of eosinophilic asthma with the potential benefit of inhibiting eosinophilic airway inflammation for at least 30 days after one injection. A recent case report supports the use of benralizumab in this way (10). Larger studies are needed to determine whether this strategy is clinically effective and cost effective.
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3. Rescue ventilators (as a safety measure if shared ventilation fails) may not be available or may understandably also be in use in such a situation.

4. Pressure control when patients breathe together does not ensure that lung damage from divergent patient courses does not occur. Driving pressure and barotrauma are an issue if compliance rises significantly for one patient and similarly for underventilation and a need for greater pressure in one patient. This approach thus puts great weight on not only patient matching but also matching and tracking patient course to avoid damage. It may work in a limited trial and study but not necessarily in a COVID-19 “overrun” situation, in which staffing capability is stretched to the limit.

5. The authors state, “Patient selection and management require considerable expertise to ensure safety. Therefore, we recommend a regional referral model wherein ventilator sharing is restricted to expert centers, and patients and ventilators move throughout the region accordingly.” However, it requires significant time, cost, and effort to move infectious patients. It also implies greater risk for a select set of patients in the receiving center(s), which may not be ethical or provide equity of access to care for patients.

Importantly, we admire this result but feel in-parallel ventilation carries too much risk and difficulty to implement safely.

We would thus draw the authors’ attention to the concept of in-series breathing (patients breathe one after the other) in a simply implemented active circuit (3) as a safer alternative. It allows individualized positive end-expiratory pressure and driving pressure to account for differences between patients and reduces risk of harm because patients breathe separately (not together).

Thus, Beitler and colleagues (1) developed excellent results in a limited test situation but added significant complexity and cost per patient, which may not be feasible in general or in COVID-19 overrun. The use of in-parallel breathing requires significant matching of patient condition and monitoring of time course to assess risks of barotrauma or volutrauma (even with pressure control) as well as a risk of underventilation. All these risks are well-known to be difficult to monitor and assess in the best of times. A COVID-19 overrun situation demanding ventilator doubling is not the best of times. We suggest in-series breathing as a safer solution.

Available from: https://www.sccm.org/Disaster/Joint-Statement-on-Multiple-Patients-Per-Ventilator.
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To the Editor:

In a recent article, Beitler and colleagues described their methodology and lessons learned from ventilator sharing during the acute shortage caused by the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic (1). We applaud their efforts during unprecedented circumstances, as we similarly assessed the safety and feasibility of ventilator sharing at a time of near depletion. In their assessment, each patient was matched with identical ventilator settings before sharing pressure-control ventilation. In our assessment, we used the Vent Multiplexor device to modulate flow in a volume-control mode and permit individual adjustments of VT to two patients.

At baseline, patient A had a VT of 350 ml (5.5 ml/kg predicted body weight), driving pressure of 14 cm H2O with positive end-expiratory pressure (PEEP) of 14 cm H2O, and pH 7.36 with PaCO2 56 mm Hg; patient B had a VT of 450 ml (6.8 ml/kg predicted body weight), driving pressure of 12 cm H2O with PEEP of 10 cm H2O, and pH 7.42 with PaCO2 54 mm Hg. Each had different static lung compliances (A = 25 ml/cm H2O; B = 37.5 ml/cm H2O). Both had a respiratory rate of 20 breaths/min and required vasopressor support and neuromuscular blockade for the assessment; neither had underlying lung disease. Before the assessment, consent was obtained from both patients’ families. The Vent Multiplexor was assembled within the circuit described in Figure 1. In the assessment, the device was adjusted to deliver different flow ratios to patients, with vitals, end-tidal carbon dioxide, plateau pressures, and arterial blood gases monitored over a 2-hour period.

*This article is open access and distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial No Derivatives License 4.0 (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/). For commercial usage and reprints, please contact Diane Gern (dgern@thoracic.org).
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