Lung protection & Aveolar recruitment during lung isolation

Dr. Thao Giang, Heart Center,

Vietnam National Children's Hospital

No Conflict of Interest

Outline

- 1. Intraoperative PLV & one-lung ventilation
 - what's make it different
- 2. Mechanism of injuries in Lung Isolation
 - Ventilated lung & deflated lung
 - How to mitigate
- 3. PLV and ARM
 - unseparated couple

Intraoperative- Protective Lung Ventilation

- Cyclic tidal overdistention causing VILI
- Atelectrauma is the most concern

(not volume trauma or barotrauma as ARDS)

- Diaphragm dysfunction (atrophy)
- Surgical manipulation



1957 2024 2000 2015 2016 2023 ARDS net AMATO NEJM LUNG SAFE ESICM GUIDELINES AND BEYOND \bigcirc $\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{0}_2\\ \mathbf{C}\mathbf{0}_2 \end{array}$ 12-15 ml/kg Normalize P_{PLAT} to Gas 50 cmH₂0 Exchange **Clinical Practice** Superiority of VT $V_T = 7.6(7.5 - 7.7)$ Tailoring "Lower" VT 6 ml/kg PBW Construct ml/kg PBW (4-8 ml/kg V_T to **Dose-response** PPLAT = 23.2(22.6-23.7) PBW) is not Lung Size curve for V_T cmH₂O supported PPLAT (PBW) PPLAT measured in 40% by statistical ≤30 cmH₂0 of ventilated patients significance Minimize Construct Tailoring VILI Dose-response ΔP~15 cmH₂O V_T to curve for ΔP associated to Lung better clinical Role of Stress Function outcomes Index (C_{ST}) Role of Power

From: Finding the optimal tidal volume in acute respiratory distress syndrome

Timetable reporting changes of evidence guiding V_T and airway pressure settings to ensure proper mechanical ventilation in ARDS. The timetable goes from 1957, when ARDS was first defined until today. Abbreviations: *ARDS* acute respiratory distress syndrome, C_{RS} compliance of the respiratory system, C_{ST} static compliance, ΔP driving pressure, P_{PLAT} plateau pressure, *PBW* predicted body weight, V_T tidal volume

Pellegrinin, 2024: Intensive care Medecine

Intraoperative- Protective Lung Ventilation

PIP	= Flow x resistance + Pav
Resistance	= (PIP – Pplateau)/Vi
P mean	= 0,5 x (PIP–PEEP) x (Tisp/Ttotal) + PEEP
P plateau	= (Vt/Compliance) + PEEP





Figure 1 Schematic representation of the relationship between structures within the respiratory system. According to the equation of motion of the respiratory system. $P_{TOT}=P_{AW} + P_{MUS}(1)$. $P_{TOT} =$ $P_0+E_{RS}*V+R_{RS}*V'(2)$. since $P_{RS}=P_L + P_{CW}$, $E_{RS}=E_L + E_{CW}$ and the final equation can be written as. $p_{AW} + P_{MUS} = P_0 + E_{CW}*V + E_L*V + R_{RS}*V'(3)$. E_{CW} , chest wall elastance; E_L , lung elastance; E_{RS} , respiratory system elastance; P_{ATM} , atmospheric pressure; P_{AW} , airways pressure; P_0 , p_{AW} at the beginning of the ventilatory cycle; P_{CW} , pressure difference across the chest wall; P_L , transpulmonary pressure; P_{MUS} , respiratory muscles' generated-pressure; P_{PL} , pleural pressure; P_{RS} , pressure difference across the respiratory system; P_{TOT} , total pressure applied to the respiratory system; V, air volume; V', airflow.

Intraoperative- Protective Lung Ventilation

ANESTHESIOLOGY

Driving Pressure during Thoracic Surgery

A Randomized Clinical Trial

MiHye Park, M.D., Hyun Joo Ahn, M.D., Ph.D., Jie Ae Kim, M.D., Ph.D., Mikyung Yang, M.D., Ph.D., Burn Young Heo, M.D., Ph.D., Ji Won Choi, M.D., Ph.D., Yung Ri Kim, M.D., Sang Hyun Lee, M.D., Ph.D., HeeJoon Jeong, M.D., Soo Joo Choi, M.D., Ph.D., In Sun Song, M.D.

(ANESTHESIOLOGY 2019; 130:385-93)

ABSTRACT

Background: Recently, several retrospective studies have suggested that pulmonary complication is related with driving pressure more than any other ventilatory parameter. Thus, the authors compared driving pressure—guided ventilation with conventional protective ventilation in thoracic surgery, where lung protection is of the utmost importance. The authors hypothesized that driving pressure—guided ventilation decreases postoperative pulmonary complications more than conventional protective ventilation.

Methods: In this double-blind, randomized, controlled study, 292 patients scheduled for elective thoracic surgery were included in the analysis. The protective ventilation group (n = 147) received conventional protective ventilation during one-lung ventilation: tidal volume 6 ml/kg of ideal body weight, positive end-expiratory pressure (PEEP) 5 cm H_2O , and recruitment maneuver. The driving pressure group (n = 145) received the same tidal volume and recruitment, but with individualized PEEP which produces the lowest driving pressure (plateau pressure–PEEP) during one-lung ventilation. The primary outcome was postoperative pulmonary complications based on the Melbourne Group Scale (at least 4) until postoperative day 3.

Conventional PLV: FiO2 100% Vt=6ml/kg PEEP= 5 Tins pause 30% I:E=1:2 \updownarrow RR

Results: PPCs= 8/145 patients (5.5%) in ΔP group, 18 of 147 (12.2%) in the PLV group (P = 0.047, odds ratio 0.42; 95% Cl, 0.18 to 0.99).

What're we doing

Use of lung-protective strategies during one-lung ventilation surgery: a multi-institutional survey

Biniam Kidane^{1,2}, Stephen Choi³, Dalilah Fortin^{1,4,5}, Turlough O'Hare⁶, George Nicolaou⁷, Neal H. Badner⁷, Richard I. Inculet^{1,4}, Peter Slinger³, Richard A. Malthaner^{1,4}

¹Department of Surgery, Western University, London, Ontario, Canada; ²Department of Surgery, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada; ³Department of Anesthesia, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada; ⁴Division of Thoracic Surgery, Department of Surgery, ⁵Division of Critical Care Medicine, Department of Medicine, Western University, London, Ontario, Canada; ⁶Department of Anesthesia, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada; ⁷Department of Anesthesia & Perioperative Medicine, Western University, London, Ontario, Canada *Contributions*: (I) Conception and design: All authors; (II) Administrative support: All authors; (III) Provision of study materials or patients: All authors; (IV) Collection and assembly of data: B Kidane, S Choi; (V) Data analysis and interpretation: All authors; (VI) Manuscript writing: All authors; (VII) Final approval of manuscript: All authors.

Correspondence to: Biniam Kidane. 820 Sherbrook Street, GE-611, Winnipeg, Manitoba, R3A 1R9, Canada. Email: b.kidane@mail.utoronto.ca.

In 2018, at 3 high volume Canadian tertiary centers

(205-300 cases of lung cancer/year)

✓ Survey on anesthesiologists who perform OLV surgeries

Kidane B, Choi S, Fortin D, O'Hare T, Nicolaou G, Badner NH, Inculet RI, Slinger P, Malthaner RA. Use of lung-protective strategies during one-lung ventilation surgery: a multi-institutional survey. Ann Transl Med 2018;6(13):269. doi: 10.21037/atm.2018.06.02 **Results:** Seventy-five (63%) of 120 eligible respondents completed the survey. Although the critical care literature focuses on minimizing tidal volume (TV) as the central strategy of LPV, most respondents (89%, n=50/56) focused on minimizing peak airway pressure (PAP) as their primary strategy of intraoperative LPV. Only 64% (n=37/58) reported actively trying to minimize TV. While 32% (n=17/54) were unsure about the current evidence regarding LPV, 67% (n=36/54) believed that the evidence favoured their use during OLV. Perceived clinical and institutional barriers were the only predictors of reduced attempts to minimize TV with adjusted odds ratio of 0.1 (95% CI: 0.03–0.6).



When asked to rate in order of importance what defines LPV, the aggregate order placed minimization of PAP as most important followed by minimization of TV

1-> 4: the most important-> the least important

Mechanism of Injuries





Non-ventilated lung

- * Surgical trauma
- Ischemia-reperfusion
- Reexpansion
- * Decrease lymphatic drainage

Both lungs

- * Local hypoxia in collapsed areas
- * Oxidative stress
- * Positive fluid balance
- * Hyperperfusion capillary stress
- * Biotrauma
- * Surfactant deficit

Ventilated lung

VILI

Mechanism of Injuries

CARDIOVASCULAR ANESTHESIOLOGY: REVIEW ARTICLE

Lung Injury After One-Lung Ventilation A Review of the Pathophysiologic Mechanisms Affecting the Ventilated and the Collapsed Lung

Lohser, Jens MD, MSc, FRCPC^{*}; Slinger, Peter MD, FRCPC[†]

Author Information ${igodot}$

Anesthesia & Analgesia 121(2):p 302-318, August 2015. | DOI: 10.1213/ANE.000000000000808



Mechanism of Injuries

CARDIOVASCULAR ANESTHESIOLOGY: REVIEW ARTICLE

Lung Injury After One-Lung Ventilation

A Review of the Pathophysiologic Mechanisms Affecting the Ventilated and the Collapsed Lung

Lohser, Jens MD, MSc, FRCPC^{*}; Slinger, Peter MD, FRCPC[†]

Author Information⊗

Anesthesia & Analgesia 121(2):p 302-318, August 2015. | DOI: 10.1213/ANE.00000000000808

Collapsed lung Ventilated lung B Tissue MDA (nmoles/g) 100 * T T_ OLV OLV OLV Control OLV OLV OLV Control 60 120 180 120 60 180 MDA Plasma Procedure type П (nmoles/ml) Pneum 2-lobe Lobe Bx 20 0 ## # - 10 -10 - 20 -0 % change in Control OLV OLV OLV plasma Thiol 60 90 120

Oxidative stress

Bx = lung biopsy; Lobe = lobectomy; 2-lobe = bilobectomy; MDA = malondialdehyde; Pneum = pneumonectomy.

PLV implication in OLV

OLV in pig-model: more tidal recruitment during OLV, resulting in increased amounts of poorly aerated lung tissue on resumption of 2-lung ventilation (#P < 0.05; Vt 5 vs 10 mL/kg).

Kozian A, Schilling T, Schütze H, Senturk M, Hachenberg T, Hedenstierna G. Ventilatory protective strategies during thoracic surgery: effects of alveolar recruitment maneuver and low-tidal volume ventilation on lung density distribution. Anesthesiology 2011;114:1025–35



Intraoperative- Protective Lung Ventilation

BIOMEDICAL REPORTS 20: 73, 2024

Effects of tidal volume on physiology and clinical outcomes in patients with one-lung ventilation undergoing surgery: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials

JIE JIANG^{1,2}, FEIPING XIA¹, ZHONGHUA LU¹, YUYING TANG¹, HAIBO QIU³, YI YANG³ and FENGMEI GUO³

¹Department of Critical Care Medicine, School of Medicine, Southeast University, Nanjing, Jiangsu 210009; ²Department of Critical Care Medicine, Nanjing Central Hospital, Nanjing, Jiangsu 210018; ³Jiangsu Provincial Key Laboratory of Critical Care Medicine, Department of Critical Care Medicine, Zhongda Hospital, School of Medicine, Southeast University, Nanjing, Jiangsu 210009, P.R. China

Received May 8, 2023; Accepted February 16, 2024

DOI: 10.3892/br.2024.1761

A		L	ow VT		н	igh VT			Mean difference	Mean difference
	Study or subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
-	1.1.1 Low VT group									
	Lin 2008	209.3	55.7	20	269.4	57.2	20	22.7%	-60.10 [-95.09, -25.11]	
	Michelet 2006	91	41.48	26	189	123.7	26	17.4%	-98.00 [-148.15, -47.85]	+
	Subtotal (95% CI)			46			46	40.0%	-74.62 [-110.73, -38.51]	•
	Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	231.50; 0	Chi ² = '	1.48, df	= 1 (P =	: 0.22);	1 ² = 32 ⁴	%		
	Test for overall effect: Z = 4.05 (P < 0.0001)									
1.1.2 Low VT group with VT = 6 ml/kg										
	Ahn 2012	7.5	5.12	25	10.3	8.1	25	31.8%	-2.80 [-6.56, 0.96]	•
	Kim 2019	8.13	9.56	20	22.22	44.22	20	28.2%	-14.09 [-33.92, 5.74]	
	Subtotal (95% CI)			45			45	60.0%	-4.08 [-11.08, 2.93]	1
	Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	10.73; C	hi² = 1.	20, df =	= 1 (P =	0.27); F	² = 17%			
	Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.14	(P = 0.	25)						
	Total (95% CI)			91			91	100.0%	-35.51 [-66.47, -4.54]	٠
	Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	782.44; 0	Chi ² = 2	24.73, 0	df = 3 (P	< 0.00	01); l ² =	88%		
	Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.25	(P = 0.	02)						-500 -250 0 250 500
	Test for subgroup diffe	erences: ($Chi^2 = 1$	14.13; 0	if = 1 (P	= 0.000	02); l ² =	92.9%		Pavous Low VI Pavous High V
3		1	Low V	г	н	iah VT			Mean difference	Mean difference
	Study or subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV Bandom 95% CI	IV Bandom 95% CI
1	olday of subgroup	wica		Total	Wean	00	Total	Wolgin	rv, nandolli, oo ii ol	IV, Handoli, 55% Of
	Kim 2019	14	4 4	20	18	5	20	18.8%	-4.00 [-6.81, -1.19]	
	Marret 2018	14.1	1 4.7	172	22.7	5.6	171	24.7%	-8.60 [-9.69, -7.51]	
	Maslow 2013	13.6	5 4	16	22.8	4.5	16	18.3%	-9.20 [-12.15, -6.25]	
	Schilling 2005	19.4	4 7.3	16	19.4	4.7	16	13.8%	0.00 [-4.25, 4.25]	
	Yang 2011	13	3 3	50	19	3	50	24.5%	-6.00 [-7.18, -4.82]	•
	Total (95% CI)			274			273	100.0%	-6.02 [-8.32, -3.72]	•
Heterogeneity: $T_{PU}^2 = 5.27$; $Chi^2 = 27.89$, $df = 4$ ($P < 0.0001$); $l^2 = 96\%$										
	Test for overall effect: $7 = 5.13$ (P < 0.00001)								-20 -10 0 10 20	
			0 (.	0.000	0.)					Favours Low VT Favours High \
С	Louv/T Link//T Man difference							Mean difference	Mean difference	
	Study or subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Tota	Weight	IV. Random, 95% CI	IV. Bandom, 95% Cl
-	Jung 2014	312	24	30	289	41	30	31.0%	23 00 16 00 40 001	+
	Kim 2019	454	123	20	341	105	20	3.1%	113.00 [42.12. 183.88]	
	L in 2008	401	56	20	360	54	20	11.6%	41 00 [6 91 75 09]	
	Maslow 2013	255 7	148	16	240.2	140	16	1.6%	15.50 [-84.32, 115.32]	
	Qutub 2014	230	45.4	13	206	48	13	10.6%	24.00 [-11.92, 59.92]	+
	Shen 2013	326.35	34	53	292.85	28.74	48	42.1%	33.50 [21.26, 45.74]	•
	Total (95% CI)			152			147	100.0%	32 27 [19 54 45 01]	•
	Hotorogonoity: Tou? -	61 10.0	hi2 = 6	71 df-	5 (D -	0 24)- 1	2 = 250/	100.070	SELET [10:04, 40:01]	
	Test for everall effects	7 - 4 07	/P < 0	/ 1, uf =	- 5 (P = 1	0.24), 1	- 20%			-200 -100 0 100 200
	rest for overall effect:	2 = 4.9/	11 = 0.	00001)	25					Eavours High VT Eavours Low V

A: II-6 B: driving pressure C: P/F ratio

Intraoperative- Protective Lung Ventilation

Favor outcomes of: reduced risk of ALI, II-6 secretion, driving pressure, P/F oxygen

But not length of hospital stay

A	Low V	т	High \	/Т		Risk ratio	Risk	ratio
Study or subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	M-H, Rando	om, 95% Cl
Ahn 2012	1	25	4	25	7.4%	0.25 [0.03, 2.08]		
Marret 2018	11	172	19	171	65.2%	0.58 [0.28, 1.17]	-	
Michelet 2006	3	26	6	26	20.3%	0.50 [0.14, 1.79]	-	-
Qutub 2014	0	13	0	13		Not estimable		
Yang 2011	1	50	4	50	7.1%	0.25 [0.03, 2.16]		-
Total (95% CI)		286		285	100.0%	0.50 [0.28, 0.88]	•	
Total events	16		33					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	= 0.00; Chi ²	= 0.97	df = 3 (F	9 = 0.81	1); l ² = 0%			10 1000
Test for overall effect	: Z = 2.39 (I	P = 0.0	2)		n • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		Favours Low VT	Favours High VT

В	Experimental			Control			Mean difference		Mean difference
Study or subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
9.1.1 Low VT group v	with VT <	6 ml/	kg						
Marret 2018	11	4.4	172	12	5.2	171	30.1%	-1.00 [-2.02, 0.02]	
Maslow 2013	5.6	1.4	16	7.1	5	16	4.8%	-1.50 [-4.04, 1.04]	
Qutub 2014	7	1.5	13	7	1.5	13	23.5%	0.00 [-1.15, 1.15]	+
Shen 2013	9.4	3.6	53	10.9	4.7	48	11.6%	-1.50 [-3.15, 0.15]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			254			248	70.0%	-0.78 [-1.45, -0.11]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 2.98, df = 3 (P = 0.39); l ² = 0%									
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.29 (P = 0.02)									
9.1.2 Low VT group with VT = 6 ml/kg									
Ahn 2012	7	3	25	7	3	25	11.3%	0.00 [-1.66, 1.66]	
Yang 2011	7.8	3.1	50	7.7	3.5	50	18.6%	0.10 [-1.20, 1.40]	+
Subtotal (95% CI)			75			75	30.0%	0.06 [-0.96, 1.08]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.00; Ch	j² = 0.0)1, df =	= 1 (P =	0.93)	; $ ^2 = 0^4$	%		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.12	(P = 0	.91)						
Total (95% CI)			329			323	100.0%	-0.53 [-1.09, 0.03]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 4.82, df = 5 (P = 0.44); l ² = 0%									
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.85 (P = 0.06) -10 -5 0 5							-10 -5 0 5 10		
Test for subgroup diffe	rences: C	hi ² = 1	.83; df	= 1 (P =	0.18); $ ^2 = 4$	5.4%		Favours low vi Favours high vi

A: risk of ALI B: length of hospital stay

ANESTHESIOLOGY

Hypoxemia in Young Children Undergoing One-lung Ventilation: A Retrospective Cohort Study

T. Wesley Templeton, M.D., Scott A. Miller, M.D., Lisa K. Lee, M.D., M.S., Sachin Kheterpal, M.D., M.B.A., Michael R. Mathis, M.D., Eduardo J. Goenaga-Díaz, M.D., Leah B. Templeton, M.D., Amit K. Saha, Ph.D.; for the Multicenter Perioperative Outcomes Group Investigators* *Anesthesiology 2021; 135:842–53*

Results: Three hundred six cases from 15 institutions were included for analysis. Hypoxemia and severe hypoxemia occurred in 81 of 306 (26%) patients and 56 of 306 (18%), respectively. Hypercarbia occurred in 153 of 306 (50%). Factors associated with lower risk of hypoxemia in multivariable analysis included left operative side (odds ratio, 0.45 [95% Cl, 0.251 to 0.78]) and bronchial blocker use (odds ratio, 0.351 [95% Cl, 0.177 to 0.67]). Additionally, use of a bronchial blocker was associated with a reduced risk of severe hypoxemia (odds ratio, 0.290 [95% Cl, 0.125 to 0.62]).

Conclusions: Use of a bronchial blocker was associated with a lower risk of hypoxemia in young children undergoing one-lung ventilation.

ABSTRACT

Background: One-lung ventilation in children remains a specialized practice with low case numbers even at tertiary centers, preventing an assessment of best practices. The authors hypothesized that certain case factors may be associated with a higher risk of intraprocedural hypoxemia in children undergoing thoracic surgery and one-lung ventilation.

Methods: The Multicenter Perioperative Outcomes database and a local quality improvement database were queried for documentation of onelung ventilation in children 2 months to 3 yr of age inclusive between 2010 and 2020. Patients undergoing vascular or other cardiac procedures were p excluded. All records were reviewed electronically for the presence of hypoxemia, oxygen saturation measured by pulse oximetry (Spo.) less than 90% for 3 min or more continuously, and severe hypoxemia, Spo, less than 90% for 5 min or more continuously during one-lung ventilation. Records were also assessed for hypercarbia, end-tidal CO, greater than 60 mmHg for 5 min or more or a Paco, greater than 60 on arterial blood gas. Covariates assessed for association with these outcomes included age, weight, American Society of Anesthesiologists (Schaumburg, Illinois) Physical Status 3 or greater, duration of one-lung ventilation, preoperative Spo, less than 98%, bronchial blocker versus endobronchial intubation, left operative side, video-assisted thoracoscopic surgery, lower tidal volume ventilation (tidal volume less than or equal to 6 ml/kg plus positive end expiratory pressure greater than or equal to 4 cm H₀O for more than 80% of the duration of one-lung ventilation), and type of



Overview of OLV

Table 2. St	immary of	Strategies for OLV in Infants and Young Child	ren
Strategy for OLV	Appropriate Age	Advantages	Disadvantages
Endobronchial intubation	<5 y	 Easy to perform No special blocker or tube required Can be performed blindly, with fiberoptic assistance or under fluoroscopy Good quality isolation 	 Difficult to change to two-lung ventilation ETT can become occluded with blood and/or secretions Easy to occlude right upper lobe bronchus with right-sided endobronchial intubation
Bronchial blocker	All age groups	 Technique of choice in young children with a difficult airway High quality of isolation Rapidly change from OLV to two-lung ventilation Appropriate for all ages depending on size and type of blocker Intra or extraluminal use Appropriate for children with a tracheostomy Can be used in combination with a supraglottic airway 	 Inability to suction nonventilated lung or apply CPAP Can be technically challenging to position CPAP to nonventilated lung may be ineffective Can be easily dislodged as a result of surgical manipulation
Univent tube	>8 y	 High quality of isolation May be more positionally stable than a bronchial blocker Easy to change from OLV to two-lung ventilation 	 Appropriate for children ≥8 y of age Smaller ventilating lumen relative to patient size may lead to increased resistance
Double lumen tube	>8 y	 Usually straight forward to position High quality of isolation Positionally stable Easy to change from OLV to two-lung ventilation Can suction and apply CPAP to nonventilated lung 	 Appropriate for children ≥8 y of age Potentially increased rates of glottic or tracheal injury Not appropriate in most children with a difficult airway

See Supplemental Digital Content, Table 1, http://links.lww.com/AA/D159, for the indications for OLV in children. Abbreviations: CPAP, continuous positive airway pressure; ETT, endotracheal tube; OLV, one-lung ventilation.

An Update on one lung ventilation in children-Anesthesia & Analgesia <u>132(5):p 1389-1399, May 2021.</u> Templeton, T. Wesley MD*; Piccioni, Federico MD⁺; Chatterjee, Debnath MD, FAAP[‡]

Surgical manipulation

- But it's the unavoided things!
- Just sure to be aware of this & MIS



PLV implication in OLV

Mechanisms of lung injury	Evidence	Author's suggestions
Surgical trauma	Lung injury to the operated lung is proportional to the surgical aggression	Consider minimally invasive and video-assisted surgery whenever possible
Ischemia– reperfusion (I–R) Oxidative stress	Lung injury to the operated lung caused by I–R and oxidative stress are well-known problems during and after OLV	Decrease OLV time; use the lowest $\rm FiO_2$ possible; re-expand the operated lung with a low $\rm FiO_2$
East lung re-	Abrupt and fact re-expansion of the operated lung with high driving	Re-expand the operated lung with a ventilator instead of a bag using a
expansion after OLV	pressures and volumes increases the stress in lung tissue	controlled cyclic step-wise and slow recruitment maneuver similar to the alveolar recruitment strategy
Local hypoxia by atelectasis	A mild inflammatory response develops locally in collapsed areas of the lungs	Decrease OLV time
		Treat lung collapse in the ventilated lung by a recruitment maneuver
Positive fluid balance	Excess of intravascular fluid is an independent risk factor for ARDS in patients undergoing thoracic surgeries	Apply goal-directed fluid therapy keeping normal cardiac output and oxygen delivered at the lowest amount of i.v fluids possible
		Low doses of vasoactive drugs help maintain a neutral fluid balance in case of vasodilation
		Consider inhaled B2 agents to decrease pulmonary edema
		Consider hydrocortisone to preserve the endothelial glycocalix
Capillary stress failure	Hyperperfusion of lung tissue caused by OLV, vascular clamping and declamping, and excess of inotropic vasoactive drugs injures the alveolar-capillary membrane	Perform vascular clamping and declamping slowly and avoid high doses of inotropic and vasoactive drugs
VILI	Tidal recruitment and overdistension is the main causes of VILI	Apply a goal-directed ventilatory strategy that consists of an active recruitment maneuver and sufficiently high PEEP (10 \pm 2 cm H_2O) to keep the lungs open
		Ventilate the open lung with a protective pattern at very low VTs (4 mL/kg) and low plateau pressures

Tusman G, Bohm SH, Suarez-Sipmann F. Alveolar Recruitment Maneuvers for One-Lung Ventilation During Thoracic Anesthesia. *Curr Anesthesiol Rep*. 2014;4(2):160-169

PLV & ARM



Contraindications for RMs:

- hemodynamic instability
- COPD and lung emphysema
- bronchopleural fistula
- acute cor pulmonale.

Relative contraindications: 7 ICP

- When?
- How to do?
- How to evaluate it's efficacy

Comparative Study > Crit Care Med. 2011 May;39(5):1074-81.

doi: 10.1097/CCM.0b013e318206d69a.

Tatiana Marc

John J Marin

Affiliations -

PMID: 21263

Impact
recruit· Minerva Anestesiol. 2013 Jun;79(6):590-603. Epub 2013 Feb 28.biocheThe immune response to one-lung-ventilation is not
affected by repeated alveolar recruitmentPedro L SilvaAnesthesiology. 2011 May;114(5):1025-35. doi: 10.1097/ALN.0b013e3182164356.

Ventilatory protective strategies during thoracic
 Affiliat
 PMID:
 Ventilatory protective strategies during thoracic
 surgery: effects of alveolar recruitment maneuver
 and low-tidal volume ventilation on lung density
 distribution

Alf Kozian ¹, Thomas Schilling, Hartmut Schütze, Mert Senturk, Thomas Hachenberg, Göran Hedenstierna

Affiliations + expand PMID: 21436678 DOI: 10.1097/ALN.0b013e3182164356

- When?
 - After intubation
 - ? Not right before OLV: risk of quality of collapsed lung
 - Lung recruitment and PEEP titration should be repeated in case of deteriorating oxygenation, but not routinely

- How to do?
 - Stepwise increasing PEEP
 - Use programmed ARM in anesthesia machine
 - Prolonged RM can benefit the lung

Intensive Care Med (2011) 37:1572–1574 DOI 10.1007/s00134-011-2329-7

EDITORIAL

- How to do?

John J. Marini

Recruitment by sustained inflation: time for a change

Marini, J.J. Recruitment by sustained inflation: time for a change. *Intensive Care Med* **37**, 1572–1574 (2011). https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-011-2329-7



Figure 1: Setting of a sustained inflation RM using the P/V Tool

Figure 2: The volume increase during the pause represents the volume of lung that was reaerated

P/V Tool® Pro on Hamilton Medical ventilators

ARM-PEEP



PEEP (cmH2O)

12

20

18

16

Recruitment

phase



How to evaluate it's efficacy:

- Maximum volume change from end-expiratory
- Elastance: decrease (if over-distention Δ El positive)
- Trans-pulm pressure: peak, mean
- Maybe have role of Lung Ultrasound

My key points:

- Use Bronchial Blocker for lung isolation in children
- PLV while one lung ventilation, manage to reduce duration of OLV
- Tailoring ARM & PLV for individual patient

Thank you for listening!