To the Editors:

The coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic has exhausted supplies of ventilators and patient mask interfaces in many countries around the world. As such, innovative responses from healthcare workers and engineers are combining medical (i.e. continuous positive airway pressure (CPAP)/bi-level devices) and non-medical (e.g. adapted Decathlon snorkel mask; Fig. 1) equipment to provide non-invasive ventilatory support (i.e. oxygen and positive pressure delivery) for patients. In some instances, oxygen ($O_2$) is being entrained to standard CPAP circuits at high flow rates above the manufacturer specifications (e.g. 4 L/min for ResMed S10) to provide both pressure support and supplemental $O_2$ to the patient. Two key limitations of such experimental mask and CPAP setups include: (i) the leak profile and rebreathing characteristics of non-medical grade masks when pressure and/or $O_2$ are applied are unknown and (ii) quantitative details about the relationship between above specification $O_2$ flow rate and desired inspired $O_2$ fraction ($F_{O_2}$) levels in closed CPAP circuits are unknown.

In situations where clinicians have been in short supply of CPAP equipment, they have adapted the Decathlon snorkel mask to provide a ventilatory support interface to those in need. In addition to its role as a salvage option in equipment-depleted hospital settings, this prototype interface confers potential advantages over conventional medical-grade designs. It requires no training to fit and non-critically ill patients can secure the interface without assistance. The mask is versatile in its ability to deliver air/$O_2$ blends with or without positive airway pressure (PAP). Finally, because the Decathlon snorkel mask is sealed, it potentially harnesses infectious aerosols more effectively than conventional $O_2$ delivery systems.

Our aim was to compare the performance/safety characteristics of the adapted Decathlon Easybreath snorkel mask (Decathlon, France) and oronasal CPAP masks across a series of potential clinical applications. Specifically, these include: (i) delivery of high concentrations of $O_2$ and (ii) simultaneous delivery of high flow oxygen and positive pressure support.

We conducted a series of experiments with controlled $O_2$ and positive pressure delivery to assess the impact on: (i) $F_{O_2}$; (ii) inspired carbon dioxide ($CO_2$) and, where appropriate, (iii) mask leak and (iv) mask pressure. All experiments were performed with a sealed oronasal CPAP mask (Airfit F10; Resmed, Sydney, Australia), and repeated with an adapted Decathlon snorkel mask (shown in Fig. 1). Both masks were modified to add sampling ports for measuring $O_2/CO_2$ and mask pressure, and to seal their expiratory ports. For the Decathlon mask, the direction of the existing one-way expiratory/purge valve was swapped (making a one-way inspiratory valve) and the existing snorkel connection was swapped with a three-dimensional (3-D) printed ‘Charlotte valve’ connector which allowed standard medical tubing to be connected to the mask for oxygen/CPAP delivery (Appendix S1 in Supplementary Information). For both masks, expiratory gas was vented through a bio-filter (SureGard [RJVKB8], Australia). The key aims of the experiments were to assess the performance of both mask interfaces to entrain various concentrations of $O_2$ (30%, 50%, 60%, 80% and 100%), and to determine maximal achievable $F_{O_2}$ at varied CPAP levels (Resmed S9) with entrained $O_2$ using flow rates above manufacturer specifications.

Two healthy male volunteers were recruited. Participant one (55 years, BMI = 25 kg/m$^2$) completed experiment 1 and participant two (37 years, BMI = 24 kg/m$^2$) completed experiment 2. The participants lay supine with their torso elevated 25 to the horizontal. The participants wore each mask interface attached to each of the experimental respiratory circuits described above. CPAP level, as well as the $O_2$ flow rate and mix were manipulated from an adjoining room (see Appendix S1 (Supplementary Information) for details). Human research ethics approval for this project was obtained by the Monash Health HREC (RES-20-0000-227A-63 509). Integration across the engineering and clinical science teams was facilitated by the Monash Institute of Medical Engineering and Monash Partners Academic Health Science Centre.

Figure 2 shows the performance of the CPAP mask and Decathlon snorkel mask in delivering various $O_2$ concentrations. For the CPAP mask, $F_{O_2}$ values were near consistent with the $O_2$ mix delivered. In contrast, the snorkel mask achieved lower $F_{O_2}$ at every level of $O_2$ mix. The highest $F_{O_2}$ values achieved (100% $O_2$, 15 breaths/min (bpm)) were 94% for the CPAP mask and 80% for the snorkel mask.

Higher levels of rebreathing (assessed by inspired $CO_2$) were also noted for the snorkel mask (inspired $CO_2$: 13.8–16.7 mmHg, 15 bpm) which was further elevated at the higher respiratory rate of 30 bpm. Rebreathing was minimal with the CPAP mask regardless of respiratory rate (0.1–4.7 mm Hg, 15 bpm).

Similar patterns in $F_{O_2}$ and inspired $CO_2$ were observed when $O_2$ mixtures were entrained using the venturi valve (Fig. S5 in Supplementary Information).
Moreover, the application of a positive end-expiratory pressure (PEEP) valve to the expiratory line did not alter the performance of either mask, nor did the level of PEEP (range: 5–20 cmH2O) systematically affect the FIO2 or degree of rebreathing (Fig. S6 in Supplementary Information). However, high levels of PEEP (15–20 cmH2O) delivered to the Snorkel mask caused significant leak resulting from the mask ‘lifting’ off the face.

Figure 3 demonstrates the effectiveness of both the CPAP and Decathlon snorkel mask to simultaneously deliver CPAP and high-flow O2. As expected, the application of CPAP reduced (i.e. diluted) the O2 delivered to the mask. Specifically, CPAP of 10 cmH2O delivered with 15 L/min O2 (100%) produced FIO2 values of 73% (sealed CPAP mask at 15 bpm) and 66% (snorkel mask at 15 bpm). For both masks, the magnitude of O2 dilution increased with higher levels of CPAP. Entrainment of 30 L/min of O2 largely offset this dilution effect and produced higher FIO2 values at all CPAP levels for both masks. These FIO2 values were comparable to delivering 100% O2 alone (without CPAP) at 15 L/min. For the CPAP mask, increasing pressure resulted in a small linear decrease in FIO2 at a rate of 0.8%/cmH2O (15 bpm). In contrast, the snorkel mask demonstrated a steeper, non-linear decline in FIO2 from CPAP >12 cmH2O. This was coincident with an increasing leak, which resulted in the delivered mask pressure plateauing at 14 cmH2O, despite further increases in the CPAP setting. Data from the oronasal mask (and snorkel mask ≤12 cmH2O) show CPAP level was stable and minimally affected by O2 entrainment (Fig. 2).

Both participants indicated that the oronasal CPAP mask was more comfortable compared to the snorkel mask (further details regarding subjective assessments of mask tolerability are provided in Appendices S2, S3 in Supplementary Information).

Our study demonstrates that the Decathlon Easybreath snorkel mask (i) delivers consistently lower FIO2, (ii) demonstrates higher CO2 rebreathing and (iii) leaks to a greater degree at high CPAP levels, when
compared to a sealed oronasal CPAP mask. However, its ease of fit and one-way valve to entrain room air make it a versatile alternative.

A possible reason for the consistently lower FIO2 with the snorkel mask compared to a CPAP mask is the one-way valve at the front of the snorkel mask that allows entrainment of room air. An advantage of this valve is that it creates a one-way open circuit such that delivered gases do not need to be precisely matched to minute ventilation, and allows for dilution of delivered O2 with room air within the mask. Experiments applying positive pressure partly prevent opening of the valve and thus improve FIO2 delivery. The snorkel mask can effectively deliver CPAP levels up to 14 cmH2O. However, above this level, significant leak develops across the forehead seal of the mask prohibiting the ability to deliver higher pressures (despite increases in set pressure). In a COVID-19 setting, any excessive leak could be problematic as virus aerosolization is a risk for nosocomial spread. Our data show that there was a sharp increase in leak from the snorkel mask beginning at 12 cmH2O. In contrast, the oronasal CPAP mask had fewer difficulties with higher CPAP levels and must be preferred in the setting of delivering higher pressures to COVID-19 patients.

Importantly, during the CPAP and O2 pressure experiments, we were able to demonstrate the ability of standard CPAP with 30 L/min O2 entrained to deliver high mask FIO2 at consistent CPAP levels. This is a critical demonstration of the equipment capabilities above manufacturer specifications that will give clinicians confidence in delivering treatment in this way.

The snorkel mask demonstrated a higher level of CO2 accumulation at the mask (maximum recorded: 25 mmHg, ~3%) compared to the CPAP mask (5 mmHg, ~0.6%). We feel these levels are tolerable for several hours for most patients receiving care. Caution is advised for hypercapnic patients.

In summary, we have compared the performance characteristics of an adapted Decathlon Easybreath snorkel mask to a standard oronasal CPAP mask for a range of blended O2 and CPAP delivery levels. The Decathlon snorkel mask presents a viable and simpler alternative for selected patients; however, use should...
be limited to CPAP levels below 12 cmH₂O. Standard CPAP with entrained O₂ and oronasal mask performer above manufacturer specifications and delivers stable CPAP at high FIO₂. In patients suspected of having COVID-19, mask leak levels should be closely monitored regardless of PAP level or interface type.

Shane A. Landry,1,2,* Dwayne L. Mann,1,3,* Lee Djumas,4 Ludovico Messineo,5 Philip I. Terrill,6,* Luke D.J. Thomson,1 Caroline J. Beatty,1* Garun S. Hamilton,6,7,8* Darren Mansfield,2,6,8* Bradley A. Edwards1,3,8* and Simon A. Joosten6,7,8,†

1Department of Physiology, School of Biomedical Sciences and Biomedical Discovery Institute, Monash University, Melbourne, VIC, Australia; 2Turner Institute for Brain and Mental Health, Monash University, Melbourne, VIC, Australia; 3School of Information Technology and Electrical Engineering, University of Queensland, Brisbane, QLD, Australia; 4Woodside Innovation Centre, Department of Materials Science and Engineering, Monash University, Melbourne, VIC, Australia; 5Adelaide Institute for Sleep Health, Flinders Health and Medical Research Institute (FHMRI), Flinders University, Adelaide, SA, Australia; 6Monash Lung and Sleep, Monash Medical Centre, Melbourne, VIC, Australia; 7School of Clinical Sciences, Monash University, Melbourne, VIC, Australia; 8Monash Partners – Epworth, Melbourne, VIC, Australia

*S.A.L. and *D.L.M, and *B.A.E. and *S.A.J. have contributed equally to this study

Correspondence: Shane A. Landry, Sleep and Circadian Medicine Laboratory, Monash University, Ground Floor, BASE facility, 264 Ferntree Gully Road, Notting Hill, Melbourne, VIC 3168, Australia. Email: shane.landry@monash.edu

Key words: coronavirus disease, COVID-19, CPAP, critical care medicine, Oxygen, ventilation.

Acknowledgements:
The investigators are grateful to the Isinnova.it team for the useful technical insights. This work was funded by the Monash Partners and the Monash Institute of Medical Engineering. Dr B.A.E. is supported by a Heart Foundation of Australia Future Leader Fellowship (101167). Dr S.A.J. is supported by an NHMRC Early Career Fellowship (1139745).

Disclosure statement: G.S.H. and S.A.J. have received equipment to support research from ResMed, Philips Respironics and Air Liquide Healthcare. Dr B.A.E. has received funding from Apnimed.

Author contributions: Conceptualization: L.M., D.M., B.A.E., S.A.J. Data curation: D.L.M., D.M. Funding acquisition: D.M. Formal analysis: D.L.M., P.I.T. Visualization: D.L.M., P.I.T. Investigation: S.A.L., L.D.J.T., C.J.B., D.M., B.A.E., S.A.J. Methodology: S.A.L., L.D.J.T., C.J.B., D.M., B.A.E., S.A.J. Project administration: S.A.L., C.J.B., D.M., B.A.E., S.A.J. Resources: L.D., B.A.E., S.A.J. Supervision: B.A.E. Writing—original draft: S.A.L., D.L.M., L.D., B.A.E., S.A.J. Writing—review and editing: S.A.L., D.L.M., L.D., P.I.T., L.D.J.T., C.J.B., G.S.H., D.M., B.A.E., S.A.J. Writing—review and editing: S.A.L., D.L.M., L.D., P.I.T., L.D.J.T., C.J.B., G.S.H., D.M., B.A.E., S.A.J.

Abbreviations: BMI, body mass index; bpm, breaths/min; CPAP, continuous PAP; COVID-19, coronavirus disease 2019; FIO₂, inspired O₂ fraction; lpm, L/min; PAP, positive airway pressure; PEEP, positive end-expiratory pressure

REFERENCES
1 Grasselli G, Pesenti A, Cecconi M. Critical care utilization for the COVID-19 outbreak in Lombardy, Italy: early experience and forecast during an emergency response. JAMA 2020; 323: 1545.
2 ResMed. Airsense10 User Guide. 2020. Available from URL: https://www.resmed.com/us/dam/documents/products/machine/airsense-series/user-guide/airsense-10-device-with-humidifier_user-guide amer_engpdf

Supplementary Information
Additional supplementary information can be accessed via the html version of this article at the publisher’s website.

Appendix S1 Methods.
Appendix S2 Results.
Appendix S3 The Landry Intolerability Scale.
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