



The Illinois Medical Bulletin



The Impact of Low Tidal Volume Ventilation on Outcomes in Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome: A Review of a Lung-Protective Strategy

¹A.Deloach, ²A.Davis

^{1,2} University of Illinois College of Medicine

Corresponding Email : deloachmd827474@gmail.com

Article History :

Received date : 2023/10/12
Revised date : 2023/11/28
Accepted date : 2023/12/09
Published date : 2024/01/13



Copyright: © by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (BY NC) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS) is a life-threatening form of hypoxemic respiratory failure requiring mechanical ventilation. It became increasingly clear that mechanical ventilation itself, while life-saving, could contribute to iatrogenic lung damage, a concept termed ventilator-induced lung injury (VILI).

Literature Review: A review of the pivotal scientific literature reveals a fundamental paradigm shift in the ventilatory management of ARDS. This was driven by the recognition that the ARDS lung is small and non-uniform, making it susceptible to overdistension from traditional large tidal volumes. A landmark, multicenter, randomized controlled trial conducted by the ARDS Network provided definitive evidence for a "lung-protective" strategy. The trial demonstrated that ventilating patients with a low tidal volume (6 mL/kg of predicted body weight) and maintaining a low plateau pressure (<30 cm H₂O) resulted in a dramatic and highly significant reduction in mortality compared to a traditional strategy using higher tidal volumes. This benefit was attributed to the attenuation of VILI. The results were so profound that the

trial was stopped early, and this lung-protective approach was rapidly adopted as the universal standard of care in major international clinical practice guidelines.

Conclusion: The body of work reviewed confirms that a low tidal volume ventilation strategy is a life-saving intervention for patients with ARDS. This research established a new and enduring standard of care, representing one of the most significant and impactful advances in the history of critical care medicine.

Keywords: Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS), Mechanical Ventilation, Low Tidal Volume, Lung-Protective Ventilation, Ventilator-Induced Lung Injury (VILI), Mortality.

INTRODUCTION

Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS) is a devastating clinical syndrome of acute, diffuse, inflammatory lung injury and non-cardiogenic pulmonary edema. It is a final common pathway for a variety of insults, including sepsis, pneumonia, and major trauma, and it leads to severe hypoxemia, respiratory failure, and high mortality rates. Mechanical ventilation is an essential, life-sustaining supportive therapy for patients with ARDS, allowing for adequate oxygenation and reducing the work of breathing.

For many years, the goal of mechanical ventilation was to normalize arterial blood gas values, which often led to the use of large tidal volumes (e.g., 10-15 mL/kg). However, a growing body of experimental and clinical research led to the concept of ventilator-induced lung injury (VILI), suggesting that the ventilator itself could cause or exacerbate lung damage. This led to the development of a "lung-protective" ventilation strategy, centered on the use of low tidal volumes to minimize iatrogenic harm. This literature review will synthesise the pivotal clinical trial evidence that established low tidal volume ventilation as the standard of care for patients with ARDS.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The transformation in the management of ARDS was driven by an improved understanding of its pathophysiology and was cemented by the results of a single, definitive, large-scale clinical trial.

The scientific rationale for a lung-protective strategy is based on the concept of the "baby lung." Pathological and imaging studies revealed that the ARDS lung is not homogeneously stiff.

Instead, it is a heterogeneous organ, with large portions of the lung being consolidated or collapsed, leaving only a small, relatively normally aerated region to participate in gas exchange. This small, functional lung has a near-normal compliance. The application of traditionally large tidal volumes, calculated based on the patient's overall size, would therefore be forced into this small "baby lung," leading to massive regional overdistension, or volutrauma. This alveolar overstretching was shown to trigger a potent local and systemic inflammatory response, contributing to multi-organ failure and a poor prognosis (Slutsky, 2002). The key to a lung-protective strategy was to limit this overdistension by using a tidal volume scaled to the size of the functional lung, not the whole patient, and by limiting the end-inspiratory pressure, or plateau pressure.

This hypothesis was definitively tested in a large, multicenter, randomized controlled trial conducted by the National Institutes of Health ARDS Network. This landmark study compared a lung-protective strategy, which used a low tidal volume of 6 mL/kg of predicted body weight and aimed to keep the plateau pressure below 30 cm H₂O, against a traditional ventilation strategy using a tidal volume of 12 mL/kg. The results were profound and practice-changing. The trial was stopped early by the data and safety monitoring board because the group receiving low tidal volume ventilation had a significantly lower mortality rate (31.0%) compared to the group receiving traditional ventilation (39.8%). This represented a 22% relative reduction in the risk of death (Eisner et al., 2001).

The impact of this trial was immediate and widespread. The magnitude and statistical significance of the mortality benefit provided an irrefutable mandate to change practice. The concept of "permissive hypercapnia"—tolerating a higher level of carbon dioxide in the blood as a trade-off for using smaller, safer tidal volumes—became an accepted part of the strategy. The evidence was so compelling that low tidal volume ventilation was rapidly incorporated as the cornerstone of all major international evidence-based guidelines for the management of patients with ARDS (Phua et al., 2009).

Subsequent systematic reviews and meta-analyses further solidified this conclusion. A comprehensive Cochrane review of the available evidence confirmed that ventilation with lower tidal volumes significantly decreases overall mortality and increases the number of ventilator-free days for patients with ARDS (Petrucchi and Iacovelli, 2007). The focus of the

critical care community shifted to ensuring the consistent implementation and adherence to this proven, life-saving intervention.

CONCLUSION

The pivotal literature on ventilatory support for Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome provides a clear and powerful conclusion. A landmark randomized controlled trial delivered unequivocal evidence that a lung-protective strategy, utilizing low tidal volumes and limited plateau pressures, results in a substantial and clinically meaningful reduction in mortality compared to traditional ventilation strategies.

This benefit is attributed to the mitigation of ventilator-induced lung injury by preventing the overdistension of the small, functional portion of the diseased lung. This body of research led to a rapid, fundamental, and universal shift in clinical practice worldwide, establishing low tidal volume ventilation as the undisputed standard of care for patients with ARDS. It remains one of the most significant and impactful advances in the history of critical care medicine, directly responsible for saving countless lives.

REFERENCES

- Eisner, M.D., Thompson, B.T., Hudson, L.D., Luce, J.M., Hayden, D., Schoenfeld, D. and Matthay, M.A. (2001) 'Efficacy of low tidal volume ventilation in patients with different clinical risk factors for acute lung injury and the acute respiratory distress syndrome', *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine*, 164(2), pp. 231-236.
- Malhotra, A. (2007) 'Low-tidal-volume ventilation in the acute respiratory distress syndrome', *New England Journal of Medicine*, 357(11), pp. 1113-1120.
- Petrucci, N. and Iacovelli, W. (2007) 'Lung protective ventilation strategy for the acute respiratory distress syndrome', *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, (3), p. CD003844.
- Phua, J., Badia, J.R., Adhikari, N.K., Friedrich, J.O., Fowler, R.A., Singh, J.M., Scales, D.C., Stather, D.R., Li, A., Jones, A., Saad, R.R. and Ferguson, N.D. (2009) 'Has mortality from acute respiratory distress syndrome decreased over time?: A systematic review', *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine*, 179(3), pp. 220-227.
- Slutsky, A.S. (2002) 'Lung injury caused by mechanical ventilation', *Chest*, 122(6 Suppl), pp. 298S-302S.

