medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.01.20080556; this version posted July 3, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Is it safe to use a single ventilator for two or more patients?

Sebastián Ugarte Ubiergo MD[1,4], Felipe Castillo Merino PT[1,2] , Óscar Arellano-Pérez PT, MSc[1,2,3]

1 Adult Critical Patient Center, INDISA Clinic, Santiago, Chile.
2 Faculty of Physical Therapy, School de Kinesiology, Andrés Bello University, Santiago, Chile.
3 Faculty of Health Sciences, School de Kinesiology, Bernardo O'Higgins University, Santiago, Chile.
4 Faculty of Medicine, Andrés Bello University, Santiago, Chile.

Abstract

In the context of SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, the mechanical ventilation is essential. Given its limited availability due to high cost, increased by a global demand, sharing a single mechanical ventilator with 2 or more patients with has been advocated. We have designed an experimental model for ventilating 2 test lungs with a single equipment, in order to measure these possible asymmetries during ventilation in parallel circuits with different compliances. Quantitative results shown decreasing the distensibility of one of the test lungs resulted in smaller volume received than its counterpart in volume-controlled mode and pressure-controlled. By adding a restrictive element to one of them, we proved that volumes given to either test lungs are different, and that the maximum pressure increases in the volume-controlled mode. The volume difference is greater in pressure-controlled mode. This report attempts a first approach to the risks in ventilating 2 patients with single equipment, since there are differences in volumes which are not monitored by the ventilator, with the consequent risks of distension or alveolar collapse if used in real patients with different thoracopulmonary mechanics

Introduction

In the context of SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, health systems have faced an exponential increase in demands for beds, professionals and intensive care systems (1). For serious cases requiring hospitalization in intensive care units (ICUs) who suffer from severe respiratory failure, mechanical ventilation is essential. Given its limited availability due to high cost, increased by a global demand and based on experiences gathered from Italy and Spain (2), sharing a single mechanical ventilator with 2 or more patients with has been advocated (3).

Presently several Scientific Societies have released statements (2) warning about the potential dangers of this strategy; in their opinion, ventilators might not pass their initial automatic tube compensation, volumes delivered would go to lung segments with more compliance, PEEP could not be individualized, pressure and volume monitoring would be an average of both patients, and each patient's deterioration and/or recovery could occur with different timing, among several other limitations.

Ever since March 16th, Chile is within phase 4 of the pandemic (5); in this scenario we have designed an experimental model for ventilating 2 test lungs with a single equipment, in order to

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.01.20080556; this version posted July 3, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

measure these possible asymmetries during ventilation in parallel circuits with different compliances.

Method

Puritan Bennett 840 (Covidien llc, USA) mechanical ventilator was used, with two EasyLungTM test lungs (Imtmedical, Switzerland), each with a compliance of 25 ml/mbar and a maximum volume of 1000 ml, 2 respirometers (Wright Haloscale, Spire), 2 pressure gauges (VBM) and 2 Disposable Ventilator Breathing Circuit Corrugated Tube. External elastic bands were used on test lungs to increase elasticity. Ten measurements were made for each condition, first with 2 lungs without a restrictive component (CTL) and then with one with a restrictive component (ITL), in volume and pressure-controlled mode. Tidal volume, maximum pressure and minute volume were measured (Table 1).

Results

Automatic tube compensation (ATC) of the ventilator was performed to evaluate the pressurization and compliance of 2 parallel connected circuits. The test was successful.

Table 1 compares the results of the CTL and the ITL before and after the elastic band has been placed.

	AC/CV (Vt programmed 900 ml, Fr 20 bpm, PEEP 8 cmH2O)									
	Flow (l/min)				Vt exhaled (ml)		Pressure (cmH2O)			
	Pre test	(DS)	Post test	(DS)	Pre test	Post test	Pre test	(DS)	Post test	(DS)
Control Test Lung (CTL)	8540	±77,8	12902	±41,5	427	645,1	24	±0,5	47	±0,7
Interventional Test Lung (ITL)	9598	±78,9	4774	±409,7	478,4	238,7	24	±0,5	47	±1,2

	AC/CP (Pinsp. 20 cmH2O, Fr 20 bpm, PEEP 8 cmH2O)									
	Flow (l/min)				Vt exhaled (ml)		Pressure (cmH20)			
	Pre test	(DS)	Post test	(DS)	Pre test	Post test	Pre test	(DS)	Post test	(DS)
Control Test Lung (CTL)	10164	±5,5	10468	±494,1	508,2	523,4	28,4	±0,9	27,6	±0,5
Interventional Test Lung (ITL)	10562	±8,4	780	±50	528,1	39	28,6	±0,5	27,4	±0,5

Table 1

Decreasing the distensibility of one of the test lungs (under equal basal conditions) resulted in smaller volume received than its counterpart in volume-controlled mode ($p < 0{,}0001$) and pressure-controlled mode ($p < 0{,}0001$), being this difference greater in pressure-controlled mode (Figure 1). System pressure increased in both circuits in volume-controlled mode. The difference in maximum pressure between test lungs was not significant in both VC ($p > 0.9999$) and PC (p: 0.1679)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.07.01.20080556; this version posted July 3, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 1

Conclusions

The ventilator succeeded in automatic tube compensation with two parallel circuits. Tidal volumes, pressures and flows were initially similar in both modes. By adding a restrictive element to one of them, we proved that volumes given to either test lungs are different, and that the maximum pressure increases in the volume-controlled mode. The volume difference is greater in pressure-controlled mode. This report attempts a first approach to the risks in ventilating 2 patients with single equipment, since there are differences in volumes which are not monitored by the ventilator, with the consequent risks of distension or alveolar collapse if used in real patients with different thoracopulmonary mechanics (2).

References:

1.- Kallet R, Robinson L. Resources. SARS CoV-2, Guidance Document. AARC. https://www.aarc.org/resources/. Accessed April 2, 2020.

2.- SCCM: Consensus Statement on Multiple Patients Per Ventilator. Society of Critical Care Medicine (SCCM). http://www.sccm.org/Disaster/Joint-Statement-on-Multiple-Patients-Per-Ventilato. Published March 26, 2020. Accessed April 2, 2020.

3.- University of Vermont. PulmCrit - Splitting ventilators to provide titrated support to a large group of patients. EMCrit Project. https://emcrit.org/pulmcrit/split-ventilators/. Published March 29, 2020. Accessed April 2, 2020.

4.- COVID-19 en España: la presión en las UCI, principal reto en un contexto de posible cambio de tendencia en los contagios. Medscape. https://espanol.medscape.com/verarticulo/5905228. Published March 30, 2020. Accessed April 2, 2020.

5.- Coronavirus en Chile pasa a fase 4 y Presidente anuncia cierre de fronteras. Ministerio de Salud – Gobierno de Chile. https://www.minsal.cl/coronavirus-en-chile-pasa-a-fase-4-y-presidente-anuncia-cierre-de-fronteras/. Published March 16, 2020. Accessed April 2, 2020.