ISSN: 0975-3583,0976-2833 VOL15, ISSUE 3, 2024

ORIGINAL RESEARCH

Evaluating Various Modes of Ventilation during Cardiopulmonary Bypass and its Postoperative effect on Pulmonary Dysfunction

Dr. Saurabh Gupta[1], Dr. Nabeel Ahmed Hashmi[2], Dr. Sachin Dev[3], Dr. Dushyant Pal Singh[4]

[1]Assistant Professor, Department of Cardiac Anaesthesia, Mahatma Gandhi Medical College, Jaipur.

[2]Associate Professor, Department of General Medicine, People's College of Medical Sciences and Research Centre, Bhopal, M.P.

[3]Professor and HOD, Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, PDM Dental College and Research Institute, Bahadurgarh.

[4]Assistant Professor, Department of Dentistry, Government Medical College, Chittorgarh.

Corresponding Author:Dr. Dushyant Pal Singh
dushyantsinghjadoun@gmail.com

Received: 20th Feb, 2024 Accepted: 16th March, 2024 Published: 27th March 2024

Abstract:

Background: Cardiopulmonary bypass (CPB) is a crucial component of cardiac surgery, yet it often leads to postoperative pulmonary dysfunction (PPD). Various modes of ventilation during CPB have been employed, but their comparative effects on PPD remain unclear.

Materials and Methods: This study aimed to compare different modes of ventilation—namely, conventional ventilation (CV) and protective ventilation (PV)—during CPB and assess their impact on PPD. A total of 100 patients undergoing cardiac surgery were randomly assigned to either the CV group or the PV group. Demographic data, intraoperative variables, and postoperative outcomes were recorded. PPD was assessed through pulmonary function tests (PFTs) postoperatively.

Results: In the CV group, PPD was observed in 45% of patients, with a mean reduction in forced vital capacity (FVC) of 25% and forced expiratory volume in one second (FEV1) of 30%. Contrastingly, in the PV group, PPD occurred in only 20% of patients, with a mean reduction in FVC of 15% and FEV1 of 20%. The incidence of pneumonia was also significantly lower in the PV group ($p < 0.05$).

Conclusion: Protective ventilation during CPB appears to mitigate the incidence and severity of postoperative pulmonary dysfunction compared to conventional ventilation. Employing protective ventilation strategies may contribute to improved postoperative outcomes and reduced pulmonary complications following cardiac surgery.

Keywords: Cardiopulmonary bypass, ventilation modes, postoperative pulmonary dysfunction, protective ventilation, conventional ventilation.

Introduction

Cardiopulmonary bypass (CPB) is a fundamental technique in cardiac surgery, facilitating temporary cessation of heart and lung function to enable surgical interventions (1). Despite its utility, CPB is associated with various complications, including postoperative pulmonary dysfunction (PPD), which significantly impacts patient outcomes (2).

ISSN: 0975-3583,0976-2833 VOL15, ISSUE 3, 2024

PPD encompasses a spectrum of pulmonary complications, ranging from atelectasis to acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS), and is a leading cause of morbidity and mortality following cardiac surgery (3). Factors contributing to PPD include the inflammatory response induced by CPB, mechanical ventilation strategies during surgery, and patient-related factors (4).

Ventilation strategies during CPB play a pivotal role in modulating the extent of pulmonary injury and subsequent dysfunction. Conventional ventilation (CV), characterized by high tidal volumes and low positive end-expiratory pressure (PEEP), has been the traditional approach (5). However, emerging evidence suggests that protective ventilation (PV), utilizing lower tidal volumes and higher levels of PEEP, may confer advantages in mitigating lung injury and improving postoperative outcomes (6).

This study aims to compare the effects of CV and PV during CPB on the incidence and severity of PPD following cardiac surgery. By elucidating the differential impact of ventilation modes on pulmonary function, this research seeks to inform clinical practice and enhance perioperative management strategies to minimize pulmonary complications in cardiac surgery patients.

Materials and Methods

Study Design: This study was conducted as a prospective randomized controlled trial at a tertiary care cardiac surgery center. Written informed consent was obtained from all participants.

Participants: A total of 100 adult patients scheduled for elective cardiac surgery requiring CPB were enrolled in the study. Patients with preexisting pulmonary disease, significant renal dysfunction, or contraindications to specific ventilation strategies were excluded.

Randomization and Group Allocation: Patients were randomly assigned to either the conventional ventilation (CV) group or the protective ventilation (PV) group using computer-generated randomization. Allocation concealment was ensured through sequentially numbered opaque sealed envelopes opened just before surgery.

Anesthesia and Surgical Procedure: Standardized anesthesia protocols were followed for all patients. Cardiopulmonary bypass was instituted using a standard technique. During CPB, patients in the CV group received conventional ventilation with tidal volumes of 8–10 ml/kg ideal body weight and PEEP of 3–5 cm H2O. In contrast, patients in the PV group were ventilated with protective strategies, including tidal volumes of 6 ml/kg ideal body weight and PEEP of 8–10 cm H2O.

Data Collection: Demographic characteristics, comorbidities, intraoperative variables (such as duration of CPB, aortic cross-clamp time), and perioperative hemodynamic parameters were recorded. Postoperative pulmonary function tests (PFTs), including forced vital capacity (FVC) and forced expiratory volume in one second (FEV1), were performed within 24 hours of surgery.

Outcome Measures: The primary outcome measure was the incidence of postoperative pulmonary dysfunction (PPD), defined as a reduction in FVC and/or FEV1 of more than 20% from baseline. Secondary outcomes included the incidence of pulmonary complications (e.g., pneumonia, atelectasis) and duration of mechanical ventilation.

ISSN: 0975-3583,0976-2833 VOL15, ISSUE 3, 2024

Statistical Analysis: Data were analyzed using appropriate statistical tests, including Student's t-test for continuous variables and chi-square test for categorical variables. A p-value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant. Analysis was performed using SPSS version 23.0 (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY, USA).

Results

Participant Characteristics:

The study included 100 patients undergoing elective cardiac surgery, with 50 patients allocated to each group. Demographic characteristics and baseline variables were comparable between the two groups (Table 1).

Characteristic	Conventional Ventilation Group	Protective Ventilation Group
Age (years), Mean ± SD	62.4 ± 8.1	63.2 ± 7.5
Gender (Male/Female)	30/20	28/22
Body Mass Index (kg/m^2), Mean ± SD	27.5 ± 3.2	26.8 ± 2.9
Comorbidities (n)		
- Hypertension	25	27
- Diabetes Mellitus	15	14
- Coronary Artery Disease	40	38

Intraoperative Variables:

Intraoperative parameters, including duration of cardiopulmonary bypass (CPB) and aortic cross-clamp time, were similar between the CV and PV groups (Table 2).

Intraoperative Variable	Conventional Ventilation Group	Protective Ventilation Group
CPB Duration (min), Mean ± SD	102.5 ± 15.3	101.8 ± 14.9
Aortic Cross-Clamp Time (min), Mean ± SD	58.3 ± 8.7	57.9 ± 9.1

Postoperative Outcomes:

The incidence of postoperative pulmonary dysfunction (PPD) was significantly lower in the PV group compared to the CV group (20% vs. 45%, p < 0.05). Additionally, patients in the PV group demonstrated less severe reductions in forced vital capacity (FVC) and forced expiratory volume in one second (FEV1) compared to the CV group (Table 3).

ISSN: 0975-3583,0976-2833 VOL15, ISSUE 3, 2024

Outcome Measure	Conventional Ventilation Group	Protective Ventilation Group
PPD Incidence (%)	45	20
Mean Reduction in FVC (%)	25	15
Mean Reduction in FEV1 (%)	30	20

Furthermore, the incidence of postoperative pulmonary complications, such as pneumonia and atelectasis, was lower in the PV group compared to the CV group (Table 4).

Pulmonary Complication	Conventional Ventilation Group	Protective Ventilation Group
Pneumonia (n)	12	5
Atelectasis (n)	8	3

Duration of Mechanical Ventilation:

Patients in the PV group had a shorter duration of mechanical ventilation compared to the CV group (Table 5).

Duration of Mechanical Ventilation (hours), Mean ± SD	Conventional Ventilation Group	Protective Ventilation Group
8.3 ± 1.2	6.7 ± 0.9	

SD: Standard Deviation

Note: Statistical significance was determined at $p < 0.05$ using appropriate tests.

Discussion

Postoperative pulmonary dysfunction (PPD) is a significant concern following cardiac surgery, contributing to increased morbidity and mortality rates (1). In this study, we investigated the impact of different ventilation strategies during cardiopulmonary bypass (CPB) on the incidence and severity of PPD. Our findings suggest that protective ventilation (PV) during CPB is associated with a reduced incidence and severity of PPD compared to conventional ventilation (CV).

The observed benefits of PV in mitigating PPD align with previous studies demonstrating the advantages of protective ventilation strategies in various clinical settings (2). By utilizing lower tidal volumes and higher levels of positive end-expiratory pressure (PEEP), PV aims to minimize ventilator-induced lung injury and reduce the inflammatory response associated with mechanical ventilation (3). Our results support the notion that these protective measures during CPB contribute to improved postoperative pulmonary outcomes.

ISSN: 0975-3583,0976-2833 VOL15, ISSUE 3, 2024

The reduction in PPD incidence and severity in the PV group may be attributed to several factors. Firstly, the use of lower tidal volumes reduces the risk of alveolar overdistension and barotrauma, thereby preserving lung integrity (4). Additionally, higher levels of PEEP help maintain alveolar recruitment and prevent atelectasis, which is common during CPB and contributes to postoperative pulmonary complications (5).

The observed decrease in the incidence of pulmonary complications, such as pneumonia and atelectasis, further underscores the clinical significance of PV in reducing postoperative morbidity. Pneumonia, in particular, is a major contributor to postoperative complications following cardiac surgery and is associated with prolonged hospital stays and increased healthcare costs (6).

The shorter duration of mechanical ventilation observed in the PV group is consistent with previous studies demonstrating the benefits of protective ventilation in facilitating earlier extubation and recovery of pulmonary function (7). This not only improves patient comfort but also reduces the risk of ventilator-associated complications, such as ventilator-associated pneumonia and ventilator-induced lung injury (8).

While our study provides valuable insights into the benefits of PV during CPB, several limitations should be acknowledged. Firstly, the study was conducted at a single center, which may limit the generalizability of our findings. Additionally, the sample size was relatively small, warranting larger multicenter trials to validate our results. Furthermore, long-term outcomes, such as mortality and length of hospital stay, were not assessed in this study and merit further investigation.

Conclusion

In conclusion, our study suggests that protective ventilation during CPB is associated with a reduced incidence and severity of postoperative pulmonary dysfunction compared to conventional ventilation. These findings highlight the importance of optimizing ventilation strategies during cardiac surgery to improve postoperative outcomes and reduce pulmonary complications.

References

1. Al-Sarraf N, Thalib L, Hughes A, et al. Cross-clamp time is an independent predictor of mortality and morbidity in low- and high-risk cardiac patients. Int J Surg. 2011;9(1):104-9.
2. Serpa Neto A, Hemmes SNT, Barbas CSV, et al. Protective versus conventional ventilation for surgery: a systematic review and individual patient data meta-analysis. Anesthesiology. 2015;123(1):66-78.
3. Amato MBP, Barbas CSV, Medeiros DM, et al. Beneficial effects of the "open lung approach" with low distending pressures in acute respiratory distress syndrome: a prospective randomized study on mechanical ventilation. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 1995;152(6 Pt 1):1835-46.
4. Amato MBP, 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.
5. Tusman G, Böhm SH, Vazquez de Anda GF, et al. Alveolar recruitment strategy increases arterial oxygenation during one-lung ventilation. Ann Thorac Surg. 2002;73(4):1204-9.

ISSN: 0975-3583,0976-2833 VOL15, ISSUE 3, 2024

6. Cislaghi F, Condemi AM, Corona A, et al. The impact of pneumonia on intensive care unit mortality in patients undergoing cardiac surgery. Chest. 2012;141(4):1025-30.
7. Futier E, Constantin JM, Paugam-Burtz C, et al. A trial of intraoperative low-tidal-volume ventilation in abdominal surgery. N Engl J Med. 2013;369(5):428-37.
8. Slutsky AS, Ranieri VM. Ventilator-induced lung injury. N Engl J Med. 2013;369(22):2126-36.