08)	0.90	0.10	0.88	Lo
	0.4	1.0	2.0					
	Favors treat	tment	avors comparator					
		_	\longrightarrow					
	Notwo	ork Riek Ratio	(95% Crl)					
	INELWO		(50/0 011)					

According to better gas exchange, enhance lung compliance and improve gas exchange, impact on patient outcomes is not well defined.















































- Low tidal volume, low pressure
- Open lung approach makes "sense"
 - Recruitment
 - High PEEP
- Minimize FiO₂
- Early prone ventilation in patients meeting criteria

Society	Recommendation	Strength of Recommendation	Evidence
	Mechanical ventilation with low tidal volumes and inspiratory pressures	Strong	Moderate
	Daily prone positioning >12 h	Strong	Moderate-hig
ATS/ESICM/SCCM	Avoid HFOV in patients with moderate or severe ARDS	Strong	Moderate-hig
	Mechanical ventilation with higher levels of PEEP for moderate or severe ARDS	Conditional	Moderate
	Recruitment maneuvers should be used	Conditional	Low-moderat
	Additional research needed to recommend use of ECMO in patients with ARDS	Not applicable	Not applicabl
	Mechanical ventilation with low tidal volumes (<6 mL/kg ideal body weight) and plateau pressure (<30 cm H ₂ O)	Strong	Moderate
	Daily prone positioning ≥12 h in patients with moderate/severe ARDS	Strong	Moderate
FICKUSC	Avoid HFOV	Strong	Moderate
FICM/ICS	Conservative fluid management	Weakly in favor	Low
	Mechanical ventilation with higher levels of PEEP in patients with moderate/severe ARDS	Weakly in favor	Low
	Neuromuscular blocking agents in patients with moderate/severe ARDS	Weakly in favor	Moderate
	Use of ECMO in patients with severe ARDS	Weakly in favor	Very low
	Abbreviations: ATS: American Thoracic Society; ESIC Society of Critical Care Medicine Clinical Practice G Intensive Care Society.	CM: European Society of Intensuideline; FICM: Faculty of Inte	sive Care Medicine; S ensive Care Medicine

