

Venovenous Extracorporeal CO₂ removal to support ultraprotective ventilation in moderate-severe ARDS: A systematic review and meta-analysis of the literature

Authors

Elliott Worku^{1,2}, Daniel Brodie^{3,4}, Ryan Ruiyang Ling⁵ (ORCID: 0000-0002-8335-7640), Kollengode Ramanathan^{5,6}, Alain Combes^{7,8}, Kiran Shekar^{1,2,9,10}

Affiliations

¹Adult Intensive Care Services, the Prince Charles Hospital, Metro North Hospital and Health Service, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia

² University of Queensland, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia

³Department of Medicine, Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons, New York, USA.

⁴Center for Acute Respiratory Failure, New York-Presbyterian Hospital, New York, USA.


⁵Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine, National University of Singapore

⁶Cardiothoracic Intensive Care Unit, National University Heart Centre, National University Hospital, Singapore

⁷Sorbonne Université, Institute of Cardiometabolism and Nutrition, Paris, France¹⁰Critical Care Research Group and Centre of Research Excellence for Advanced Cardio-respiratory Therapies Improving OrgaN Support (ACTIONS)

Corresponding author

Elliott T Worku

 [0000-0002-1824-9870](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1824-9870) ✓
etworku@gmail.com

Abstract

Background

A strategy that limits tidal volumes and inspiratory pressures, improves outcomes in patients with the acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS). Extracorporeal carbon dioxide removal (ECCO₂R) may facilitate ultra-protective ventilation . We conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis to evaluate the efficacy and safety of venovenous ECCO₂R in supporting ultra-protective ventilation in moderate-to-severe ARDS.

Methods: MEDLINE and EMBASE were interrogated for studies (2000-2021) reporting venovenous ECCO₂R use in patients with moderate-to-severe ARDS. Studies reporting ≥ 10 adult patients in English language journals were included. Ventilatory parameters after 24 hours of initiating ECCO₂R, device characteristics, and safety outcomes were collected. The primary outcome measure was the change in driving pressure at 24 hours of ECCO₂R therapy in relation to baseline. Secondary outcomes included change in tidal volume, gas exchange, and safety data.

Results: Ten studies reporting 421 patients (PaO₂:FiO₂ 141.03mmHg) were included. Extracorporeal blood flow rates ranged from 0.35-1.5 L/min. Random effects modelling indicated a 3.56 cmH₂O reduction (95%-CI: 3.22-3.91) in driving pressure from baseline (p<0.001) and a 1.89 ml/kg (95%-CI: 1.75-2.02, p<0.001) reduction in tidal volume. Oxygenation, respiratory rate and PEEP remained unchanged. No significant interactions between driving pressure reduction and baseline driving pressure, partial pressure of arterial carbon dioxide or PaO₂:FiO₂ ratio were identified in metaregression analysis. Bleeding and haemolysis were the commonest complications of therapy.

Conclusions: Venovenous ECCO₂R permitted significant reductions in ΔP in patients with moderate-to-severe ARDS. Heterogeneity amongst studies and devices, a paucity of randomised controlled trials, and variable safety reporting calls for standardisation of outcome reporting. Prospective evaluation of optimal device operation and anticoagulation in high quality studies is required before further recommendations can be made.

Key words: acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS); extracorporeal carbon dioxide removal (ECCO₂R); extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO); ultra-protective lung ventilation (UPV); ventilator-induced lung injury (VILI); driving pressure (ΔP)

Key Messages

What is the Key Question?

- In adult patients with moderate-to-severe acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS), can venovenous extracorporeal carbon dioxide removal (ECCO₂R) support ultraprotective lung ventilation beyond the current standard for protective ventilation in ARDS?

What is the bottom line?

- Systematic review of available data on venovenous ECCO₂R shows that it can reduce driving pressure in ventilated patients with moderate-to-severe ARDS, supporting ultraprotective ventilation. Prospective measurement of mechanical power, and greater emphasis on safety and patient-centred outcomes is needed.

Why read on?

- This is the first systematic review to exclusively address venovenous ECCO₂R use in the moderate-to-severe ARDS cohort. We report the degree of lung protection achieved with venovenous ECCO₂R devices, along with factors potentially limiting widespread adoption.

Introduction

Acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) accounts for 10% of all intensive care unit (ICU) admissions, yet remains underappreciated by clinicians.¹ Ventilator-induced lung injury (VILI) potentiates multiorgan dysfunction² and mediates poor outcomes in ARDS. Limiting tidal volumes and airway pressures in patients with ARDS, demonstrated a survival benefit in the seminal ARDS Network trial,³ with potentially protective effects when preemptively applied.⁴ To better protect patients with ARDS, there has been growing interest in ultraprotective ventilation, historically defined by more emphatic reductions in tidal volume compared with standard lung protective ventilation. More recently, driving pressure, the quotient of tidal volume divided by static respiratory system compliance (V_t/Crs)⁵ has been shown to independently predict mortality in secondary analyses of ARDS trials.^{5-7,8,9} Mechanical power further incorporates static and dynamic¹⁰ determinants of stress and strain (including respiratory frequency) thus providing what may be a more complete evaluation of the injurious potential of ventilation practices.^{11,12} Ultra-protective ventilation is an attractive strategy to mitigate ARDS progression, and is feasible without extracorporeal support; accepting however the risk of severe hypercapnic acidosis, and compensatory increases in respiratory rate which effectively abolish reductions in mechanical power that may be expected from lowered driving pressures.¹³ Furthermore, unchecked hypercapnia may be deleterious through altered alveolar fluid clearance,¹⁴ conflicting effects on immune function,¹⁵ and unfavourable increases in pulmonary vascular afterload and right ventricular dysfunction.¹⁶

Extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO), and extracorporeal CO₂ removal (ECCO₂R) both offer carbon dioxide removal, yet the extent of support provided differs (see supplement). Early iterations of ECCO₂R employed arteriovenous cannulation, however modern venovenous devices typically utilise centrifugal pumps, and in contrast to ECMO, may be performed with smaller, single site access.^{17,18} As the intention of ECMO is typically oxygenation, a large proportion of native cardiac output should be ‘captured’ by the membrane lung¹⁹ in order to support significant reductions in mechanical power^{20,21} (typically $\geq 3l \cdot \text{min}^{-1}$),²² but the relative solubility of carbon dioxide permits very low blood flows (e.g $< 500 \text{ml} \cdot \text{min}^{-1}$) to provide meaningful clearance.^{17,23,24} The extent to which ECCO₂R may facilitate ultra-protective ventilation is contingent on the interplay between the

subject's metabolism, native lung gas exchange, membrane lung efficiency, sweep gas flow rate, and extracorporeal blood flow rate.^{25 26}

Uptake and experience with venovenous ECCO₂R in ARDS is limited²⁷, largely due to safety concerns and unclear efficacy.²⁸ We undertook a systematic review and meta-analysis of venovenous ECCO₂R studies in moderate-to-severe ARDS; to evaluate the evidence for efficacy with respect to supporting ultra-protective ventilation as well as the occurrence of complications.

Methods

This systematic review was conducted and reported in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statement.²⁹ The protocol was registered in the PROSPERO database (CRD42020166051); the initial registration accounted for a systematic review only, but was subsequently modified (by consensus amongst authors) in line with emerging definitions of ultraprotective ventilation, and with the publication of major studies in this area permitting a meta-analysis to be performed.

Search Strategy and study selection

We interrogated MEDLINE and EMBASE databases for articles from the 1st January, 2000, until 1st September, 2021, using Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) terms and keywords (supplement), adapted from a recent review.³⁰ This epoch was justified by the scarcity of pre-2000 evidence, and the advances in general ICU care and extracorporeal support in the last 20 years. A similar time period was selected in a recent meta-analysis pertaining to the use of ECMO.³¹ Citations were screened at the title and abstract level; those of relevance were reviewed in detail. Reference lists were explored, and periodic review of the search was performed. Articles in English reporting on the use of venovenous ECCO₂R with blood flow rate (BFR) <2.0L.min⁻¹ for at least 24 hours in ≥10 mechanically ventilated adult patients with baseline partial pressure of arterial oxygen to fraction of inspired oxygen (PaO₂:FiO₂) ratio ≤200 mmHg were considered; American-European Consensus Conference (AECC),³² and Berlin³³ definitions for ARDS were accepted. Abstracts or poster citations, pre-clinical, animal, paediatric and review articles were excluded. Studies utilising pumpless arterial

ECCO₂R devices were also excluded. Authors were contacted for additional clarification where necessary, the absence of which led to study exclusion (figure 1).

Assessment of methodological quality

Study quality was assessed using the appropriate Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) critical appraisal checklists. The certainty of evidence was rated using the Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development, and Evaluations (GRADE) approach.

Outcomes of interest and data collection

The aim of this review was to characterise the evolution of ventilatory and physiological variables, as well as complication rates. The main outcome measure was the change in driving pressure (ΔP) with respect to baseline values; and secondarily the tidal volume (V_t), plateau airway pressure (P_{plat}), respiratory rate (RR) and positive end-expiratory pressure (PEEP) after 24 hours of venovenous ECCO₂R therapy. The 24 hour interval was consistently reported across included studies, and chosen as biphasic elimination of CO₂ under ECCO₂R has previously been described.³⁴⁻³⁷ Rapid initial clearance is due to removal of the dissolved component, with steady state carbon dioxide removal achieved at approximately 24 hours,³⁴ reflecting elimination of stored CO₂. Data pertaining to study design, patient demographics, and outcome data was extracted to populate tables, designed *a priori* (see supplement). For three studies, graphical data were abstracted using WebPlotDigitiser V4.2.³⁸ Data from each study at baseline, and following 24 hours of ECCO₂R has been summarised in table 3. The mean and standard deviation (SD) were estimated from the median (interquartile range, IQR), as appropriate. In the absence of marked skewness (i.e. the median was approximately midway in the IQR) the mean was estimated as the median and the SD was estimated as $IQR/1.35$.³⁹

Data synthesis

The primary meta-analysis consisted of pooling the change in ventilatory parameters, while accounting for a pre- and post-intervention correlation by assuming a correlation coefficient (r) of 0.5. We carried out random effects meta-analysis (DerSimonian and Laird, Table 4) based on the

Freeman-Tukey double arcsine transformation, and computed the 95% confidence intervals (CIs) using the Clopper-Pearson method.⁴⁰⁻⁴² Sensitivity analyses were conducted by simulating different values of r , including 0, 0.25, 0.75 and 0.9. A second sensitivity analysis was conducted by excluding studies with relatively higher risks of bias (defined *a priori* as JBI score <8). As interstudy heterogeneity among observational studies can be misleadingly overestimated when using I^2 statistics, we used the GRADE approach to assess the interstudy variability⁴³. Meta-regression analyses were conducted if a minimum of 6 data points could be collected, in accordance with previous meta-analyses,⁴³ to explore potentially prognostically relevant study-level covariates and possible sources of heterogeneity (supplement), for example the influence of baseline driving pressure on the primary outcome under ECCO₂R. Statistical analyses were performed on R3.6.2.

Results

Of 534 citations identified, 346 were reviewed at the abstract level, and 23 as full texts. In total, ten studies, reporting 421 patients, were identified spanning October 2009⁴⁴ through August 2021⁴⁵ (PRISMA figure – supplement). There were 2 prospective pilot studies, 4 prospective observational cohort studies, 1 retrospective chart review, 1 prospective multicentre international phase 2 study, 1 quasi-experimental prospective observational cohort study, and 1 randomised controlled trial (RCT) (table 1). Baseline patient demographics were broadly homogenous (table 1, and supplement) with a preponderance of men (68.4%), and mean age 62.2 years. Baseline PaO₂:FiO₂ ratios ranged from 83-173mmHg; two studies^{46 47} included mixed indications for ECCO₂R therapy (e.g. acute hypercapnic exacerbations of chronic obstructive disease), but ARDS specific data was able to be extracted. In one study, mean Vt at inclusion was slightly above the average at 6.9ml/Kg PBW and was reduced more modestly to <6ml/Kg⁴⁸, with the primary intent of maintaining PaCO₂ (Table 2). All studies reported pumped venovenous devices, predominantly coupled with double-lumen catheters inserted into the internal jugular vein. Venous access generally ranged from 13Fr-15Fr in size, with larger 24Fr catheters coupled with higher blood flow rates in one trial⁴⁹. Mean extracorporeal blood flows ranged from 350 ml.min⁻¹ to a maximum of 970 ml.min⁻¹ (supplement). Further appraisal of

commercially available ECCO₂R devices, qualities and operational characteristics is provided in the supplement.

The results of the meta-analysis assuming an r-value of 0.5 are presented here; the results of the other analyses with different r-values can be found in table (4). With random effects modelling, the pooled reduction in ΔP was 3.56 cmH₂O (95%CI: -3.91 to -3.22, table 4, low certainty). The pooled estimates for the remaining variables, revealed a reduction in V_t of -1.79ml/Kg (95%CI: -1.89 to -1.69) and a correspondent change in P_{plat} of -3.09 cmH₂O (95%CI: -3.55 to -2.62). Under ECCO₂R, the PaO₂:FiO₂ ratio was slightly reduced by 4.1mmHg (95%CI: -7.45 to -0.76), while PEEP was increased by 0.97cmH₂O (95%CI: 0.74-1.20). Forest plots for ΔP and V_t can be found in figures 4 and 5. Confidence intervals for all remaining variables were nonsignificant and crossed zero; the corresponding forest plots are presented in the supplement. JBI appraisal of the included studies found all studies to be of high quality (JBI score ≥ 8), precluding any sensitivity analysis based on the risk of bias (table 3a). Meta-regression analysis found that increasing age was associated with smaller reductions in ΔP (regression coefficient: 0.13, 95%CI: 0.02 to 0.24, p=0.020), but there were no other significant interactions between demographics, baseline ΔP , PaCO₂, and PaO₂:FiO₂ ratio on the primary outcome of ECCO₂R-facilitated reductions in ΔP (see supplement). The overall pooled 28-day mortality in the cohort was 41.6% (95%CI 30.0%-53.5%) (supplement).

Complications

The mechanical, and patient-related complications of venovenous ECCO₂R are summarised in Table 4, with expansion in the supplementary materials. Importantly, not all studies documented all complications. Anticoagulation strategies varied, with 4 studies utilising activated partial thromboplastin time/ratio, 2 studies recording activated clotting time, and 3 adjusting to anti-factor Xa levels; in the most recent study, the intensity of anticoagulation was not reported. Bleeding rates where reported, ranged 10-50% (5/10 studies), with *clinically significant* bleeding rates - variably defined by transfusion requirement and validated tools (see table 4) - between 6 and 50%. Intracranial haemorrhage was reported in 5 studies^{45-47 49 50} at a rate of between 1 and 5%;

Mechanical complications included catheter dislodgement, kinking or thrombosis ranging 4-40% (6/10 studies), with 2 trials reporting catheter-related infections, n=3.^{46 49} Circuit thrombosis was documented in 7 studies ranging from 14-30%, leading to circuit changes in up to 6% of cases in one series. Air was noted in 2 extracorporeal circuits in one study,⁴⁶ without clinically apparent air embolism.

Discussion

To our knowledge, this is the first systematic review evaluating venovenous ECCO₂R in moderate-to-severe ARDS. Two contemporary systematic reviews assessed mixed cohorts of both chronic obstructive pulmonary disease and ARDS patients,³⁰ or included pumpless arteriovenous devices;⁵¹ neither evaluated the larger venovenous ECCO₂R study published by Combes et al⁴⁹ or the recently published “pRotective veEtilation with venovenouS lung assisT in respiratory failure (REST)” trial⁴⁵. Our main finding was a significant 3.56cmH₂O reduction in driving pressure at 24 hours. Ventilatory parameters under ECCO₂R largely conformed with ultra-protective ventilation targets from a mechanical perspective (driving and plateau pressures)⁵². Plateau pressure was ≥ 25 cmH₂O in all 10 cohorts at the outset, and was reduced significantly at 24 hours with reported values ≤ 25 cmH₂O in 7 studies. Driving pressure was >14 cmH₂O in just two of the seven studies reporting ΔP at baseline. While it was reduced to <10 cmH₂O in 5 studies, and below 14cmH₂O in all reporting studies, tidal volume remained slightly above 4ml/Kg in the majority (table 2). This suggests that studies reported patients with relatively preserved respiratory compliance, in whom ECCO₂R may not be maximally efficacious.^{53 54}

Whether progressive reductions in driving pressure below conventionally accepted limits of ultraprotective targets can further improve patient centred outcomes compared with standard low-volume, low-pressure ventilation strategies^{6 7 21 55 56} is not entirely clear. A recent large RCT comparing conventional low tidal volumes with ECCO₂R-enabled ultraprotective ventilation found no difference in 28-day mortality, a longer duration of mechanical ventilation and ICU length of stay (LOS) and a 31% rate of serious adverse events in the intervention group⁴⁵. Patients with moderate-to-severe ARDS are a heterogenous cohort with emerging clinical sub-phenotypes,^{57 58} thus the absence

of mortality benefit in two recent RCTs is unsurprising.^{45 59} Our analysis showed a pooled 28-day mortality was 41.6% (95%CI: 30.0%-53.5%), which is similar to that reported in a large meta-analysis of mechanically ventilated ARDS patients of comparable severity.⁹ The lack of prospective comparison limits inferences, but the similar mortality rates, may indicate an inability of ECCO₂R to meaningfully attenuate mechanical power, perhaps through underappreciated influences of respiratory frequency and PEEP.^{10 55 60}

Reductions in ventilatory frequency may represent a key target in limiting VILI. Expert opinion suggests that ECCO₂R ultra-protective ventilation should be used to effect a respiratory rate <25 breaths per minute⁵². Greater reductions in ventilator frequency may have been demonstrated if investigators had specifically targeted greater this, had been more permissive of hypercapnia, or if the devices that were used could either achieve higher blood flow rates or greater CO₂ removal efficiency. The median pH was >7.3 in nine of ten studies at 24hrs (table 2), however it is pertinent that the median PaCO₂ at 24hrs remained ≥50mmHg in 7 of the nine included studies, and greater than 55mmHg in one (pH 7.29). The absolute degree of hypercapnia tolerated must not only consider in terms of acid-base, but also right ventricular performance.⁵⁰ Interestingly, reductions in plateau pressure after ECCO₂R initiation, rather than change in PaCO₂ were best correlated with improvements in right ventricular afterload.⁵⁰ Baseline PaCO₂ (a surrogate for the underlying dead space fraction) has previously been suggested to predict patients in whom ECCO₂R could be most efficacious,^{53 54} however this was not evident in the current metaregression analysis, nor was an interaction with severity of ARDS by oxygenation. As lower flow ECCO₂R devices only permit partial correction of PaCO₂, sedation and neuromuscular blocking agents may be needed to play a role in modulating patients' respiratory drive and ventilator asynchronies.⁶¹⁻⁶³

Prone positioning (PP) may be synergistic with ECCO₂R, through enhanced reductions in driving pressure,^{53 54 64} CO₂ elimination^{65 66}, and right ventricular unloading⁶⁷. While prone positioning was infrequently employed in the reported ECCO₂R studies (n=22), it was undertaken, when used, without serious incident (table 1).

A trend towards lower thrombosis and bleeding rates was seen in more recent studies, corroborating existing insights.⁵¹ Two studies from 2016, and 2017 described 46.7% and 50% bleeding rates respectively, while the five papers from 2018-2021 recorded 10-24.3% bleeding rates. Anti-Xa-guided anticoagulation may offer favourable bleeding profiles,⁶⁸ however, this could not be statistically evaluated here and definitions of bleeding were not standardised. Higher blood flow rate devices were associated with reduced haemorrhage and haemolysis (21% vs 6%, $p=0.045$)⁴⁶ and (27% vs 6%, $p=0.01$) respectively in SUPERNOVA,⁶⁹ and the same inverse relationship - bleeding: (30% vs 6%, $p=0.04$), and haemolysis: (28% vs 0% , $p=0.03$)^{46 49} were documented by Augy et al.⁴⁶ Rotary pumps may exert increased blood trauma at lower blood flows (particularly $<1\text{L}\cdot\text{min}^{-1}$),⁷⁰⁻⁷² causing shear stress and loss of high molecular weight von Willebrand factor multimers.⁷³⁻⁷⁶ Mean blood flow rates may not only influence hematologic complications, but also the degree of lung protection achievable;^{25 26} unfortunately several studies utilised a variety of devices and different blood flow rates, such that metaregression analysis was not appropriate. While anticoagulation management is extrapolated from the ECMO experience, perhaps personalised approaches based on device and patient characteristics, even including regional methods of anticoagulation⁷⁷ may enhance ECCO₂R safety.^{51 78}

Strength and limitations

Strengths of this review include the comprehensive search, broad criteria including available RCT data, and relevant exclusion criteria. Rigorous quality assessment was performed, deeming studies of high quality and suitable for inclusion. Furthermore, we limited the inclusion of studies to moderate-to-severe ARDS which was undertaken in order to homogenise the study population, and meta-regression analyses were specifically performed to interrogate whether ECCO₂R efficacy was influenced with respect to baseline PaCO₂, as a surrogate of dead space fraction,^{53 54 66} although no such relationship was identified. Where possible, duplication of data was avoided, however 4 patients were concurrently enrolled in more than one of the reported studies; a lack of patient-level data precluded their identification and removal.

We nonetheless recognise several limitations of our review. Only 10 studies qualified for analysis, of which, just one was an RCT. Over 75% of the patient data was contributed by just 3 studies, with the largest study responsible for nearly half. In the aforementioned study, 50 centres were involved, thus enrolment may have been as low as 4 patients per centre. The other two manuscripts were from highly experienced ECMO centres, which may have influenced their low mortality rates (supplement). A volume-outcome effect⁷⁸ cannot be discounted. In addition, given that these studies were mostly observational, the effect estimates are open to confounding factors, particularly in the absence of propensity-score or risk-adjustment methods. Some of these include the ventilatory mode employed, right ventricular function, and other adjuvant therapies (e.g proning), with variability potentially accounting for some of the heterogeneity in observed mortality rates (15-47%). The meta-regression analysis is limited by a small sample size (6 studies minimum), and open to Type II errors.

Further dividing the moderate-to-severe ARDS category into patients with a PaO₂/FiO₂ ratio above and below 150mmHg,^{79 80} or even more directly, by dead space fraction and compliance,^{53 54 81} may enhance selection. Aside from survival, there is glaring need to prospectively investigate cost effectiveness of therapy,⁸² and other patient-centred outcomes such as length of hospital stay, delirium, return to pre-morbid function and long-term outcomes, which were inconsistently reported if at all. A suite of therapies combining ECCO₂R of adequate intensity with prone ventilation (to perhaps enhance both lung and right ventricular protection)^{66 67 83}, early spontaneous breathing⁸⁴ and mobilisation may be required to effect a meaningful survival benefit. Even in light of recent evidence, the question of whether venovenous ECCO₂R has the power to impact mortality in the moderate-to-severe ARDS cohort still remains.

Conclusion

Venovenous ECCO₂R supported significant reductions in driving pressure at 24 hours in moderate-to-severe ARDS, with an overall mortality of 41.6%. While early ECCO₂R may facilitate ultra-protective ventilation and mitigate ARDS progression, the benefits are currently offset by the

invasiveness of therapy, and limited CO₂ removal made possible at low blood flow rates. Significant reductions in respiratory rate, and hence further reductions in mechanical power may not be feasible when using very low blood flow rates, potentially limiting the utility of ECCO₂R in patients with more severe forms of ARDS, or right ventricular dysfunction. Enrichment of study populations, and reporting data consistently to minimum standards, is critical to meaningfully researching benefits of ECCO₂R therapy in ARDS.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Dr Dominic Worku (St George's Hospital NHS trust, London) for his contribution with the literature review, Dr. Chuen Seng Tan (Saw Swee Hock School of Public Health, National University of Singapore) for the assistance with the final statistical analysis, and Dr. Karen Hay for her efforts in preliminary statistical analyses. Dr Shekar acknowledges research support from Metro North Hospital and Health Service.

Contributors

EW and KS conceived the study and protocol for the systematic review. EW produced the original draft and coordinated the writing process. EW performed the data collection. RRL conducted the statistical analysis and was assisted by Dr Karen Hay (QIMR Berghorfer) and Dr Chuen Seng Tan . All authors contributed to the interpretation of the results. DB, KR, and RRL contributed significantly to the editing process. AC provided critical commentary and insights to the ongoing revisions, and all authors approved the final manuscript.

Funding

Not applicable

Competing interests/Disclosures

DB reports receiving research support from ALung Technologies. He has been on the medical advisory boards for Baxter, Abiomed, Xenios and Hemovent. DB is also Chair of the Executive

Committee of the International ECMO Network (ECMONet) and on the Board of Directors of the Extracorporeal Life Support Organization (ELSO). AC reports receiving grants and personal fees from Maquet, Xenios and Baxter and serving as a member of the executive and scientific committees for ECMONet and as the recent past president of the EuroELSO organization. KS is a member of the ECMONet scientific committee, the Asia-Pacific ELSO educational committee, and Australia and New Zealand's Intensive Care Society COVID-19 working group; he is also the lead of an ECMOed research working group.

Data sharing statement

The search strategy and further data analysis is available in the supplementary materials

References

1. Bellani G, Laffey JG, Pham T, et al. Epidemiology, Patterns of Care, and Mortality for Patients With Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome in Intensive Care Units in 50 Countries. *JAMA* 2016;315(8):788-800. doi: 10.1001/jama.2016.0291 [published Online First: 2016/02/24]
2. Stapleton RD, Wang BM, Hudson LD, et al. Causes and timing of death in patients with ARDS. *Chest* 2005;128(2):525-32. doi: 10.1378/chest.128.2.525 [published Online First: 2005/08/16]
3. Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome N, Brower RG, Matthay MA, et al. Ventilation with lower tidal volumes as compared with traditional tidal volumes for acute lung injury and the acute respiratory distress syndrome. *N Engl J Med* 2000;342(18):1301-8. doi: 10.1056/NEJM200005043421801 [published Online First: 2000/05/04]
4. Sutherasan Y, Vargas M, Pelosi P. Protective mechanical ventilation in the non-injured lung: review and meta-analysis. *Crit Care* 2014;18(2):211. doi: 10.1186/cc13778 [published Online First: 2014/04/26]
5. Amato MB, Meade MO, Slutsky AS, et al. Driving pressure and survival in the acute respiratory distress syndrome. *N Engl J Med* 2015;372(8):747-55. doi: 10.1056/NEJMsa1410639 [published Online First: 2015/02/19]
6. Bugeo G, Retamal J, Bruhn A. Driving pressure: a marker of severity, a safety limit, or a goal for mechanical ventilation? *Crit Care* 2017;21(1):199. doi: 10.1186/s13054-017-1779-x [published Online First: 2017/08/05]
7. Serpa Neto A, Schmidt M, Azevedo LC, et al. Associations between ventilator settings during extracorporeal membrane oxygenation for refractory hypoxemia and outcome in patients with acute respiratory distress syndrome: a pooled individual patient data analysis : Mechanical ventilation during ECMO. *Intensive Care Med* 2016;42(11):1672-84. doi: 10.1007/s00134-016-4507-0 [published Online First: 2016/10/21]
8. Parhar KKS, Zjadewicz K, Soo A, et al. Epidemiology, Mechanical Power, and 3-Year Outcomes in Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome Patients Using Standardized Screening. An Observational Cohort Study. *Ann Am Thorac Soc* 2019;16(10):1263-72. doi: 10.1513/AnnalsATS.201812-910OC [published Online First: 2019/06/28]
9. Aoyama H, Petteuzzo T, Aoyama K, et al. Association of Driving Pressure With Mortality Among Ventilated Patients With Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Crit Care Med* 2018;46(2):300-06. doi: 10.1097/CCM.0000000000002838 [published Online First: 2017/11/15]
10. Gattinoni L, Tonetti T, Cressoni M, et al. Ventilator-related causes of lung injury: the mechanical power. *Intensive Care Med* 2016;42(10):1567-75. doi: 10.1007/s00134-016-4505-2 [published Online First: 2016/09/14]
11. Marini JJ, Jaber S. Dynamic predictors of VILI risk: beyond the driving pressure. *Intensive Care Med* 2016;42(10):1597-600. doi: 10.1007/s00134-016-4534-x [published Online First: 2016/09/18]
12. Protti A, Maraffi T, Milesi M, et al. Role of Strain Rate in the Pathogenesis of Ventilator-Induced Lung Edema. *Crit Care Med* 2016;44(9):e838-45. doi: 10.1097/CCM.0000000000001718 [published Online First: 2016/04/08]
13. Richard JC, Marque S, Gros A, et al. Feasibility and safety of ultra-low tidal volume ventilation without extracorporeal circulation in moderately severe and severe ARDS patients. *Intensive Care Med* 2019;45(11):1590-98. doi: 10.1007/s00134-019-05776-x [published Online First: 2019/09/25]
14. Vadasz I, Hubmayr RD, Nin N, et al. Hypercapnia: a nonpermissive environment for the lung. *Am J Respir Cell Mol Biol* 2012;46(4):417-21. doi: 10.1165/rmb.2011-0395PS [published Online First: 2012/01/17]
15. Curley G, Contreras MM, Nichol AD, et al. Hypercapnia and acidosis in sepsis: a double-edged sword? *Anesthesiology* 2010;112(2):462-72. doi: 10.1097/ALN.0b013e3181ca361f [published Online First: 2010/01/14]

16. Mekontso Dessap A, Boissier F, Charron C, et al. Acute cor pulmonale during protective ventilation for acute respiratory distress syndrome: prevalence, predictors, and clinical impact. *Intensive Care Med* 2016;42(5):862-70. doi: 10.1007/s00134-015-4141-2 [published Online First: 2015/12/10]
17. Cove ME, MacLaren G, Federspiel WJ, et al. Bench to bedside review: Extracorporeal carbon dioxide removal, past present and future. *Crit Care* 2012;16(5):232. doi: 10.1186/cc11356 [published Online First: 2012/09/28]
18. Abrams D, Bacchetta M, Brodie D. When the momentum has gone: what will be the role of extracorporeal lung support in the future? *Curr Opin Crit Care* 2018;24(1):23-28. doi: 10.1097/MCC.0000000000000475 [published Online First: 2017/11/16]
19. Schmidt P, Ritscher L, Dong EN, et al. Identification of determinants required for agonistic and inverse agonistic ligand properties at the ADP receptor P2Y12. *Mol Pharmacol* 2013;83(1):256-66. doi: 10.1124/mol.112.082198 [published Online First: 2012/10/25]
20. Combes A, Hajage D, Capellier G, et al. Extracorporeal Membrane Oxygenation for Severe Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome. *N Engl J Med* 2018;378(21):1965-75. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1800385 [published Online First: 2018/05/24]
21. Araos J, Alegria L, Garcia P, et al. Near-Apneic Ventilation Decreases Lung Injury and Fibroproliferation in an Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome Model with Extracorporeal Membrane Oxygenation. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2019;199(5):603-12. doi: 10.1164/rccm.201805-0869OC [published Online First: 2018/09/15]
22. Ficial B, Vasques F, Zhang J, et al. Physiological Basis of Extracorporeal Membrane Oxygenation and Extracorporeal Carbon Dioxide Removal in Respiratory Failure. *Membranes (Basel)* 2021;11(3) doi: 10.3390/membranes11030225 [published Online First: 2021/04/04]
23. Gattinoni L, Carlesso E, Langer T. Clinical review: Extracorporeal membrane oxygenation. *Crit Care* 2011;15(6):243. doi: 10.1186/cc10490 [published Online First: 2011/12/23]
24. Schmidt M, Tachon G, Devilliers C, et al. Blood oxygenation and decarboxylation determinants during venovenous ECMO for respiratory failure in adults. *Intensive Care Med* 2013;39(5):838-46. doi: 10.1007/s00134-012-2785-8 [published Online First: 2013/01/08]
25. Karagiannidis C, Strassmann S, Brodie D, et al. Impact of membrane lung surface area and blood flow on extracorporeal CO2 removal during severe respiratory acidosis. *Intensive Care Med Exp* 2017;5(1):34. doi: 10.1186/s40635-017-0147-0 [published Online First: 2017/08/03]
26. Strassmann S, Merten M, Schafer S, et al. Impact of sweep gas flow on extracorporeal CO2 removal (ECCO2R). *Intensive Care Med Exp* 2019;7(1):17. doi: 10.1186/s40635-019-0244-3 [published Online First: 2019/03/27]
27. Deniau B, Ricard JD, Messika J, et al. Use of extracorporeal carbon dioxide removal (ECCO2R) in 239 intensive care units: results from a French national survey. *Intensive Care Med* 2016;42(4):624-25. doi: 10.1007/s00134-016-4226-6 [published Online First: 2016/02/03]
28. Gattinoni L, Kolobow T, Tomlinson T, et al. Low-frequency positive pressure ventilation with extracorporeal carbon dioxide removal (LFPPV-ECCO2R): an experimental study. *Anesth Analg* 1978;57(4):470-7. doi: 10.1213/00000539-197807000-00018 [published Online First: 1978/07/01]
29. Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, et al. The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate healthcare interventions: explanation and elaboration. *BMJ* 2009;339:b2700. doi: 10.1136/bmj.b2700 [published Online First: 2009/07/23]
30. Taccone FS, Malfertheiner MV, Ferrari F, et al. Extracorporeal CO2 removal in critically ill patients: a systematic review. *Minerva Anesthesiol* 2017;83(7):762-72. doi: 10.23736/S0375-9393.17.11835-3 [published Online First: 2017/04/13]
31. Combes A, Peek GJ, Hajage D, et al. ECMO for severe ARDS: systematic review and individual patient data meta-analysis. *Intensive Care Med* 2020;46(11):2048-57. doi: 10.1007/s00134-020-06248-3 [published Online First: 2020/10/07]
32. Bernard GR, Artigas A, Brigham KL, et al. The American-European Consensus Conference on ARDS. Definitions, mechanisms, relevant outcomes, and clinical trial coordination. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 1994;149(3 Pt 1):818-24. doi: 10.1164/ajrccm.149.3.7509706 [published Online First: 1994/03/01]
33. Force ADT, Ranieri VM, Rubenfeld GD, et al. Acute respiratory distress syndrome: the Berlin Definition. *JAMA* 2012;307(23):2526-33. doi: 10.1001/jama.2012.5669 [published Online First: 2012/07/17]
34. Muller T, Lubnow M, Philipp A, et al. Extracorporeal pumpless interventional lung assist in clinical practice: determinants of efficacy. *Eur Respir J* 2009;33(3):551-8. doi: 10.1183/09031936.00123608 [published Online First: 2008/11/18]
35. Hermann A, Riss K, Schellongowski P, et al. A novel pump-driven veno-venous gas exchange system during extracorporeal CO2-removal. *Intensive Care Med* 2015;41(10):1773-80. doi: 10.1007/s00134-015-3957-0 [published Online First: 2015/07/15]
36. Fischer S, Simon AR, Welte T, et al. Bridge to lung transplantation with the novel pumpless interventional lung assist device NovaLung. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 2006;131(3):719-23. doi: 10.1016/j.jtcvs.2005.10.050 [published Online First: 2006/03/07]
37. Bein T, Weber F, Philipp A, et al. A new pumpless extracorporeal interventional lung assist in critical hypoxemia/hypercapnia. *Crit Care Med* 2006;34(5):1372-7. doi: 10.1097/01.CCM.0000215111.85483.BD [published Online First: 2006/03/17]
38. Kuo I, Akpa BS. Validity of the lipid sink as a mechanism for the reversal of local anesthetic systemic toxicity: a physiologically based pharmacokinetic model study. *Anesthesiology* 2013;118(6):1350-61. doi: 10.1097/ALN.0b013e31828ce74d [published Online First: 2013/03/06]

39. Higgins J, Li T, Deeks J. Chapter 6: Choosing effect measures and computing estimates of effect. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* version 62 version 6.2 ed. www.training.cochrane.org/handbook.: Cochrane 2021.
40. DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. *Control Clin Trials* 1986;7(3):177-88. doi: 10.1016/0197-2456(86)90046-2 [published Online First: 1986/09/01]
41. Miller JJ. The Inverse of the Freeman – Tukey Double Arcsine Transformation. *The American Statistician* 1978;32(4):138-38. doi: 10.1080/00031305.1978.10479283
42. Clopper CJ, Pearson ES. THE USE OF CONFIDENCE OR FIDUCIAL LIMITS ILLUSTRATED IN THE CASE OF THE BINOMIAL. *Biometrika* 1934;26(4):404-13. doi: 10.1093/biomet/26.4.404
43. Iorio A, Spencer FA, Falavigna M, et al. Use of GRADE for assessment of evidence about prognosis: rating confidence in estimates of event rates in broad categories of patients. *BMJ* 2015;350:h870. doi: 10.1136/bmj.h870 [published Online First: 2015/03/18]
44. Terragni PP, Del Sorbo L, Mascia L, et al. Tidal volume lower than 6 ml/kg enhances lung protection: role of extracorporeal carbon dioxide removal. *Anesthesiology* 2009;111(4):826-35. doi: 10.1097/ALN.0b013e3181b764d2 [published Online First: 2009/09/11]
45. McNamee JJ, Gillies MA, Barrett NA, et al. Effect of Lower Tidal Volume Ventilation Facilitated by Extracorporeal Carbon Dioxide Removal vs Standard Care Ventilation on 90-Day Mortality in Patients With Acute Hypoxemic Respiratory Failure: The REST Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA* 2021 doi: 10.1001/jama.2021.13374 [published Online First: 2021/09/01]
46. Augy JL, Aissaoui N, Richard C, et al. A 2-year multicenter, observational, prospective, cohort study on extracorporeal CO2 removal in a large metropolis area. *J Intensive Care* 2019;7:45. doi: 10.1186/s40560-019-0399-8 [published Online First: 2019/08/28]
47. Winiszewski H, Aptel F, Belon F, et al. Daily use of extracorporeal CO2 removal in a critical care unit: indications and results. *J Intensive Care* 2018;6:36. doi: 10.1186/s40560-018-0304-x [published Online First: 2018/07/11]
48. Peperstraete H, Eloit S, Depuydt P, et al. Low flow extracorporeal CO2 removal in ARDS patients: a prospective short-term crossover pilot study. *BMC Anesthesiol* 2017;17(1):155. doi: 10.1186/s12871-017-0445-9 [published Online First: 2017/11/29]
49. Combes A, Fanelli V, Pham T, et al. Feasibility and safety of extracorporeal CO2 removal to enhance protective ventilation in acute respiratory distress syndrome: the SUPERNOVA study. *Intensive Care Med* 2019;45(5):592-600. doi: 10.1007/s00134-019-05567-4 [published Online First: 2019/02/23]
50. Goursaud S, Valette X, Dupeyrat J, et al. Ultrprotective ventilation allowed by extracorporeal CO2 removal improves the right ventricular function in acute respiratory distress syndrome patients: a quasi-experimental pilot study. *Ann Intensive Care* 2021;11(1):3. doi: 10.1186/s13613-020-00784-3 [published Online First: 2021/01/08]
51. Fitzgerald M, Millar J, Blackwood B, et al. Extracorporeal carbon dioxide removal for patients with acute respiratory failure secondary to the acute respiratory distress syndrome: a systematic review. *Crit Care* 2014;18(3):222. doi: 10.1186/cc13875 [published Online First: 2014/07/18]
52. Combes A, Auzinger G, Capellier G, et al. ECCO2R therapy in the ICU: consensus of a European round table meeting. *Crit Care* 2020;24(1):490. doi: 10.1186/s13054-020-03210-z [published Online First: 2020/08/10]
53. Goligher EC, Combes A, Brodie D, et al. Determinants of the effect of extracorporeal carbon dioxide removal in the SUPERNOVA trial: implications for trial design. *Intensive Care Med* 2019;45(9):1219-30. doi: 10.1007/s00134-019-05708-9 [published Online First: 2019/08/23]
54. Goligher EC, Amato MBP, Slutsky AS. Applying Precision Medicine to Trial Design Using Physiology. Extracorporeal CO2 Removal for Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2017;196(5):558-68. doi: 10.1164/rccm.201701-0248CP [published Online First: 2017/06/22]
55. Das A, Camporota L, Hardman JG, et al. What links ventilator driving pressure with survival in the acute respiratory distress syndrome? A computational study. *Respir Res* 2019;20(1):29. doi: 10.1186/s12931-019-0990-5 [published Online First: 2019/02/13]
56. Rozenecwajg S, Guihot A, Franchineau G, et al. Ultra-Protective Ventilation Reduces Biotrauma in Patients on Venovenous Extracorporeal Membrane Oxygenation for Severe Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome. *Crit Care Med* 2019;47(11):1505-12. doi: 10.1097/CCM.0000000000003894 [published Online First: 2019/08/07]
57. Beitler JR. Lung protection in acute respiratory distress syndrome: what should we target? *Curr Opin Crit Care* 2019 doi: 10.1097/MCC.0000000000000692 [published Online First: 2019/12/10]
58. Calfee CS, Delucchi K, Famous KR. Reply: Next Step to Understanding Subphenotypes of Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2017;196(6):796. doi: 10.1164/rccm.201704-0693LE [published Online First: 2017/04/14]
59. Bein T, Weber-Carstens S, Goldmann A, et al. Lower tidal volume strategy (approximately 3 ml/kg) combined with extracorporeal CO2 removal versus 'conventional' protective ventilation (6 ml/kg) in severe ARDS: the prospective randomized Xtravent-study. *Intensive Care Med* 2013;39(5):847-56. doi: 10.1007/s00134-012-2787-6 [published Online First: 2013/01/12]
60. Writing Group for the Alveolar Recruitment for Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome Trial I, Cavalcanti AB, Suzumura EA, et al. Effect of Lung Recruitment and Titrated Positive End-Expiratory Pressure (PEEP) vs Low PEEP on Mortality in Patients With Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA* 2017;318(14):1335-45. doi: 10.1001/jama.2017.14171 [published Online First: 2017/10/04]
61. Spinelli E, Mauri T, Lissoni A, et al. Spontaneous Breathing Patterns During Maximum Extracorporeal CO2 Removal in Subjects With Early Severe ARDS. *Respir Care* 2020;65(7):911-19. doi: 10.4187/respcare.07391 [published Online First: 2020/02/13]

62. Spinelli E, Mauri T, Beitler JR, et al. Respiratory drive in the acute respiratory distress syndrome: pathophysiology, monitoring, and therapeutic interventions. *Intensive Care Med* 2020;46(4):606-18. doi: 10.1007/s00134-020-05942-6 [published Online First: 2020/02/06]
63. Vaporidi K, Akoumianaki E, Telias I, et al. Respiratory Drive in Critically Ill Patients. Pathophysiology and Clinical Implications. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2020;201(1):20-32. doi: 10.1164/rccm.201903-0596SO [published Online First: 2019/08/23]
64. Franchineau G, Brechot N, Hekimian G, et al. Prone positioning monitored by electrical impedance tomography in patients with severe acute respiratory distress syndrome on veno-venous ECMO. *Ann Intensive Care* 2020;10(1):12. doi: 10.1186/s13613-020-0633-5 [published Online First: 2020/02/06]
65. Charron C, Repesse X, Bouferrache K, et al. PaCO₂ and alveolar dead space are more relevant than PaO₂/FiO₂ ratio in monitoring the respiratory response to prone position in ARDS patients: a physiological study. *Crit Care* 2011;15(4):R175. doi: 10.1186/cc10324 [published Online First: 2011/07/28]
66. Gattinoni L, Vagginelli F, Carlesso E, et al. Decrease in PaCO₂ with prone position is predictive of improved outcome in acute respiratory distress syndrome. *Crit Care Med* 2003;31(12):2727-33. doi: 10.1097/01.CCM.0000098032.34052.F9 [published Online First: 2003/12/12]
67. Vieillard-Baron A, Charron C, Caille V, et al. Prone positioning unloads the right ventricle in severe ARDS. *Chest* 2007;132(5):1440-6. doi: 10.1378/chest.07-1013 [published Online First: 2007/10/11]
68. Figueroa Villalba CA, Brogan TV, McMullan DM, et al. Conversion From Activated Clotting Time to Anti-Xa Heparin Activity Assay for Heparin Monitoring During Extracorporeal Membrane Oxygenation. *Crit Care Med* 2020 doi: 10.1097/CCM.0000000000004615 [published Online First: 2020/10/04]
69. Combes A, Tonetti T, Fanelli V, et al. Efficacy and safety of lower versus higher CO₂ extraction devices to allow ultraprotective ventilation: secondary analysis of the SUPERNOVA study. *Thorax* 2019;74(12):1179-81. doi: 10.1136/thoraxjnl-2019-213591 [published Online First: 2019/08/15]
70. Ki KK, Passmore MR, Chan CHH, et al. Low flow rate alters haemostatic parameters in an ex-vivo extracorporeal membrane oxygenation circuit. *Intensive Care Med Exp* 2019;7(1):51. doi: 10.1186/s40635-019-0264-z [published Online First: 2019/08/23]
71. Schneider SW, Nuschele S, Wixforth A, et al. Shear-induced unfolding triggers adhesion of von Willebrand factor fibers. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2007;104(19):7899-903. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0608422104 [published Online First: 2007/05/02]
72. Gross-Hardt S, Hesselmann F, Arens J, et al. Low-flow assessment of current ECMO/ECCO2R rotary blood pumps and the potential effect on hemocompatibility. *Crit Care* 2019;23(1):348. doi: 10.1186/s13054-019-2622-3 [published Online First: 2019/11/07]
73. Heilmann C, Geisen U, Beyersdorf F, et al. Acquired von Willebrand syndrome in patients with ventricular assist device or total artificial heart. *Thromb Haemost* 2010;103(5):962-7. doi: 10.1160/TH09-07-0497 [published Online First: 2010/03/31]
74. Heilmann C, Geisen U, Beyersdorf F, et al. Acquired von Willebrand syndrome in patients with extracorporeal life support (ECLS). *Intensive Care Med* 2012;38(1):62-8. doi: 10.1007/s00134-011-2370-6 [published Online First: 2011/10/04]
75. Heilmann C, Trummer G, Beyersdorf F, et al. Acquired Von Willebrand syndrome in patients on long-term support with HeartMate II. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg* 2017;51(3):587-90. doi: 10.1093/ejcts/ezw348 [published Online First: 2017/01/14]
76. Wu J, Paden BE, Borovetz HS, et al. Computational fluid dynamics analysis of blade tip clearances on hemodynamic performance and blood damage in a centrifugal ventricular assist device. *Artif Organs* 2010;34(5):402-11. doi: 10.1111/j.1525-1594.2009.00875.x [published Online First: 2009/10/17]
77. Morimont P, Habran S, Desai T, et al. Extracorporeal CO₂ removal and regional citrate anticoagulation in an experimental model of hypercapnic acidosis. *Artif Organs* 2019;43(8):719-27. doi: 10.1111/aor.13431 [published Online First: 2019/02/02]
78. Barbaro RP, Odetola FO, Kidwell KM, et al. Association of hospital-level volume of extracorporeal membrane oxygenation cases and mortality. Analysis of the extracorporeal life support organization registry. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2015;191(8):894-901. doi: 10.1164/rccm.201409-1634OC [published Online First: 2015/02/20]
79. Maiolo G, Collino F, Vasques F, et al. Reclassifying Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2018;197(12):1586-95. doi: 10.1164/rccm.201709-1804OC [published Online First: 2018/01/19]
80. Chiumello D, Brioni M. Severe hypoxemia: which strategy to choose. *Crit Care* 2016;20(1):132. doi: 10.1186/s13054-016-1304-7 [published Online First: 2016/06/04]
81. Goligher EC, Costa ELV, Yarnell CJ, et al. Effect of Lowering Tidal Volume on Mortality in ARDS Varies with Respiratory System Elastance. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2021 doi: 10.1164/rccm.202009-3536OC [published Online First: 2021/01/14]
82. Ethgen O, Goldstein J, Harenski K, et al. A preliminary cost-effectiveness analysis of lung protective ventilation with extra corporeal carbon dioxide removal (ECCO2R) in the management of acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS). *J Crit Care* 2021;63:45-53. doi: 10.1016/j.jcrc.2021.01.014 [published Online First: 2021/02/23]
83. Poon WH, Ramanathan K, Ling RR, et al. Prone positioning during venovenous extracorporeal membrane oxygenation for acute respiratory distress syndrome: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Crit Care* 2021;25(1):292. doi: 10.1186/s13054-021-03723-1 [published Online First: 2021/08/14]
84. Mustafa AK, Alexander PJ, Joshi DJ, et al. Extracorporeal Membrane Oxygenation for Patients With COVID-19 in Severe Respiratory Failure. *JAMA Surg* 2020;155(10):990-92. doi: 10.1001/jamasurg.2020.3950 [published Online First: 2020/08/12]

MAIN TABLES

1. Included Study Characteristics
2. Ventilation and Physiological Parameters
3. Quality assessment
 - a. Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) Critical Appraisal Checklist for Case Series and Randomised Controlled Trials
 - b. GRADE – Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Evaluations
4. Outcomes of 24hr ECCO2R therapy: results of random effects Meta-analysis
5. Forest Plots 1a/b/c = Driving Pressure, Plateau Pressure, Tidal Volume
6. Forest Plots 2a/b = PaO₂:FiO₂ Ratio, Positive End Expiratory Pressure
7. Forest Plots 3a/3b/3c = Respiratory Frequency, PaCO₂, pH
8. Adverse Events

Table 1. Included studies and demography

	Vt(ml/Kg PBW)	n	Age (Yrs.)	RR/f	Primary outcome	ΔP (cmH2O)		Pplat (cmH2O)	
						(mmHg)	(mmHg)	Reporting	PP/NMBA
McNamee 2021[^]	Multicentre open-label pragmatic RCT Terminated early due to futility	202=ECCO ₂ R group	60.2 (50.6-69.0)	68:32	90d all-cause mortality. Tidal volume, duration of invasive ventilation, need for ECMO, 28d mortality, adverse events rate	153.1 ±84.0	55.8±14.4	Yes	55.6% NMBA 9.1% prone 3.5% inh. Nitric oxide during ECCO ₂ R 6% need for ECMO
Goursaud 2021	Quasiexperimental prospective observational pilot study	18	64 (57;76)	72:18	24hrs of ECCO ₂ R facilitated UPV (and echocardiographic right ventricular systolic function Secondary: Safety data	108.5 (96.5;136.3)	43.1 (38.2;57.9)	Limited	6 (33%) prone during ECCO ₂ R 17 (94.4%) NMBA
Augy et al 2019[^]	Multicentre observational prospective cohort	24/70	66 (63;77)	71:29	Utilisation of ECCO ₂ R and safety data Secondary: ECCO ₂ R effect on physiological/ventilator variables	131 (100;190)	58.0 (48.0;65.0)	Yes	^4 (6%) Prone ventilation 37 (53%) NMBA
Combes et al 2019	Prospective Multi-centre international phase 2	95	60.2 ±14	67.4:32.6	Proportion reaching UPV with stable PCO ₂ /pH* at 8h and 24h (facilitated by vvECCO ₂ R)	173 ±61	47.8 ± 9.4'	Yes	23 (24.2%) Prone 80 (84.2%) NMBA
Schmidt et al 2018	Prospective pilot Study	20	60 ±12	55:45	Vt lowered to 4ml/Kg + Pplat<25cmH2O: ventilator parameter evolution - Feasibility and Safety of vvECCO ₂ R	188 ±75	43.0 ±8.0'	Limited	8 (40%) prone 16 (80%) NMBA 2 rescue prone on ECCO₂R
Winiszewski et al 2018[^]	Retrospective chart review	16/33 ^{^^}	63 (59;68) [^]	60.6:39.4 [^]	Description of UPV in ARDS facilitated by vvECCO ₂ R	145 (116;161)	50.3 (45.8;56.3)"	Limited [^]	10 (62%) Prone on ECCO₂R 94% NMBA baseline weaned to 56% (48hrs)
Peperstraete et al 2017	Prospective pilot - crossover off-on-off design	10	50.5 (34.8;63.3)	60:40	20% reduction in PCO ₂ within 2h of vvECCO ₂ R (aiming LPV<6ml/Kg Pplat<25)	83 (67.6;121.1) 60%<100	68.3 (57.7;86.2)	Yes	2 (20%) prone 10 (100%) NMBA
Fanelli et al 2016	Prospective Observational - Feasibility Run-in	15	55 ±19	73:27	Reduction Vt6ml/Kg to UPV 4ml/Kg with vvECCO ₂ R to maintain pH and PCO ₂	159 ±34	51.0 ±15.0	Limited	Baseline NR 4 Rescue prone on ECCO₂R (PFR108-162) 2 vvECMO
Allardet-Servent et al 2015	Prospective Observational	11	70 ±9	73:27	Primary: 20% reduction PaCO ₂ at 20 minutes vvECCO ₂ R; reduction Vt6ml/Kg to 4ml/Kg	133 ±41	48.0 ±10.0	Limited	NR
Terragni et al 2009	Prospective Observational	10	64.1 ±13.5	70:30	Vt~4ml/kg + Pplat 25-28cmH ₂ O (with vvECCO ₂ R) - evolution of lung weight, ventilator variables and inflammatory cytokines	136 ±30	48.4 ±8.7	Yes	NR

Data reported Median + IQR or Mean ±SD (as per manuscript) ; [^]= reported for whole trial cohort (not specific to ARDS patients) - ARDS patients/total patient ; *pH>7.3 and PCO₂ within 20% of baseline value EOLIA – 124 assigned to ECMO; ^{^^}4 ARDS patients concurrently enrolled in other ECCO₂R trials: 3 in SUPERNOVA, 1 in Schmidt et al 2018 JBI: Joanna Briggs assessment

	Baseline	24hrs ECCO2R	Baseline	24hrs ECCO2R	Baseline	24hrs ECCO2R	Baseline	24hrs ECCO2R
McNamee 2021	6.3 (5.8-7.0)	4.2 ±1.2	23.9 ±5.02	26.6 ±5.7	14.9 ±5.3	12.1±4.9	25.9±5.2	23.5±5.2
Goursaud 2021	6.06 (6.00;6.35)	4.13 (4.0;4.28)*	28 (25;30)	30(27.5;32)	11.5 (10-17.8)	8.6 (6-11.5)	25.5(24;28)	22.5(19.8;25.3)*
Augy 2019	5.9 (5.5;6.0)	4.1 (3.9;4.8)*	NR	-	-	-	28±1.58	-
Combes 2019	6.02±0.37	4.16±0.46*	27.4±4.7	23.5±6.7*	13.2±4.1	9.9±4.3*	26.7±3.1	23.5±3.9*
Schmidt 2018	6.10±0.3	3.98±0.18*	26±4	25±6	13.0±4.8	7.9±3.2*	26.3±3.5	22.8±2.6*
Winiszewski 2018	5.3 (4.4;5.9)	3.9 (3.5;4.2)*	26 (22;28)	21 (18;23)*	10 (8;15)	7 (6;10)*	26 (24;27)	26 (22;29)
Peperstraete 2017	6.85 (6.31;7.48)	5.60(4.90;6.05)	32.0 (27.8;33.0)	30.0(27.5;31.5)	19.0 (17.5;24.0)	14.0 (11.0;18.5)	31.5 (28.8;35.5)	25.0 (22.5;30.5)
Fanelli 2016	6.2±0.7	4.29±0.5*	28±7	31.6±4.6*	13.8±3.4	9.9±3.3*	27.7±1.6	23.9±1.0*
Allardet-Servent 2015	383±63 (ml)	269±50 (ml)	20±2	20±2	-	-	25±4	21.5±3.7*
Terragni 2009	6.3±0.2	4.6(3.6;5.4)*	31.2±2.3	-	-	-	29.1±1.2	25.1(23.9;26.0)*
	PaO ₂ :FiO ₂ ratio		PEEP		PaCO ₂		pH	
	Baseline	24hrs ECCO2R	Baseline	24hrs ECCO2R	Baseline	24hrs ECCO2R	Baseline	24hrs ECCO2R
McNamee 2021	153.1±84.0	147.8±52.5	11.0 ±3.1	11.3 ±3.2	55.8 ±14.4	60.8 ±14.6	7.31±0.09	7.29±0.13
Goursaud 2021	108.5 (96.5;136.3)	113.5 (81.9;142)	11.5 (9.3;14.8)	13.0 (9.5;15.3)	43.1 (38.2;57.9)	52.5 (44.2;64.0)*	7.38 (7.34;7.42)	7.31 (7.27;7.33)
Augy2019	131 (100;190)	-	10 (5;15.5)	-	58.0 (48.0;65.0)	51.0 (44.5;55.7)	7.24	7.31 (7.24;7.36)*
Combes 2019	168±64	168±62	13.6±3.7	13.8±3.9	48.0±9.6	46.7±10.4	7.34±0.09	7.39±0.08*
Schmidt 2018	188±75	184±67	13.4±3.6	15.0±3.4	43±8	53±9*	7.39±0.1	7.32±0.1*
Winiszewski 2018	145 (116;161)	182(149;211)	13 (10;15)	14 (12;18)	50.3 (45.8;56.3)	42.0 (36.0;57.0)	7.31 (7.25;7.41)	7.40 (7.33;7.45)
Peperstraete 2017	83.0 (67.6;105.4)	131.4 (90.2;212.7)	12.0 (9.0;12.75)	11.0 (8.5;14.5)	68.3 (57.3;86.2)	50.3 (42.9;63.9)	7.21 (7.11;7.23)	7.33 (7.29;7.38)
Fanelli 2016	159±34	175±45	12±3	14±2	51±15	53±15	7.36±0.1	7.33±0.1
Allardet-Servent 2015	150 (97;201)	139(87;191)	11.7±2.2	10.9±1.9	47±10	50±7	7.28±0.12	7.33±0.08*
Terragni 2009	135±30	149 (109;248)	12.1±2.5	15.3(14.0;16.0)*	48.4±8.7	51.7 (43.8;58.0)	7.36±0.03	7.36(7.30;7.41)

Table 2. Ventilator and Physiological Parameters – Baseline Vs 24hrs of ECCO2R

*P<0.05 Vs Baseline – reported in source manuscripts NR=Not reported

Terragni 2009 was abstracted from graphically presented data = Mean (Min;Max) other trials report as Mean±SD or Median (IQR)

Author	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Augy	☐☐	?	?	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	8/10
Combes	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	?	?	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	8/10
Fanelli	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	?	?	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	8/10
Peperstraete	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	X	X	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	8/10
Schmidt	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	?	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	9/10
Terragni	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	10/10
Winiszewski	☐☐	?	?	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	8/10
Goursaud	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	?	?	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	8/10
McNamee	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	X	X	X	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	☐☐	10/13

Table 3a Joanna Briggs Institute Critical Appraisal Checklists for case series and randomised controlled trials (McNamee)

No of studies	Certainty assessment						Effect			Certainty	Importance
	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	No of events	No of individuals	Rate (95% CI)		
Change in driving pressure after 24 hours of ECCOR therapy											
8	observational studies	not serious	serious ^a	not serious	serious ^b	none	-	377	MD -3.56 cm H ₂ O (-3.91 to -3.22)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ LOW	CRITICAL

Table 3b. Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development, and Evaluations

Explanations

- There was significant heterogeneity, and visual inspection of the forest plots found that the point estimates were rather sparsely distributed; confidence intervals occasionally overlapped.
- While the 95%-CI remains relatively narrow with respect to the pooled estimate, the sample size is small and below the optimal information size. As such, we downgraded for imprecision.

Parameter	R=0	R=0.25	R=0.5	R=0.75	R=0.9
DP	-3.47 (-3.87 to -3.07) 96.8%	-3.52 (-3.89 to -3.14) 98.2%	-3.56 (-3.91 to -3.22) 99.2%	-3.62 (-3.94 to -3.31) 99.8%	-3.69 (-3.97 to -3.40) 100.0%
VT	-1.79 (-1.89 to 1.69) 100%	-1.79 (-1.89 to 1.69) 100%	-1.79 (-1.89 to -1.69) 100.0%	-1.79 (-1.89 to -1.69) 100.0%	-1.79 (-1.89 to -1.69) 100.0%
RR	0.03 (-2.99 to +3.04) 99.9%	0.04 (-2.96 to +3.04) 99.9%	0.04 (-2.94 to 3.02) 100.0%	0.05 (-3.00 to 3.09) 100%	0.05 (-2.75 to 2.85) 100%
Pplat	-3.04 (-3.54 to -2.54) 99.3%	-3.05 (-3.53 to -2.56) 99.6%	-3.09 (-3.55 to -2.62) 99.8%	-3.16 (-3.59 to -2.74) 99.9%	-3.28 (-3.69 to -2.86) 100.0%
P/F ratio	-4.25 (-10.41 to +1.91) 0.0%	-4.20 (-8.96 to 0.55)	-4.10 (-7.45 to -0.76)	-0.012 (-6.03 to 6.00) 48.0%	4.57 (-1.34 to 10.48) 87.4%
pH	0.013 (-0.019 to +0.046) 100%	0.013 (-0.019 to 0.046) 100%	0.013 (-0.020 to 0.046) 100%	0.013 (-0.021 to 0.047) 100%	0.013 (-0.021 to 0.047) 100%
PEEP	0.92 (0.64 to 1.20) 96.7%	0.96 (0.70 to 1.21) 98.0%	0.97 (0.74 to 1.20) 99.0%	1.13 (0.92 to 1.33) 99.6%	0.89 (0.73 to 1.05) 99.9%
PCO2	1.02 (-2.59 to +4.63) 98.7%	1.12 (-2.30 to 4.54) 99.2%	1.18 (-2.04 to 4.39) 99.7%	0.95 (-2.06 to 3.96) 99.9%	0.39 (-2.50 to 3.28) 100.0%

Table 4. Outcomes of 24hr ECCO2R therapy: results of random effects Meta-analysis




Figure 1a. Forest Plot: Change in Driving Pressure following 24hours of ECCO₂R




Figure 1b. Forest Plot: Change in Plateau Pressure following 24hrs of ECCO₂R




Figure 1c. Forest Plot: Change in Tidal volume following 24hours of ECCO₂R




Figure 2a. Forest Plot: Change in PaO₂:FiO₂ ratio at 24hours of ECCO₂R




Figure2b. Forest Plot: Change in Positive End Expiratory Pressure at 24hours of ECCO₂R




Figure3a. Forest Plot: Change in Respiratory Frequency at 24hours of ECCO₂R




Figure3b. Forest Plot: Change in Arterial Partial pressure of Carbon Dioxide at 24hours of ECCO₂R

Study	N=	Bleeding	Significant	Haemolysis	Catheter Complication	Circuit Clotting	Circuit malfunction	ICH/SAE
McNamee 2021	202	18 (8.9%) non-ICH bleeds Of which 8 (4%) cannula related	6 non-ICH bleeds reported as SAE	3 (1.5%)	1 cannula failure (0.5%)	NR	1 (0.5%)	1 ischaemic 1 pulmonary 4 episodes




Figure3c. Forest Plot: Change in pH at 24hours of ECCO₂R

Goursaud et al 2021	18	NR	-	NR	-	5 (28%)	-	1 ICH (5.5%)
Augy et al 2019	24/70	17 (24.3%)	7->transfusion 3->embolization 6 discontinuations 2 ⁰ bleeding	15 (21.4%) 6 (8.6%) [^] Hemolung>iLA	3 (4.3%) catheterisation failure 1 (1.4%) catheter infection	11 (15.7%) iLA >Hemolung	6 (8.6%) Incl.3 software failures 2 (3%) air in circuit	2 (2.9%)
Combes et al 2019	95	13 (14%) 10-cannula related	6 (6%)	12 (13%) Plts<50	2 (2%) Catheter displacements 2 (2%) catheter infections	13 (14%) 6 (6%) circuit change	3 (3%) pump malfunctions	1(1%) ICH 1 Pneuothorax
Schmidt et al 2018	20	2 (10%) mild haemoptysis	NR	NR	NR	10 (50%) membrane	NR	NR
Winiszewski et al 2018	16/33	NR	NR	16 (48%)	NR	5 (15%) 1 circuit change	NR	1 (3.0%)
Peperstraete et al 2017	10	5 (50%) 4 at access sites, 3 epistaxis/pharyngo-tracheal	5 (50%) requiring transfusion (4 mod 1 mild)*	NR	2 (20%) difficult insertion 1 of which -> bleeding + PRC	3 (30%) →2 cessations anticoagulation	NR	NR
Fanelli et al 2016	15	NR	NR	1 (6.7%) Leading to discontinuation	1 (6.7%) Kinking of catheter	NR	NR	NR
Allardet-Servent et al 2015	11	NR	NR	NR	1 (9.1%) Catheter requiring replacement	NR	1 premature cessation	NR
Terragni et al 2009	10	NR	NR	NR	4 (40%) replaced 2 recirculation 1 kinking 1 displacement	3 (30%)	1 (10%)	NR
Totals	484	55/377 = 14.6%	33/377 = 8.8%	47/415 = 11.3%	17/413 = 4.1%	50/256 = 19.5%	12/388 = 3.1%	ICH 14/418 = 3.3%

Mean complication rates calculated across trials reporting the complication to minimise bias from under-reporting.

*=Used GUSTO (Global Utilization Of Streptokinase And Tpa For Occluded Arteries) criteria; ‘ = median PRC transfusion requirement ; [^]= Biological haemolysis/Clinically significant haemolysis (biological= serum free Hb >100mg/l); Total Cohort complication rates reported (ie. ARDS+non-ARDS patients: Winiszewski 2018 + Augy 2019)