

CORRESPONDENCE

Open Access



# Can fluid responsiveness tests utilizing positive end-expiratory pressure changes be adapted to improve applicability in all mechanically ventilated patients?

Camilo Pérez<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Laura Castillo<sup>1,2</sup> and Jorge Alvarado<sup>1,3</sup>

We were enthusiastic about reading the article by Lai et al. which cleverly predicts fluid responsiveness in low tidal volume ventilated patients by utilizing changes in positive end-expiratory pressure (PEEP) on cardiac output [1]. We applaud the authors for demonstrating once again the effect of PEEP on the performance of fluid responsiveness tests.

However, we want to highlight certain limitations of the study, such as the inclusion of only low tidal volume ventilated patients with PEEP greater than 10 cmH<sub>2</sub>O, who mostly presented low respiratory system compliance. This narrows down the applicability of the results and adds to the long list of variables that affect fluid responsiveness tests, such as spontaneous efforts, tidal volume, lung and chest wall elastance, recruited volume, cardiac function, and heart rate, among others [2]. Although the study results are positive, it is still unclear whether a test based on these principles can be useful for all mechanically ventilated patients. It is likely that this

is not possible, prompting us to question the possibility of adjusting the cutoff points of these tests based on the aforementioned variables to make them useful for the majority of patients.

If we assume that changes in stroke volume during the respiratory cycle are caused by changes in transpulmonary pressure (PL) and pleural pressure (Ppl) [2, 3], we can draw some conclusions. Previous research has shown that changes in transpulmonary pressure related to alterations in positive end-expiratory pressure (PEEP) are proportional to increases in PEEP [4]. Therefore:

$$\Delta PL = \Delta PEEP$$

$$\Delta PL = PEEP_{\text{High}} - PEEP_{\text{Low}}$$

Assuming that transpulmonary pressure (PL) is the difference between plateau pressure (Paw) and pleural pressure (Ppl) ( $PL = Paw - Ppl$ ) and that driving pressure (DP) is the difference between Paw and PEEP ( $DP = Paw - PEEP$ ), we can draw some conclusions:

$$\Delta PL = \Delta Paw - \Delta Ppl$$

$$\Delta Ppl = \Delta Paw - \Delta PL$$

$$\Delta Ppl = \Delta Paw - \Delta PEEP$$

$$\Delta Ppl = (Paw_{\text{High}} - Paw_{\text{Low}}) - (PEEP_{\text{High}} - PEEP_{\text{Low}})$$

This comment refers to the article available online at <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13054-023-04424-7>.

\*Correspondence:

Camilo Pérez  
perezcamilo35@gmail.com

<sup>1</sup> Critical and Intensive Care Medicine Department, Hospital Universitario Fundación Santa Fe de Bogotá, Bogotá, Colombia

<sup>2</sup> School of Medicine and Health Sciences, Universidad del Rosario, Bogotá, Colombia

<sup>3</sup> Department of Physiology, National University of Colombia, Bogotá, Colombia



© The Author(s) 2023. **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>. The Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication waiver (<http://creativecommons.org/publicdomain/zero/1.0/>) applies to the data made available in this article, unless otherwise stated in a credit line to the data.

$$\Delta P_{pl} = (P_{aw_{High}} - PEEP_{High}) - (P_{aw_{Low}} - PEEP_{Low})$$

$$\Delta P_{pl} = DP_{High} - DP_{Low}$$

$$\Delta P_{pl} = \Delta DP$$

Although the study did not find a correlation between the recruitment-to-inflation ratio and the hemodynamic changes after the PEEP test, it is important to note that this ratio is not a direct measure of the change in lung volume at end-expiration but rather evaluates the probability of recruitment [5]. Additionally, the study did not have sufficient statistical power to test the correlation between the magnitude of the increase in the cardiac index and the change in PEEP. Therefore, it is possible that there is a correlation that was not detected by the study due to its limited statistical power.

To summarize, the cutoff point for changes in the cardiac index after the PEEP test can only predict fluid responsiveness in a limited group of patients. There is still room for exploration in terms of adjusting these cutoff points based on the mechanics of the respiratory system. One potential proposal is to base it on changes in PEEP, end-expiratory lung volume, and driving pressure, but this requires further demonstration.

#### Abbreviations

DP	Driving pressure
Paw	Plateau pressure
PEEP	Positive end-expiratory pressure
PL	Transpulmonary pressure
Ppl	Pleural pressure

#### Acknowledgements

Hospital Universitario Fundación Santa Fe de Bogotá, Universidad del Rosario, Universidad Nacional de Colombia.

#### Author contributions

CP, LC and JA were responsible for the manuscript draft. JA revised the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

#### Funding

Not applicable.

#### Availability of data and materials

Not applicable.

#### Declarations

#### Ethics approval and consent to participate

Not applicable.

#### Consent for publication

All authors give the consent to publish.

#### Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Received: 5 May 2023 Accepted: 10 May 2023

Published online: 17 May 2023

#### References

- Lai C, Shi R, Beurton A, et al. The increase in cardiac output induced by a decrease in positive end-expiratory pressure reliably detects volume responsiveness: the PEEP-test study. *Crit Care*. 2023;27:136.
- Monnet X, Shi R, Teboul J-L. Prediction of fluid responsiveness. What's new? *Ann Intensive Care*. 2022;12:46.
- Gattinoni L, Giosa L, Bonifazi M, Pasticci I, Busana M, Macri M, Romitti F, Vassalli F, Quintel M. Targeting transpulmonary pressure to prevent ventilator-induced lung injury. *Expert Rev Respir Med*. 2019;13:737–46.
- Stenqvist O, Grivans C, Andersson B, Lundin S. Lung elastance and transpulmonary pressure can be determined without using oesophageal pressure measurements. *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand*. 2012;56:738–47.
- Chen L, Sorbo L, Grieco DL, et al. Potential for lung recruitment estimated by the recruitment-to-inflation ratio in acute respiratory distress syndrome. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1164/rccm.201902-0334OC>.

#### Publisher's Note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Ready to submit your research? Choose BMC and benefit from:

- fast, convenient online submission
- thorough peer review by experienced researchers in your field
- rapid publication on acceptance
- support for research data, including large and complex data types
- gold Open Access which fosters wider collaboration and increased citations
- maximum visibility for your research: over 100M website views per year

At BMC, research is always in progress.

Learn more [biomedcentral.com/submissions](https://biomedcentral.com/submissions)

