

POSTER PRESENTATION

Open Access

Lung protective vs. standard ventilation during laparoscopic surgery in obese patients. preliminary results of a randomized, controlled trial

DL Grieco^{1*}, A Russo¹, MS Vallecoccia¹, L Polidori¹, B Costantini², V Simili¹, F Varone³, G Scambia², E Marana¹, M Antonelli¹

From ESICM LIVES 2015

Berlin, Germany. 3-7 October 2015

Introduction

Two different papers published recently suggested the use of a comprehensive strategy providing low tidal volumes, peep and recruiting maneuvers in patients undergoing open abdominal surgery (1,2). It is unknown whether such ventilatory approach may be feasible in patients undergoing laparoscopy, as pneumoperitoneum and Trendelenburg position may alter lung volumes and chest-wall elastance.

Objectives

We designed an open-label randomized, controlled trial to assess the effect of a lung-protective ventilation strategy in obese patients undergoing laparoscopic surgery.

Methods

ASA status I-II morbidly obese patients (BMI > 35) undergoing gynecological laparoscopic surgery were randomly assigned to intraoperative volume-controlled protective (TV 6 ml/kg IBW, peep 10, recruiting maneuvers) (PV) or standard (TV 10 ml/kg IBW, peep 5) ventilation (SV). An esophageal catheter was placed to estimate pleural pressure and compute transpulmonary pressure. Results are expressed as median [interquartile range].

Results

Twelve patients were enrolled (age 62 [57-67], BMI 44 [39-48], IBW 52 [46-58], length of surgery 185 [165-209] minutes).

Intraoperative PaO₂/FiO₂ was not different between groups (p = 0.33), whereas mean PaCO₂ and respiratory

rate were lower and mean pH was higher in SV patients (35 [34-36] vs. 41 [37-42], p = 0.05; 14 mmHg [13-17] vs. 25 mmHg [21-27], p = 0.04; 7.42 [7.40-7.43] vs. 7.37 [7.36-7.39], p = 0.01). During pneumoperitoneum, patient in PV group showed a lower transpulmonary driving pressure (8.5 [7-10] cmH₂O vs. 14 [12.5-20] cmH₂O, p = 0.007) and a trend to a higher lung compliance (40 [36-57] ml/cmH₂O vs. 29 [19-40] ml/cmH₂O, p = 0.08). During pneumoperitoneum, in none of the two groups positive end expiratory pressure was able to generate a positive transpulmonary end-expiratory pressure (PV -1 [-5-0] cmH₂O and SV -6 [-10 - -4] cmH₂O). PaO₂/FiO₂, respiratory rate, PaCO₂ and pH 1 hour and one day after extubation were not different between groups. Comparison of pulmonary function tests at day 2 showed similar FEV₁ and FEV₁/FVC ratio, while a higher percentage of predicted forced vital capacity was detected in patients of SV group (100% [83-110] vs. 78% [71-88]; p = 0.04).

Conclusions

Preliminary results of the present randomized controlled trial indicate that a comprehensive lung-protective strategy providing low tidal volumes, higher peep and recruiting maneuvers during laparoscopic surgery in obese patients, despite optimizing intraoperative respiratory mechanics, may not yield a relevant benefit on postoperative oxygenation and respiratory function.

Authors' details

¹Catholic University of Rome, Anesthesiology and Intensive Care Medicine, Rome, Italy. ²Catholic University of Rome, Gynaecology and Obstetrics, Rome, Italy. ³Catholic University of Rome, Pulmonary Medicine, Rome, Italy.

Published: 1 October 2015

¹Catholic University of Rome, Anesthesiology and Intensive Care Medicine, Rome, Italy

Full list of author information is available at the end of the article

References

1. Severgnini P, Selmo G, Lanza C, *et al*: Protective mechanical ventilation during general anesthesia for open abdominal surgery improves postoperative pulmonary function. *Anesthesiology* 2013, **118**:1307.
2. Futier E, Constantin J-M, Paugam-Burtz C, *et al*: A trial of intraoperative low-tidal-volume ventilation in abdominal surgery. *N Engl J Med* 2013, **369**:428-3.

doi:10.1186/2197-425X-3-S1-A683

Cite this article as: Grieco *et al*: Lung protective vs. standard ventilation during laparoscopic surgery in obese patients. preliminary results of a randomized, controlled trial. *Intensive Care Medicine Experimental* 2015 **3** (Suppl 1):A683.

Submit your manuscript to a SpringerOpen[®] journal and benefit from:

- ▶ Convenient online submission
- ▶ Rigorous peer review
- ▶ Immediate publication on acceptance
- ▶ Open access: articles freely available online
- ▶ High visibility within the field
- ▶ Retaining the copyright to your article

Submit your next manuscript at ▶ springeropen.com
