Title

A new method for bedside determination of effective lung volume (ELV) and functional residual capacity (FRC).

Andras Gedeon, Jakob Jansson, David Patriksson, Mats Wallin

Author information

Andras Gedeon Mincor AB Stockholm Sweden ORCID 0009-0006-4519-8948

Jakob Jansson Spirotronic AB Stockholm Sweden

David Patriksson eHeart AB Stockholm Sweden

Mats Wallin Department of Physiology and Pharmacology, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden
ORCID 0000-0003-1492-0089

Corresponding author

Andras Gedeon agedeon46@gmail.com

Abstract

Established methods of measuring FRC involve sophisticated equipment and elaborate procedures. Here we present and evaluate a new method based on CO_2 rebreathing and end-tidal CO_2 monitoring using simple equipment and procedure applicable at bedside.

Ten healthy subjects with diverse anthropometric and respiratory parameters were studied in the sitting position. Reference FRC (RefFRC) and tidal volume (TV) were measured with the Cosmed Quark CPET unit using the single-breath helium dilution technique. Rebreathing through a dead space of precisely known volume and recording the resulting rise in the end-tidal CO_2 value for the first two breaths allows the determination of ELV. FRC is then calculated from ELV. Two sets of measurements were made on each subject 15 minutes apart.

Bland-Altman analysis of a comparison between FRC and RefFRC shows a bias= 0.08 l and SD=0.67 l. Comparing the first set of data to the second, (alfa =0.05) paired t-test shows the two sets to be independent. When the mean value of two observations is calculated (meanFRC) and compared to RefFRC we obtain bias= -0.04 l with SD=0.38 l which results in a percentage error PE=0.23

The FRC data obtained has good absolute accuracy. Due to the short measuring time, a mean of two observations can be formed that has sufficient precision to meet criteria for exchangeability with reference. The simplicity of equipment and procedure, could make this method attractive both in the pre-operative and the post-operative setting.

Key words

New method, CO_2 rebreathing, effective lung volume, FRC

Acknowledgements

Dr R Winter for placing the resources of eHeart AB to our disposal. Clinical Trial Consultants AB (Uppsala Sweden) for recruiting the study subjects.

Introduction

Pre-operative measurement of FRC, particularly in high-risk patients, can help guide anesthesia but also predict postoperative pulmonary complications [1]. Post-operative monitoring of FRC allows assessment of lung recovery and detect early pulmonary complications. Although there are several well-established methods for measuring functional residual capacity (FRC) [1-4] they all require expensive sophisticated equipment and elaborate time-consuming procedures and none of them can be used at bedside. Here we describe and evaluate a new method, based on a short period of rebreathing, to measure the effective lung volume (ELV). From ELV we can calculate the FRC. The procedure is fast and employs only simple equipment suitable for bedside use.

Methods

Ten subjects, 4 women and 6 men, with no known cardio-pulmonary disease, were recruited and studied in the sitting position. They were between 39-70 (mean 55) years old, with weights between 62-99 (mean 80) kg, tidal volume (TV) was between 0.58-1.7 (mean 1,1) l and respiratory rate (RR) between 4.6-16.8 (mean 11) breath/minute.

Fig 1



Fig 2



The equipment used for this study is shown in Fig 1. It is made up of a nose clip, a dead space volume (DV), a sampling IR CO2 analyzer, ET600 Side stream CO2CGM Module (Ronseda Electronics Co. Ltd China) and a laptop computer for data collection. TV and the functional residual capacity reference (RefFRC) were measured with Cosmed Quark CPET (COSMED SRl Italy) in the sitting position using the single-breath helium dilution method.[4]

The dead space volume is formed by connecting together a mouthpiece, a respiratory filter and a pipe. The total volume is determined by an accuracy of better than 3 ml. The sampling port of the analyzer is connected to the pipe through a nafion tube and a sampling filter. DV = 0.148 l was used throughout and resulted in a DV/TV ratio in the range ~ 0.10 - 0.25. The sampling point was ~ 10 mm inside the lumen of the pipe.

The subjects were instructed to sit still for about 5 minutes. Then they were asked to apply the nose clip and to start breathing in the dead space, beginning with an expiration and to breathe in a normal manner till instructed to stop. Data collection took less than 30 seconds. After sitting still for about 15 minutes this procedure was repeated for a second set of measurements.

Six subjects could be evaluated twice while three cases could not be reliably evaluated due to irregular breathing and/or leakage at the mouthpiece. Thus, we obtained 17 measurements including 6 pairs of data points.

In our approach [6], first the volume of CO_2 within the dead space is determined at the end of expiration. The CO_2 volume in the dead space is calculated as the product of the known dead space volume and a representative sample of the CO_2 partial pressure within the dead space at the end of expiration.

With DV/TV < 0.25 the CO_2 partial pressure will decrease slowly and linearly within the dead space away from the subject. At a sampling point that divides the dead space into two equal parts we can therefore get a representative

average value (avPet) for the entire dead space. The CO_2 volume is obtained as a product of avPet and DV. Introducing this CO_2 volume into ELV produces an increase in Pet, delta Pet given by

$$delta\ Pet = \frac{avPet\ \ x\ DV}{ELV}$$

and so

$$ELV = \frac{avPet\ \ x\ DV}{delta\ Pet}$$

Rebreathing produces a rise in Pet as shown in Fig 2.

We consider only the very beginning of this rising curve, the first two breaths, which represent the nearly linear portion of the curve. In principle the very first breath could determine the value of delta Pet but in order to get a more robust estimate we use a weighted average of the first two breaths according to the formula

$$delta\ Pet = \ 0.5\ x\ (delta\ Pet1 + 0.57\ x\ delta\ Pet2)$$

with the result

$$ELV = \ 2.0\ x\ avPet\ x\ DV\ /\ (delta\ Pet1 + 0.57\ x\ delta\ Pet2)$$

In healthy subjects, it has been shown that irrespective of anthropometric data there is a fixed relation between FRC and ELV [7]

$$FRC = \ 0.80\ x\ ELV$$

FRC calculated in this way is compared to RefFRC

Results

Fig 3



Fig 4



Fig 3 shows a Bland-Altman analysis [8] of a comparison between 17 observations (two identical) of FRC and Ref FRC with bias = 0.08 l and SD = 0.67 l. According to paired t-test (alfa=0.05), the first set of measurements and the second set of measurements are independent. We can therefore calculate the mean value of FRC (meanFRC) for each of the six subjects with two sets of data.

Fig 4 shows a Bland-Altman analysis of meanFRC vs RefFRC with bias = -0.04l and SD = 0.38 l, with the resulting percentage error is PE = 0.23, demonstrating the much improved precision of meanFRC compared to FRC.

Discussion

Our approach [6] is based on first principles. The expression for ELV is a ratio of Pet- measurements from a single CO_2 analyzer so the result is not affected by the gain setting of the instrument. The only source of measuring error in ELV is the measurement of the dead space volume, which is better than 2%.

The size of the dead space volume should not be chosen to be too small or too large compared to the tidal volume. If it is too small the required changes in the Pet value will be small and lead to unwanted information loss. If it is too large, then the first two breaths used in the analysis could extend beyond the linear portion of the rising Pet trajectory. We have found that DV/TV= 0.1-0.25 is an adequate range for measuring FRC.

The calculation of FRC from ELV is based on a comprehensive study [7] of a large group of healthy subjects and is also supported by other work [9,10]. The relationship between ELV and FRC is very well defined and shows a remarkable independence of anthropometric and physiological parameters. This could be understood as an expression of common intrinsic characteristics across individuals such as the average thickness of the lung tissue volume associated with the solution/dissolution of carbon dioxide.

The major and most challenging contributor to the variability in the FRC data is irregular breathing. Test conditions and procedures that favor regular breathing are therefore of essence. However, precision can be much improved by repeating the measurement and using average values instead of single observations. With only two values averaged, SD is reduced to 0.38 l when comparing to the reference method with a percentage error of PE=0.23 indicating that the methods could be exchangeable [11].

In the present study we have chosen to repeat the measurement only once and after 15 minutes, to ascertain that the gas exchange changes introduced by the first measurement had no influence on the second. However, since only two breaths are needed to obtain the ELV value, the gas exchange balance will not be significantly disrupted and so we eestimate that the rebreathing maneuver could be repeated about every 30 seconds.

Conclusions

FRC is measured with good absolute accuracy when compared to the established technique of single-breath helium dilution. The very short measuring time allows averaging repeated measurements and to obtain satisfactory precision. The performance and the simplicity of the method could make it attractive both in the pre-operative and post-operative setting and potentially also in out of hospital environments.

References

[1] Ferguson MK. (1999) Preoperative Assessment of Pulmonary Risk. Chest 115; 5 : Suppl. 58S-63S https://doi.org/10.1378/chest.115.suppl_2.58S

[2] Wanger J., et al. (2005). "Standardisation of the measurement of lung volumes." *European Respiratory Journal*, 26(3), 511–522. https://doi.org/10.1183/09031936.05.00035005

[3] Robinson P.D., et al. (2013). "Consensus statement for inert gas washout measurement using multiple- and single-breath tests." *European Respiratory Journal*, 41(3), 507–522. https://doi.org/10.1183/09031936.00069712

[4] Kauczor H.U., et al. (2011). "Imaging of the lungs: a practical guide." *Respiration*, 82(5), 401-410. https://doi.org/10.1159/000330374

[5] Burns CB, Scheinhorn DJ. Evaluation of single-breath helium dilution total lung capacity in obstructive lung disease. (1984) Am Rev Respir Dis 130;4: 580-583 doi: 10.1164/arrd.1984.130.4.580.

[6] Gedeon A. Swedish Patent SE 545548 (2023)

[7] Crapo RO, Morris AH, Gardner RM. (1982) Reference values for pulmonary tissue volume, membrane diffusing capacity, and pulmonary capillary blood volume. Bull europ Physiopath resp. 18: 893-899

[8] Bland JM, Altman DG. (1986) Statistical methods for assessing agreement between two methods of clinical measurement. Lancet 8; 307-310.

[9] Hyde RW, Puy RJM, Raub WF, Forster RE, (1968) Rate of Disappearance of Labeled Carbon Dioxide from the Lungs of Humans during Breath Holding: a Method for Studying the Dynamics of Pulmonary C02 Exchange. J Clin Invest. 47; 1535-1552.

[10] Amstrong JO, Gluck EH, Crapo RO, Hazel AJ, Hughes JM. (1982) Lungtissue volume estimated by simultaneous radiographic and helium dilution methods. Thorax 37; 9: 676-679.

[11] Critchley L.A.H., Critchley J.A.J.H. A Meta-Analysis of Studies Using Bias and Precision Statistics to Compare Cardiac Output Measurement Techniques. J Clin Monit Comput (1999); 15, 85–91 (1999) https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1009982611386