Letter to the Editor





Authors' Response to Drs. Ece Salihoglu and Ziya Salihoglu's Letter to the Editor

Sophie E. Morton⁽¹⁾, ¹ Jennifer L. Knopp, ¹ J. Geoffrey Chase, ¹ Knut Möller, ² Paul Docherty, ¹ Geoffrey M. Shaw, ³ and Merryn Tawhai⁴

¹Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand; ²Institute of Technical Medicine, Furtwangen University, Villingen-Schwenningen, Germany; ³Department of Intensive Care, Christchurch Hospital, Christchurch, New Zealand; and ⁴Auckland Bioengineering Institute, The University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

(Received 25 July 2019; accepted 6 August 2019; published online 13 August 2019)

Associate Editor Stefan M. Duma oversaw the review of this article.

To the Editor,

We would like to thank Drs. Ece Salihoglu and Ziya Salihoglu for their interest in our article.²

While not directly addressed in the paper, the CURE clinical study data used in this paper considers patient gas concentration alongside both ventilator pressure and volume. The four CURE pilot trial patients had FiO₂ set to 40, 40, 55 and 65 with PaO₂ measurements of 71, 84, 60 and 101 mmHg, respectively. The McREM trial data used for validation did not provide specific oxygenation results.³ However, each patient's initial P/F ratio is provided in Table 1 of the paper, and indicates FiO_2 varied in typical ranges.³

The model presented in our paper was designed for use in an upcoming clinical trial that aims to optimise mechanical ventilation care.^{1,4} The trial uses two steps to optimise oxygenation. Step 1 optimises alveolar recruitment by titrating PEEP to the point of minimum elastance. The model thus safely maximises oxygenation via mechanics without adjusting FiO₂. Step 2 uses this foundation to titrate FiO_2 to achieve patient SpO_2 levels within 92-95%. This process minimises the risk of excessively high oxygen levels, so the broad range of patients with respiratory failure can be optimally treated dependent on their specific condition and response to ventilation.

Thank you again for your time and interest.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Funding was provided by NZ Tertiary Education Commission (TEC) fund MedTech CoRE (Grant No. E6391), NZ National Science Challenge 7, Science for Technology and Innovation (Grant No. E6525), Engineering Technology-based Innovation in Medicine (eTIME) consortium grant (eTIME 318943) and EU FP7 International Research Staff Exchange Scheme (IRSES) grant (#PIRSES-GA-2012-318943).

REFERENCES

Address correspondence to Sophie E. Morton, Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand. Electronic mails: sophie.morton@pg.canterbury.ac.nz, jennifer.knopp@canterbury.ac.nz, geoff.chase@canterbury.ac.nz, moe@hs-furtwangen.de, paul.docherty@canterbury.ac.nz, geoff.shaw@cdhb.health.nz, m.tawhai@auckland.ac.nz

This comment refers to the article available at https://doi.org/10. 1007/s10439-019-02253-w.

¹Morton, S., Y. Chiew, C. Pretty, E. Moltchanova, C. Scarrott, D. Redmond, G. Shaw, and J. Chase. Effective sample size estimation for a mechanical ventilation trial through Monte-Carlo simulation: length of mechanical ventilation and ventilator free days. Math. Biosci. 284:21-31, 2017.

²Morton, S. E., J. L. Knopp, J. G. Chase, K. Möller, P. Docherty, G. M. Shaw, and M. Tawhai. Predictive virtual patient modelling of mechanical ventilation: impact of recruitment function. Ann. Biomed. Eng. 47:1626-1641, 2019.

³Stahl, C. A., K. Möller, S. Schumann, R. Kuhlen, M. Sydow, C. Putensen, and J. Guttmann. Dynamic versus static respiratory mechanics in acute lung injury and acute respi-

ratory distress syndrome. Crit. Care Med. 34:2090–2098, 2006.

⁴Szlavecz, A., Y. S. Chiew, D. Redmond, A. Beatson, D. Glassenbury, S. Corbett, V. Major, C. Pretty, G. M. Shaw, and B. Benyo. The Clinical Utilisation of Respiratory Elastance Software (CURE Soft): a bedside software for

real-time respiratory mechanics monitoring and mechanical ventilation management. *Biomed. Eng. Online* 13:140, 2014.

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

