

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

1. Adiyeye E, Ozgultekin A, Turan G, et al. Non-invasive mechanical ventilation after the successful weaning: a comparison with the venturi mask. *Rev Bras Anesthesiol.* 2016;66:572–6.
2. Esteban A, Frutos-Vivar F, Ferguson ND, et al. Noninvasive positive-pressure ventilation for respiratory failure after extubation. *Engl J Med.* 2004;350:2452–60.
3. Nava S, Gregoret C, Fanfulla F, et al. Noninvasive ventilation to prevent respiratory failure after extubation in high-risk patients. *Crit Care Med.* 2005;33:2465–70.
4. Agarwal R, Aggarwal AN, Gupta D, et al. Role of non-invasive positive-pressure ventilation in postextubation respiratory failure: a meta-analysis. *Respir Care.* 2007;52:1472–9.

5. Ferrer M, Valencia M, Nicolas JM, et al. Early noninvasive ventilation averts extubation failure in patients at risk: a randomized trial. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med.* 2006;15:164–70.
6. Thille AW, Boissier F, Ben-Ghezala H, et al. Easily identified at-risk patients for extubation failure may benefit from noninvasive ventilation: a prospective before-after study. *Crit Care.* 2016;20:48.

Jacobo Bacariza Blanco^{a,*}, Antonio M. Esquinas^b

^a *Hospital Garcia de Orta EPE, Unidade de Terapia Intensiva, Almada, Portugal*

^b *Hospital Meseguer, Unidade de Terapia Intensiva, Murcia, Spain*

* Corresponding author.

E-mail: jacobobacariza@hotmail.com (J.B. Blanco).

Available online 7 June 2017

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bjane.2017.01.006>
0034-7094/

© 2017 Published by Elsevier Editora Ltda. on behalf of Sociedade Brasileira de Anestesiologia. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Noninvasive ventilation after extubation



Ventilação não invasiva após a extubação

Dear Editor,

We read with great interest the study by Adiyeye et al.¹ In their prospective work, they describe a very important reduction of post extubation respiratory failure and a huge improvement in intensive care unit length of stay provided by systematic prophylactic Non Invasive Ventilation (NIV) after extubation.

Nevertheless, some methodological flaws, somewhat limiting the conclusions, have to be underlined. First, the authors did not precisely describe the population. Therefore the number of patients harboring high risk of extubation failure does not appear in the article. Nevertheless, as stated by the authors, recent data suggest that prophylactic NIV is only useful in this subset of patients. Therefore, the principle of equipoise does not appear to be respected, meaning that the foreseeable need for the tested intervention might not have been taken into account, and that some patients with clear cut indication for the tested intervention might have been randomized in the group not providing it. This is further strengthened by the unexpectedly high rate of respiratory failure in the Venturi Mask Group. As a matter of fact, one may suggest that such a high incidence (i.e. 56%) of post extubation respiratory failure is unlikely to occur in a group of patients harboring low risk of extubation failure. Second, in most of the recent studies in the field, extubation failure incidence ranges between 10% and 20%. It has to be stressed that the small cohort described in the study was very unlikely to be powered enough to describe a significant effect of the described intervention, at least in a general ICU population.

This may suggest that whether the included population harbored specific, albeit non described, characteristics, or the effect of chance. Third, despite authors' enthusiastic evaluation of NIV use as a first line treatment in post extubation failure, it has to be kept in mind that well designed studies displayed different conclusions. Indeed, in their prospective randomized study, Esteban et al. evidenced a higher rate of in ICU death in the subgroup of patients systematically treated with NIV support requiring subsequent intubation after extubation failure.² Though NIV in post extubation failure could be beneficial in some specific setting (chronic obstructive pulmonary disease for instance), the estimated etiology of post extubation respiratory failure is not provided in the article. Therefore, we think that providing NIV to every patients experiencing post extubation failure remains a matter of debate. Altogether, though NIV remains one mainstay in extubation success, we think that current evidence remains to be followed, with the screening of patients who may benefit of this tool made before extubation for the prophylactic NIV, and the "rescue" NIV in case of post extubation failure discussed on case by case analysis.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

1. Adiyeye E, Ozgultekin A, Turan G, et al. Non-invasive mechanical ventilation after the successful weaning: a comparison with the venturi mask. *Braz J Anesthesiol.* 2016;66:572–6.
2. Esteban A, Frutos-Vivar F, Ferguson ND, et al. Noninvasive positive-pressure ventilation for respiratory failure after extubation. *N Engl J Med.* 2004;350:2452–60.

Dominique Prat^a, Pierre Trouiller^a, Benjamin Sztrymf^{a,b,*}

^a *Université Paris Sud, Hôpital Antoine Béclère, Réanimation polyvalente et surveillance continue, Clamart, France*

^b *Centre Hospitalier Marie Lannelongue, Le Plessis Robinson, France*

* Corresponding author.

E-mail: benjamin.sztrymf@aphp.fr (B. Sztrymf).

Available online 9 June 2017

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bjane.2017.01.007>
0034-7094/

© 2017 Published by Elsevier Editora Ltda. on behalf of Sociedade Brasileira de Anestesiologia. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Systemic stress and PEEP relationships during laparoscopic cholecystectomy: a new protective marker?



Estresse sistêmico e sua relação com PEEP durante colecistectomia laparoscópica: um novo marcador protetor?

Dear Editor,

The interaction of Positive End-Expiratory Pressure (PEEP) effects in gas exchange and lung mechanics during Mechanical Ventilation (MV) in intra and postoperative abdominal surgery are globally well known.¹ However, during laparoscopic cholecystectomy they remain untested. We have read with great interest the study by Oznur et al., on which they move forward testing the PEEP effects during laparoscopic cholecystectomy in two groups regarding to the PEEP level applied (5–10 cm H₂O). They registered hemodynamic (cardiac rate/systolic–diastolic pressure/mean arterial pressure), respiratory (arterial oxygen saturation/partial pressure of carbon dioxide at the end of expiration (ETCO₂), and metabolic parameters (glucose/insulin/cortisol/lactic), along three different treatment stages (before/during and after the surgery). The results showed a clear benefit on compliance and oxygenation, a reduction on post-surgical stress, and everything without hemodynamic nor respiratory deleterious effects, when higher PEEP levels were set. Higher PEEP levels recruit the lung, raising the compliance and improving the oxygenation, it also reduces the ventilation/perfusion mismatch and hence limiting the respiratory shunt.¹ On the hemodynamic point of view, the positive pressure on the lung mechanics rises the left cardiac output mainly through the after load reduction, but also reduces the right cardiac output due to the right after load elevation; so when the patient's hydration level is adequate, the global cardiac performance improves. As a final result, the physiologic stress secondary to a certain clinical condition, is limited, due to the secured peripheral tissue oxygenation, and hence cortisol and lactic levels decline² as shown by authors.

Firstly, protective effects of PEEP need to be address in time. We know that abdominal condition and their derived surgical procedures, when needed, intra-abdominal

pressure (Pabd) peaks, decreasing the lung compliance, and leading to a collapse on the lower pulmonary lobes alveoli. The atelectasis de-recruits the lung, dropping dramatically the Functional Residual Capacity (FRC) and worsening the pulmonary shunt and so the oxygenation and the CO₂ wash out. Previously papers, Pankaj et al.³ had already concluded the same effect as Oznur et al., but not long-term outcome on stress (60 min after extubation), yet observed until this study. In our opinion associations between postoperative pulmonary complications and the protective stress use of PEEP need to be clarified. We do not have this key point and mainly pulmonary post-surgical complications (early or late) need also to be taken into account.

Secondly, associations of intrabdominal pressure and the intrathoracic pressure is a controversial determinant for post operative pulmonary complications. Nevertheless some studies⁴ did not reported an straight relation between the raise on the intrabdominal pressure and the intrathoracic pressure on patients undergoing laparoscopy surgery. On the other hand, there are also the severe pathophysiological effects occurring not only on the lung, but also on the liver, kidney and heart, which potentially lead to cardiorenal, hepatopulmonary or hepatorenal syndromes.⁵ Higher PEEP, cautiously used, can fight back those deleterious conditions through the oxygenation and cardiac performance improvement.

Thirdly, sensibility and specific of variables used to define "physiologic stress" are limited for other determinants factors during surgery procedure (tissue oxygenation, cortisol and lactic levels). Additionally, no previous pathological conditions existed on the selected patients, so not chance to know if the outcomes on stress respond would be reproducible on patients with diabetes, cardiac, endocrine or respiratory disease.

Fourthly, PEEP levels shouldn't be static but dynamic, due the constant changing clinical condition, not even during short time period and minimal invasive surgery, as laparoscopy, because of the altered intrabdominal pressure while surgical procedures are delivered. The clinician must find the proper PEEP level according to the general condition, the surgical timing and of course the hemodynamic state, due to the positive pressure effects on the patients hemodynamics.⁶

Certainly further analysis is demanded, to elucidate the PEEP effects when intrabdominal pressure is elevated, especially during minimal invasive surgical procedures.