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Comparison of Airway Pressure Release Ventilation to High-Frequency Oscillatory Ventilation in Neonates with Refractory Respiratory Failure
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Background. Airway pressure release ventilation (APRV) is a relatively new mode of ventilation in neonates. We hypothesize that APRV is an effective rescue mode in infants failing conventional ventilation and it is comparable in survival rates to rescue with high-frequency oscillatory ventilation (HFOV).

Methods. This is a 6-year retrospective cohort study of infants that failed synchronized intermittent mandatory ventilation (SIMV) and were rescued with either APRV or HFOV. For comparison, we divided infants into two groups (28-37 and >37 weeks) based on their corrected gestational age (CGA) at failure of SIMV.

Results. Ninety infants were included in the study. Infants rescued with APRV (n = 46) had similar survival rates to those rescued with HFOV (n = 44)—28-37 weeks CGA (APRV 78% vs. HFOV 84%, p = 0.68) and >37 weeks CGA (APRV 76% vs. HFOV 72%, p = 0.74). Use of APRV was not associated with an increase in pneumothorax (APRV 0% and HFOV 10%, p = 0.31, in 28-37 weeks CGA, and APRV 0% and HFOV 4%, p = 0.22, in >37 weeks CGA). Conclusion. APRV can be effectively used to rescue infants with refractory respiratory failure on SIMV. When compared to HFOV, rescue with APRV is not associated with an increase in mortality or pneumothorax.

1. Introduction

In recent decades, despite progressive advances in survival of premature infants [1, 2], rates of bronchopulmonary dysplasia (BPD) have remained relatively constant [3]. Mechanical ventilation and oxygen therapy have long been recognized as mediators of lung injury. Philip described “oxygen plus pressure plus time” as the etiology of BPD in 1975 [4]. Since then, our understanding of ventilator-associated lung injury has improved, but the optimal lung-protective ventilation strategy remains elusive [5].

Concerns for lung injury from excessive pressures, hyperinflation, and atelectasis have led to the advent of alternate modes of ventilation. APRV was first described by Stock et al. [6] and is a form of pressure-limited ventilation with a time-cycled release phase [7]. The patient alternates between two pressures—“P-high” and “P-low” (release phase) for a time of “T-high” and “T-low,” respectively—but can continue to breathe spontaneously throughout all phases of the ventilator cycle [7].

APRV is used in adults with acute lung injury/acute respiratory distress syndrome (ALI/ARDS), and early application of APRV in adult trauma patients with ALI has been shown to have a tenfold reduction in ARDS and a threefold reduction in in-hospital mortality [8]. However, use of APRV in pediatric and neonatal patients is limited, and
there is a paucity of human data regarding its use in this population. Most studies are limited to case reports and series or evaluation of a small number of patients [9, 10].

Use of APRV was initiated in the neonatal intensive care unit at our institution in 2008, and it has since become a frequently utilized mode of rescue ventilation, in addition to HFOV. We hypothesize that APRV can be effectively used as a rescue mode of ventilation in infants failing conventional ventilation and survival rates for these infants are comparable to those rescued with HFOV. To test this hypothesis, we evaluated retrospective outcome data in infants rescued with either APRV or HFOV.

2. Methods

After institutional review board approval, medical records of all infants that failed SIMV from January 2010 to December 2015 were reviewed. Our inclusion criteria consisted of infants of gestational age (GA) 24-42 weeks, >28 weeks corrected at failure of SIMV, and <1 year of chronological age, with need for rescue ventilation. Our exclusion criteria were need for rescue ventilation (APRV or HFOV) for less than 6 hours or its use with extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO). Infants with congenital diaphragmatic hernia, diffuse developmental disorders of the lung, or congenital surfactant deficiencies were also excluded.

2.1. Ventilator Characteristics. SIMV and APRV were delivered using Servo-i ventilators (MAQUET Medical Systems, USA) and HFOV using a SensorMedics 3100A ventilator (SensorMedics Corporation, USA). Assessment of failure of SIMV and choice of rescue ventilation was ultimately determined by the clinical judgement of the attending neonatologist. However, the typical criteria at our institution is a pCO2 > 65 mmHg and/or a FiO2 > 60%, despite peak ventilator pressures > 25 cmH2O. In general, when a patient failing SIMV was switched to APRV, they were started on a P-high that achieved appropriate chest rise and a T-high that achieved the desired respiratory rate. P-low was set at 0-3 cmH2O and T-low was set at 0.2-0.3 seconds to generate the desired measured positive end-expiratory pressure (PEEP). For HFOV, patients were started on a mean airway pressure (Mpaw) that was 2-3 cmH2O greater than Mpaw on SIMV. Initial power was set to generate appropriate chest wiggle, and frequency was chosen based on CGA (term and postterm: 8 Hz; preterm: 10-12 Hz). Ventilator settings were titrated based on clinical judgement and blood gas measurements.

2.2. Clinical and Laboratory Data. Our primary outcome variable was survival, while our secondary outcome variable was the improvement in refractory respiratory failure, using APRV and HFOV rescue modes of ventilation. Patients were on continuous vital sign monitoring for the duration of mechanical ventilation. Blood gases were drawn to assess clinical status, based on the discretion of the attending neonatologist. Information collected from medical records included patient demographics (GA, birth weight, and sex), primary and secondary diagnoses, age and weight at failure of SIMV, length of hospital stay, survival to discharge, and incidence of pneumothorax. To evaluate the clinical status prior to rescue, blood gas and vital signs were recorded from measurements obtained immediately prior to escalation to rescue mode. To evaluate the clinical status following stabilization on the rescue mode, ventilator settings, blood gas, and vital signs were recorded at the time of the second blood gas measurement following rescue. Evaluation at the time of the second blood gas following rescue permitted the clinicians to make one set of ventilator adjustments with the first blood gas and then allowed the patient to adjust to those changes prior to the second blood gas.

2.3. Statistical Analysis. For comparison of APRV to HFOV, infants were divided into two groups based on CGA at failure of SIMV: 28-37 weeks (preterm) and >37 weeks (term). A paired two-tailed Student’s t-test was used to compare continuous variables. Chi square was used for categorical variables. Statistical significance was defined as \( p \) value < 0.05. Results were expressed as the mean with standard deviations or median with interquartile range for continuous variables or as a percentage (%) for categorical variables.

Yehya et al. [11] compared APRV to HFOV in pediatric respiratory failure. The average incidence of mortality in their study was 39%. Assuming this as the baseline incidence and assuming \( \alpha \) error of 5% and power of 80%, the sample size calculated would be 168 (84 per group) to detect a 50% change in mortality [11].

3. Results

During the 6-year study period, 112 infants met the inclusion criteria and required escalation to either HFOV or APRV, following refractory respiratory failure on SIMV. Thirteen infants in the APRV group and nine infants in the HFOV group were on the given mode of ventilation for less than 6 hours and were therefore removed from the data set leaving 90 total infants for further analysis (HFOV \( n = 44 \), APRV \( n = 46 \)). All of the infants were delivered outside of our institution, none of the infants received surfactant while on APRV or HFOV, and none of the infants were escalated to ECMO. Three infants in the HFOV group and four infants in the APRV group had hemodynamically significant patent ductus arteriosus on echocardiogram. Two infants in the APRV group and three infants in the HFOV group received paralytics during the rescue period. Beyond the common diagnosis of prematurity (HFOV \( n = 19 \), APRV \( n = 9 \)), patent ductus arteriosus (HFOV \( n = 3 \), APRV \( n = 4 \)), and meconium aspiration syndrome (HFOV \( n = 4 \), APRV \( n = 3 \)), infants were also diagnosed with necrotizing enterocolitis, gastrochisis, subglottic stenosis, tracheomalacia, congenital pulmonary airway malformation, vein of Galen malformation, tracheoesophageal fistula, hypoxic ischemic encephalopathy, and cystic teratoma.

3.1. Infants Failing SIMV and Rescued with APRV. Infants rescued with APRV saw significant reductions in peak pressures (SIMV 26.2 ± 4.5 vs. APRV 23.7 ± 3.7 cmH2O, \( p \) value < 0.001) (Figure 1(a)) and measured PEEP (SIMV 7.4 ± 1.9
vs. APRV 6.3 ± 1.9 cmH2O, p value < 0.001), following rescue, as compared to SIMV at failure, but the M\textsubscript{Paw} was significantly higher on APRV (SIMV 14.3 ± 3.2 vs. APRV 18 ± 3.2 cmH2O, p value < 0.001) (Figure 1(b)). These infants also had a significant improvement in ventilation (SIMV pCO\textsubscript{2} 78.9 ± 24.6 vs. APRV pCO\textsubscript{2} 59 ± 10.1 mmHg, p value < 0.001) and a trend towards improved oxygenation (Table 1).

3.2. Comparison of APRV to HFOV 28-37 Weeks Corrected. Infants rescued with APRV had a median GA of 31.3 weeks and were corrected to 40.4 weeks with a mean weight of 3138 ± 1057 grams at rescue, while those of the HFOV group had a median GA of 34.1 weeks and were corrected to 40.4 weeks with a mean weight of 3138 ± 1057 grams at rescue. To account for the differences in GA and weight, further comparisons were made after matching infants for CGA at failure. After matching, there were no differences between the two groups in terms of GA, CGA, and weight at failure for the 28-37-week infants (Table 2).

For these infants, HFOV was employed for rescue at significantly lower M\textsubscript{Paw} on SIMV, as compared to APRV (SIMV M\textsubscript{Paw} at failure: APRV 15 ± 2.4 vs. HFOV 12.2 ± 1.5 cmH2O, p value 0.01). There was a difference in mean arterial blood pressure (MAP) between the two groups (APRV 47.8 ± 10.9 vs. HFOV 36.6 ± 11.1 mmHg, p value 0.02), but the relative change in MAP was not clinically significant, after the use of either mode (APRV 42.4 ± 7.8 vs. HFOV 34.4 ± 9.4 mmHg, p value 0.03). There was also a significant difference in pH between the APRV and HFOV groups (7.35 ± 0.1 vs. 7.26 ± 0.1, p value 0.05) due to the higher degree of metabolic acidosis in the HFOV group prior to rescue (base excess APRV 6.6 ± 5.7 vs. HFOV −1.3 ± 6.4, p value 0.005). There was no difference in survival between APRV (78%) and HFOV (84%) (p value 0.68). Despite higher M\textsubscript{Paw} at rescue (APRV 17.6 ± 2.0 vs. HFOV 14.5 ± 4.6 cmH2O, p value 0.02), there were no pneumothoraces on APRV. In contrast, 10% of HFOV infants developed a pneumothorax; the difference was not statistically significant. APRV achieved similar oxygenation and ventilation as compared to HFOV.

3.3. Comparison of APRV to HFOV > 37 Weeks Corrected. For the >37-week group, APRV infants were significantly younger in median GA at birth (APRV 33.6 vs. HFOV 37.6, p value 0.04) but older in median CGA at failure (APRV 40.9 vs. HFOV 39.0 weeks, p value < 0.001) (Table 3). However, there was no difference in CGA at discharge. The two groups were also similar in SIMV settings...
at failure. The HFOV infants were significantly more aci-
dotic at failure (APRV 7.30 ± 0.1 vs. HFOV 7.20 ± 0.1, p
value 0.02) and remained so at the time of the second blood
gas following rescue (APRV 7.36 ± 0.1 vs. HFOV 7.26 ± 0.1,
p value < 0.001). There was no difference in survival between
APRV (76%) and HFOV (72%) (p value 0.74). There were
no pneumothoraces with APRV, whereas one infant de-
veloped a pneumothorax with HFOV; the difference was
described statistically significant. APRV achieved similar oxygenation
and ventilation as compared to HFOV.

Our comparisons suggest that survival rates are similar
in infants rescued with APRV when compared to HFOV.
To determine if there were any specific ventilatory pa-
terms that were associated with a greater chance of survival,
we compared infants that survived to those that did not sur-
vive, on each mode of ventilation (Table 4). In the APRV

group, lower FiO2 (survivor 63 ± 25 vs. nonsurvivor 82 ±
26, p = 0.03), P-low (survivor 2.9 ± 1.1 vs. nonsurvivor 4.1
± 2.0 cmH2O, p = 0.02), and measured PEEP (survivor 5.8
± 1.5 vs. nonsurvivor 7.4 ± 2.3 cmH2O, p = 0.01) were asso-
ciated with a higher rate of survival, while in the HFOV
group, a lower M Paw (survivor 15.7 ± 3.8 vs. nonsurvivor
18.7 ± 4.8 cmH2O, p = 0.04) was associated with a higher
rate of survival.

4. Discussion

Our study represents a single center experience with the use
of APRV for rescue ventilation, using a cohort of HFOV
infants as a reference group for comparison. This is the larg-
est cohort of infants rescued with APRV reported in the liter-

erature. APRV was comparable to HFOV in survival rates of
both term and preterm infants with refractory respiratory
failure on SIMV. In addition, the use of APRV was associ-
ated with an improvement in ventilation in neonates failing
conventional ventilation and showed a trend towards
improved oxygenation.

APRV used peak pressures that were ~3 cmH2O lower
to achieve a M Paw that was ~4 cmH2O higher than on
SIMV. APRV achieved this higher M Paw by maintaining

| Patient characteristics | APRV (n = 9) rescue | HFOV (n = 19) rescue | p value |
|-------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|---------|
| GA at birth (wk)*       | 26.7 (25.3-28.0)   | 28.9 (27.8-30.3)    | 0.24    |
| CGA at failure (wk)*    | 33.4 (32.3-34.1)   | 32.7 (29.8-34.3)    | 0.20    |
| Birth weight (g)        | 1170 ± 785         | 1376 ± 730          | 0.51    |
| Weight at failure (g)   | 1843 ± 553         | 1693 ± 707          | 0.58    |
| CGA at discharge (wk)*  | 44.0 (32.4-46.6)   | 39.9 (38.6-41.8)    | 0.99    |
| Pneumothorax n (%)      | 0 (0)              | 2 (10)              | 0.31    |
| Survival n (%)          | 7 (78)             | 16 (84)             | 0.68    |
| pCO2 (mmHg)             | 81.7 ± 31.3        | 91.0 ± 22.8         | 0.44    |
| pH                      | 7.2 ± 0.1          | 7.1 ± 0.1           | 0.03    |
| Ventilator M paw (cmH2O)| 15.0 ± 2.4         | 12.2 ± 1.5          | 0.01    |
| Measured PEEP (cmH2O)   | 7.4 ± 1.9          | 5.6 ± 0.8           | 0.02    |
| Ventilator rate         | 50.0 ± 8.3         | 47.4 ± 9.6          | 0.46    |
| Ventilator M paw (cmH2O)| 4.4 ± 7.6          | -1.3 ± 5.6          | 0.06    |
| Base excess             | 6.6 ± 5.7          | -1.3 ± 6.4          | 0.005   |
| FiO2 (%)                | 74.0 ± 31.5        | 72.4 ± 30.4         | 0.89    |
| Heart rate              | 156 ± 14           | 149 ± 20            | 0.28    |
| Respiratory rate        | 50.7 ± 8.8         | 49.2 ± 17.0         | 0.76    |
| BP MAP (mmHg)           | 47.8 ± 10.9        | 36.6 ± 11.1         | 0.02    |

*Values for both APRV and HFOV at the time of the second blood gas after rescue. PIP: peak inspiratory pressure; PEEP: positive end-expiratory pressure;
pCO2: partial pressure of carbon dioxide, FiO2: fractional inspired oxygen, BP MAP: blood pressure mean arterial pressure; M Paw: mean airway pressure. Data
expressed as median with interquartile range (±) or mean ± standard deviation.
peak pressures (P-high) for a prolonged period of time (T-
high). These findings are consistent with results of other
adult [12] and pediatric APRV studies [10]. Yehya et al.
compared APRV to HFOV in older pediatric patients with
hypoxemic respiratory failure on conventional ventilation
and similarly found that APRV was not associated with
increased mortality [11].

There was a substantial decrease in pCO₂ following res-
cue with APRV. While the ventilator rate on APRV was ~6
breaths per minute higher than on SIMV, a change of this
magnitude would not usually result in the ~20 mmHg reduc-
tion in pCO₂ that we observed. The reasons for improved
ventilation are unclear, but it is possible that the prolonged
P-high phase of APRV reduces airway collapse at end-expira-
tion, thereby promoting uninterrupted airflow. In addition,
an infant on APRV can continue to breathe spontaneously
throughout all phases of the ventilator cycle, which likely
contributed to the improvement in ventilation.

In our current clinical practice, pressure-controlled
SIMV is used as a primary mode and APRV and HFOV
are used as rescue modes. APRV and HFOV may occasion-
ally be used as primary modes for infants that may benefit
from limiting peak pressures. For APRV, we start infants
on a P-high 2-4 cmH₂O below peak inspiratory pressure
(PIP) on SIMV and have found that this usually achieves
appropriate chest rise. Following initiation, P-high is
titrated to achieve appropriate M_Paw and oxygenation goals.

Patient status at failure of SIMV

| Patient characteristic | APRV (n = 37) | HFOV (n = 25) | p value |
|------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------|
| GA at birth (wk)*      | 33.6 (27.0-38.0) | 37.6 (34.1-38.9) | 0.04 |
| CGA at failure (wk)*   | 40.9 (39.9-43.6) | 39.0 (38.1-40.1) | <0.001 |
| Birth weight (g)       | 1860 ± 1142   | 2433 ± 1049   | 0.05 |
| Weight at failure (g)  | 3452 ± 900    | 2863 ± 540    | 0.004 |
| CGA at discharge (wk)* | 45.7 (39.4-50.0) | 43.1 (41.7-45.8) | 0.85 |
| Pneumothorax n (%)     | 0 (0)         | 1 (4)         | 0.22 |
| Survival n (%)         | 28 (76)       | 18 (72)       | 0.74 |

Patient status at rescue

| Patient characteristic | APRV (n = 37) | HFOV (n = 25) | p value |
|------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------|
| pCO₂ (mmHg)            | 78.2 ± 23.1  | 76.5 ± 26.5  | 0.79 |
| Base excess            | 7.6 ± 8.5    | −0.1 ± 7.9   | <0.001 |
| FiO₂ (%)               | 72.8 ± 27.1  | 77.7 ± 24.1  | 0.45 |
| Heart rate             | 146 ± 25     | 144 ± 22     | 0.76 |
| Respiratory rate       | 49.5 ± 12.2  | 43.1 ± 24.1  | 0.22 |
| BP MAP (mmHg)          | 54.6 ± 11.6  | 48.2 ± 15.6  | 0.08 |

Values for both APRV and HFOV at the time of the second blood gas after rescue. PIP: peak inspiratory pressure; PEEP: positive end-expiratory pressure; pCO₂: partial pressure of carbon dioxide; FiO₂: fractional inspired oxygen; BP MAP: blood pressure mean arterial pressure; M_Paw: mean airway pressure. Data expressed as median with interquartile range (**) or mean ± standard deviation.
Similar to HFOV, since become the preferred mode of rescue ventilation [17]. A recent prospective trial compared APRV to HFOV in pediatric patients with ARDS. This study of 52 patients was terminated early when a trend towards higher mortality was observed in the APRV arm. Our study of 90 infants did not suggest a higher mortality in APRV patients. There is no clear explanation for the conflicting results. However, several hemodynamic profile. Walsh et al. found that unrestricted spontaneous breathing during APRV causes intermittent negative intrathoracic pressures restoring normal cardiopulmonary interaction leading to improved cardiac output and pulmonary perfusion [9]. In adults, APRV has been associated with improved renal perfusion [18], and animal studies have shown improved splanchic perfusion with APRV, as compared to conventional ventilation [19]. These benefits might be critical to using APRV in neonates.

While the significant heterogeneity in the etiology of respiratory failure makes direct comparisons between APRV and HFOV difficult, our results suggest that APRV may be comparable to HFOV in achieving oxygenation and ventilation goals, when used for rescue. There was a substantial decrease in pCO₂ after initiation of both rescue modes. Despite significantly higher M_Paw with APRV as compared to SIMV, there were no clinically significant changes in vital signs and no pneumothorax. In contrast, three infants rescued with HFOV developed a pneumothorax after its initiation. In the past, there have been concerns of overdistension, lung injury, and air leaks with prolonged inspiratory times [13, 14], but a large review by Jain et al. suggests that APRV is associated with no significant adverse outcomes [12] and recent animal studies indicate that APRV may be lung-protective [15, 16]. Clearly, there are multiple factors beyond ventilation that can contribute to infant mortality, and it is extremely difficult to control for those variables in a retrospective analysis of this size. We performed an initial analysis to see if there were variables associated with survival in our cohort. As anticipated, we observed a significant association between survival and lower M_Paw in the HFOV group; however, there was no association between survival and lower peak pressures or M_Paw in the APRV group. Interestingly, the most significant association in the APRV group was lower measured PEEP and P-low in the infants that survived.

HFOV was first used in neonates in the 1980s and has since become the preferred mode of rescue ventilation [17]. Similar to HFOV, an “open lung ventilation” approach is central to the success of APRV. Sustained inspiratory pressures allow the patient to maintain an open and stabilized lung which allows breathing to occur from a more compliant portion of the pressure-volume curve [7]. However, a major potential advantage of APRV over HFOV is its favorable volume modes of ventilation may be preferable for infants; therefore, APRV may have limited benefit in infants failing volume modes.

A recent prospective trial compared APRV to HFOV in pediatric patients with ARDS. This study of 52 patients was terminated early when a trend towards higher mortality was observed in the APRV arm. Our study of 90 infants did not suggest a higher mortality in APRV patients. There is no clear explanation for the conflicting results. However, several

| Table 4: Comparison of survivors versus nonsurvivors in each ventilator group. |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                                 | APRV (n = 12)   | HFOV (n = 10)   | p value         | APRV (n = 12)   | HFOV (n = 10)   | p value         |
| pH                              | 7.39 ± 0.1      | 7.25 ± 0.1      | 0.74            | 7.26 ± 0.1      | 7.25 ± 0.1      | 0.74            |
| pCO₂ (mmHg)                     | 61 ± 19         | 58 ± 21         | 0.69            | 61 ± 17         | 58 ± 21         | 0.69            |
| FiO₂ (%)                        | 63 ± 25         | 63 ± 32         | 0.29            | 74 ± 28         | 63 ± 32         | 0.29            |
| P-high (cmH₂O)                  | 23.4 ± 2.8      | 23.7 ± 5.6      | 0.81            | 23.4 ± 2.8      | 23.7 ± 5.6      | 0.81            |
| P-low (cmH₂O)                   | 2.9 ± 1.1       | 4.1 ± 2.0       | 0.02            | 2.9 ± 1.1       | 4.1 ± 2.0       | 0.02            |
| Measured PEEP (cmH₂O)           | 5.8 ± 1.5       | 7.4 ± 2.3       | 0.01            | 5.8 ± 1.5       | 7.4 ± 2.3       | 0.01            |
| T-high (s)                      | 0.9 ± 0.4       | 0.8 ± 0.2       | 0.51            | 0.9 ± 0.4       | 0.8 ± 0.2       | 0.51            |
| T-low (s)                       | 0.4 ± 0.1       | 0.3 ± 0.1       | 0.32            | 0.4 ± 0.1       | 0.3 ± 0.1       | 0.32            |
| Rate                            | 51 ± 11         | 55 ± 8          | 0.29            | 51 ± 11         | 55 ± 8          | 0.29            |
| M_Paw (cmH₂O)                   | 17.6 ± 2.4      | 18.5 ± 4.5      | 0.42            | 17.6 ± 2.4      | 18.5 ± 4.5      | 0.42            |
| Power                           | 2.7 ± 0.8       | 2.5 ± 0.4       | 0.71            | 2.7 ± 0.8       | 2.5 ± 0.4       | 0.71            |
| Amplitude                       | 31.2 ± 6.5      | 35.0 ± 8.4      | 0.16            | 31.2 ± 6.5      | 35.0 ± 8.4      | 0.16            |
| Frequency (Hz)                  | 9.3 ± 1.1       | 9.6 ± 1.2       | 0.42            | 9.3 ± 1.1       | 9.6 ± 1.2       | 0.42            |

Values for both APRV and HFOV at the time of the second blood gas after rescue. pCO₂: partial pressure of carbon dioxide; FiO₂: fractional inspired oxygen; P-high: pressure high; P-low: pressure low; PEEP: positive end-expiratory pressure; T-high: time high; T-low: time low; M_Paw: mean airway pressure. Data expressed as mean ± standard deviation.
factors in the Lalgudi Ganesan study suggest that the APRV group was younger and sicker than the HFOV group at the time of randomization [20].

In conclusion, our data suggests that APRV is an effective rescue mode of ventilation in infants failing SIMV. For these infants, it is also comparable in survival rates to HFOV and can achieve similar ventilation and oxygenation goals. APRV can serve as an important tool in the armamentarium of providers managing neonatal respiratory failure. However, further prospective randomized trials are needed to better define its safety and efficacy and to compare it to the current benchmarks of neonatal ventilation.

Abbreviations

APRV: Airway pressure release ventilation
M_paw: Mean airway pressure
HFOV: High-frequency oscillatory ventilation
SIMV: Synchronized intermittent mandatory ventilation
CGA: Corrected gestational age
BPD: Bronchopulmonary dysplasia
CPAP: Continuous positive airway pressure
CO_2: Carbon dioxide
ALI: Acute lung injury
ARDS: Acute respiratory distress syndrome
GA: Gestational age
ECMO: Extracorporeal membrane oxygenation
PEEP: Positive end-expiratory pressure
pCO_2: Partial pressure of carbon dioxide
PIP: Peak inspiratory pressure.
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This document is a guideline for the use of Airway Pressure Release Ventilation (APRV) in Neonates which describes how this mode works, initial settings and how to make adjustments. These guidelines are are meant to serve as an initial introduction to APRV and the reader should not assume that these guidelines are sufficient education to begin utilizing APRV without additional training and supervision. (Supplementary Materials)
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