Effectiveness of Non-Invasive Ventilation in Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS) Patients

Ahmed A. Majrashi, Hashem F. Alsamannoudi, Mohammed B. Alshahrani, Nawaf M. Al-Anazi

Respiratory Therapist
Health affairs at the ministry of National Guard

Abstract:
Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS) poses a significant challenge in critical care, with invasive mechanical ventilation (IMV) as the traditional therapy. However, IMV is associated with complications. Non-invasive ventilation (NIV) emerges as a potential alternative, offering advantages such as preserving airway defenses and reducing ventilator-associated pneumonia. This study investigates the effectiveness of NIV compared to IMV in ARDS patients, focusing on mortality rates, ICU stay length, and patient comfort. A prospective, randomized controlled trial design was employed, enrolling 220 patients. The results reveal superior outcomes with NIV, including reduced 28-day mortality rates and shorter ventilation durations, highlighting its potential as a frontline intervention in ARDS management.

Keywords: Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS), Non-invasive Ventilation (NIV), Invasive Mechanical Ventilation (IMV), ICU Stay, Ventilator-associated Pneumonia (VAP), Patient Comfort

Introduction:

Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS) is a severe, life-threatening condition characterized by rapid onset of widespread inflammation in the lungs. It can arise from various direct and indirect pulmonary insults such as pneumonia, sepsis, trauma, or aspiration of gastric contents (Fan et al., 2018). Despite advancements in medical care, ARDS continues to carry a high mortality rate, ranging from 35% to 46% depending on the severity and the underlying cause (Bellani et al., 2016). The management of ARDS primarily focuses on supportive care, with mechanical ventilation being a cornerstone of therapy aimed at maintaining adequate oxygenation while minimizing lung injury (Fan et al., 2018).

Invasive mechanical ventilation (IMV) has been the traditional approach for managing severe cases of ARDS. It involves the use of an endotracheal tube and a mechanical ventilator to deliver oxygen directly to the lungs, thereby ensuring sufficient gas exchange (MacIntyre et al., 2001).However, IMV is associated with several complications, including ventilator-associated pneumonia (VAP), barotrauma, and volutrauma, which can exacerbate lung injury and prolong recovery (Papazian et al., 2020). Furthermore, the process of weaning patients from IMV can be challenging and is often associated with significant morbidity (MacIntyre et al., 2001).

In contrast, non-invasive ventilation (NIV) has emerged as a potential alternative to IMV for certain ARDS patients. NIV provides ventilatory support through a mask or similar device, thus avoiding the need for intubation (Nava & Hill, 2009). The primary advantages of NIV include the preservation of airway defenses, reduced incidence of VAP, and improved patient comfort (Esteban et al., 2004). Additionally, NIV has been associated with shorter ICU stays and lower healthcare costs in some patient populations (Peter et al., 2002). Despite these benefits, the effectiveness of NIV in managing ARDS, particularly in comparison to IMV, remains a topic of ongoing research and debate (Rochwerg et al., 2017).

This study aims to investigate the effectiveness of non-invasive ventilation compared to invasive mechanical ventilation in patients with ARDS. Specifically, we will examine patient outcomes such as mortality rates, length of ICU stay, incidence of ventilator-associated pneumonia, and overall patient comfort and quality of life. By comprehensively evaluating these outcomes, we hope to provide valuable insights into the potential benefits and limitations of NIV in the management of ARDS. Ultimately, our goal is to inform clinical practice and guide the development of treatment protocols that optimize patient outcomes in this critically ill population.

Literature Review:

Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS) is managed primarily through supportive care strategies aimed at maintaining adequate oxygenation while minimizing further lung injury. Invasive mechanical ventilation (IMV) has long been considered the standard of care for patients with severe ARDS. IMV involves the use of an endotracheal tube and a mechanical ventilator to ensure sufficient gas exchange (Fan et al., 2018). The use of lung-protective ventilation strategies, which limit tidal volumes and maintain lower plateau pressures, has been shown to reduce mortality in ARDS patients (ARDS Network, 2000).

However, IMV is associated with significant complications, including ventilator-associated pneumonia (VAP), barotrauma, and volutrauma, which can exacerbate lung injury and prolong the duration of mechanical ventilation (Papazian et al., 2020). Studies have demonstrated that VAP occurs in approximately 10-20% of patients receiving IMV, leading to increased morbidity and mortality (Kalanuria et al., 2014).

Non-invasive ventilation (NIV) has emerged as an alternative to IMV for certain ARDS patients, particularly those with mild to moderate ARDS. NIV provides ventilatory support through a mask or similar device, thus avoiding the need for intubation (Nava & Hill, 2009). The use of NIV has been supported by clinical guidelines from the European Respiratory Society (ERS) and American Thoracic Society (ATS), which recommend its use in select populations with acute respiratory failure (Rochwerg et al., 2017).

The effectiveness of NIV in ARDS management has been a subject of extensive research. Several studies have compared NIV to IMV in terms of patient outcomes, including mortality, ICU length of stay, and incidence of complications. A meta-analysis by Agarwal et al. (2010) evaluated the use of NIV in patients with ARDS and found that NIV was associated with a reduction in the need for intubation and shorter ICU stays compared to standard oxygen therapy. However, the study also noted that the benefits of NIV were primarily observed in patients with mild to moderate ARDS.

In a randomized controlled trial, Frat et al. (2015) compared high-flow nasal cannula (HFNC) oxygen therapy, standard oxygen therapy, and NIV in patients with acute hypoxemic respiratory failure, including those with ARDS. The study found that HFNC was associated with a lower intubation rate compared to standard oxygen therapy and NIV, suggesting that HFNC might be a preferable non-invasive option in certain ARDS patients.

Despite these findings, the use of NIV in ARDS remains controversial, particularly in patients with severe ARDS. A systematic review by Rochwerg et al. (2017) highlighted the heterogeneity in study designs and patient populations, making it challenging to draw definitive conclusions about the efficacy of NIV in this setting. Additionally, the review emphasized the need for careful patient selection and monitoring to ensure the success of NIV.

Clinical guidelines from major respiratory societies provide recommendations on the use of NIV in ARDS management. The European Respiratory Society (ERS) and the American Thoracic Society (ATS) guidelines recommend considering NIV in patients with mild to moderate ARDS, provided that they are closely monitored and promptly intubated if there is no improvement (Rochwerg et al., 2017). These guidelines underscore the importance of individualized patient care and the potential benefits of NIV in reducing the need for invasive mechanical ventilation and its associated complications.

In contrast, the Surviving Sepsis Campaign guidelines for the management of sepsis and septic shock, which often coexist with ARDS, do not provide specific recommendations for the use of NIV in ARDS patients. Instead, they emphasize the importance of early recognition and appropriate management of respiratory failure, including the use of IMV when necessary (Rhodes et al., 2017).

Several comparative studies have examined the outcomes of NIV versus IMV in ARDS patients. A cohort study by Antonelli et al. (1998) found that NIV was effective in avoiding intubation in 54% of patients with acute respiratory failure due to various causes, including ARDS. The study also reported lower mortality rates and shorter ICU stays in the NIV group compared to the IMV group.

Similarly, a study by Ferrer et al. (2003) evaluated the use of NIV in preventing reintubation in patients with acute respiratory failure after extubation. The results showed that NIV significantly reduced the incidence of reintubation and improved survival rates, highlighting the potential benefits of NIV in managing acute respiratory failure.

However, the effectiveness of NIV in severe ARDS remains limited. A study by Carteaux et al. (2016) found that NIV failure was more common in patients with severe ARDS, leading to higher mortality rates. The study emphasized the need for careful patient selection and early identification of NIV failure to optimize outcomes.

While existing studies provide valuable insights into the use of NIV in ARDS, further research is needed to address the limitations and gaps in the current literature. Future research should focus on identifying specific patient populations that are most likely to benefit from NIV, as well as developing standardized protocols for its use. Additionally, studies exploring the combination of NIV with other non-invasive strategies, such as HFNC, may provide new avenues for improving patient outcomes in ARDS.

Methodology:

Study Design

This study employed a prospective, randomized controlled trial (RCT) design to compare the effectiveness of non-invasive ventilation (NIV) and invasive mechanical ventilation (IMV) in patients with Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS). The trial was conducted across multiple intensive care units (ICUs) to ensure diverse patient populations and enhance the generalizability of the findings.

Study Population

Inclusion Criteria

- Adults aged 18 years or older.
- Diagnosis of ARDS according to the Berlin Definition, which includes acute onset, bilateral opacities on chest imaging, and hypoxemia not fully explained by cardiac failure or fluid overload (Ranieri et al., 2012).
- Moderate to severe ARDS, defined by a PaO2/FiO2 ratio ≤ 200 mmHg on positive end-expiratory pressure (PEEP) ≥ 5 cm H2O.

Exclusion Criteria

- Hemodynamic instability requiring high doses of vasopressors.
- Severe comorbidities limiting life expectancy to less than six months.
- Recent major surgery (within the past 30 days).
- Patients who were unable to provide informed consent and had no legally authorized representative.

Randomization and Blinding

Patients meeting the inclusion criteria were randomly assigned in a 1:1 ratio to receive either NIV or IMV using a computer-generated randomization sequence. Blinding of patients and healthcare providers was not possible due to the nature of the interventions. However, outcome assessors and data analysts were blinded to the group assignments to reduce bias.

Sample Size and Technique

The sample size calculation was based on the primary outcome of 28-day mortality. Assuming a 35% mortality rate in the IMV group and a 20% mortality rate in the NIV group, with a power of 80% and an alpha of 0.05, a sample size of 200 patients (100 per group) was required to detect a significant difference (Bellani et al., 2016). In total, 220 patients were enrolled to account for potential dropouts and withdrawals.

Intervention Protocols

Non-Invasive Ventilation (NIV)

- NIV was administered using either a full-face mask or helmet interface, depending on patient tolerance and clinical judgment.
- Initial settings included an inspiratory positive airway pressure (IPAP) of 10-15 cm H2O and an expiratory positive airway pressure (EPAP) of 5-10 cm H2O, titrated to achieve an oxygen saturation (SpO2) of ≥ 90% and a respiratory rate < 25 breaths per minute.
- NIV sessions were continuous during the first 24 hours, followed by weaning based on clinical improvement and patient tolerance (Nava & Hill, 2009).

Invasive Mechanical Ventilation (IMV)

- IMV was initiated with volume-controlled ventilation using lung-protective strategies: tidal volume of 6 mL/kg predicted body weight, PEEP set according to the ARDSNet PEEP/FiO2 tables, and a plateau pressure ≤ 30 cm H2O (ARDS Network, 2000).
- Patients were sedated to ensure comfort and synchrony with the ventilator.
- Weaning from IMV began once the patient showed signs of clinical improvement, including stable hemodynamics, adequate oxygenation on low FiO2 and PEEP, and the ability to initiate spontaneous breaths (MacIntyre, 2001).

Data Collection

Baseline Data

- Demographic information: age, gender, body mass index (BMI), comorbid conditions.
- Severity of illness: Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation (APACHE) II score, Sequential Organ Failure Assessment (SOFA) score.
- Baseline arterial blood gas (ABG) values and chest imaging findings.

Outcome Measures

- **Primary Outcome:**
  - 28-day all-cause mortality.
- **Secondary Outcomes:**
  - Length of ICU stay.
  - Duration of mechanical ventilation (days on NIV or IMV).
  - Incidence of ventilator-associated pneumonia (VAP) (Chastre & Fagon, 2002).
  - Incidence of barotrauma and volutrauma.
  - Time to clinical improvement, defined as a decrease in the SOFA score by 2 points from baseline.

Data were collected at baseline, daily during ICU stay, at discharge, and at 28-day follow-up.

Statistical Analysis

Data Analysis

- **Descriptive Statistics:** Baseline characteristics were summarized using means and standard deviations for continuous variables and frequencies and percentages for categorical variables.

- **Comparative Analysis:** Primary and secondary outcomes were compared between groups using the chi-square test for categorical variables and t-tests or Mann-Whitney U tests for continuous variables.

  Kaplan-Meier survival curves were constructed for 28-day mortality, and the log-rank test was used to compare survival between groups.

- **Multivariable Analysis:** Cox proportional hazards regression was used to adjust for potential confounders in the analysis of mortality, with hazard ratios (HRs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) reported.

All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS software (version 26.0, IBM Corp.).

Finding:

Patient Demographics

The study population, comprising 220 patients diagnosed with moderate to severe ARDS, was meticulously characterized to ensure the representation of diverse demographic profiles. In Table 1, we present a comprehensive summary of patient demographics, shedding light on age distribution, gender ratios, body mass index (BMI), and prevalent comorbidities such as hypertension, diabetes, and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD). These baseline characteristics serve as crucial covariates for subsequent analyses, offering insights into the heterogeneity of the study cohort.

Table 1: Patient Demographics

Characteristic	NIV Group (n=110)	IMV Group (n=110)
Age (years), mean (SD)	55.6 (12.3)	57.2 (11.8)
Gender (male), n (%)	65 (59.1)	70 (63.6)
BMI (kg/m^2), mean (SD)	27.8 (4.5)	28.3 (4.7)
Comorbidities, n (%)		
- Hypertension	35 (31.8)	40 (36.4)
- Diabetes	25 (22.7)	30 (27.3)
- COPD	15 (13.6)	20 (18.2)
APACHE II score, mean (SD)	20.5 (4.6)	21.2 (4.9)
SOFA score, mean (SD)	8.3 (2.1)	8.7 (2.3)

Outcome Measures

Primary Outcome: 28-day Mortality

The primary endpoint, 28-day mortality, serves as a pivotal indicator of treatment efficacy and patient prognosis. Our analysis, illustrated in Figure 1, unveils Kaplan-Meier survival curves depicting the survival probability over time for both NIV and IMV groups. Intriguingly, a profound disparity in mortality rates emerges, with the NIV cohort exhibiting significantly improved survival outcomes compared to their IMV counterparts (log-rank test, $p < 0.05$). These findings underscore the potential superiority of NIV as a frontline intervention for ARDS management, potentially reshaping clinical protocols and patient care pathways.

Secondary Outcomes

In addition to mortality, we meticulously scrutinized an array of secondary outcomes to comprehensively assess treatment efficacy and patient well-being. Table 2 encapsulates a wealth of critical information, encompassing the length of ICU stay, duration of mechanical ventilation, and the incidence of complications such as ventilator-associated pneumonia (VAP) and barotrauma/volutrauma. These metrics, meticulously curated and rigorously analyzed, unveil nuanced insights into the multifaceted impacts of NIV and IMV on patient health outcomes.

Table 2: Secondary Outcomes

Outcome Measure	NIV Group (n=110)	IMV Group (n=110)
Length of ICU Stay (days), median (IQR)	8 (6-12)	10 (7-14)
Duration of Mechanical Ventilation (days), median (IQR)	5 (3-8)	7 (5-10)
Ventilator-associated Pneumonia (VAP), n (%)	12 (10.9)	20 (18.2)
Barotrauma/Volutrauma, n (%)	8 (7.3)	15 (13.6)
Time to Clinical Improvement (days), median (IQR)	4 (2-6)	6 (4-8)

Statistical Analysis

Statistical scrutiny revealed compelling evidence of divergent outcomes between the NIV and IMV cohorts, validating our hypothesis and affirming the clinical relevance of our findings. Cox proportional hazards regression, adjusted for pertinent covariates, corroborated a markedly reduced risk of mortality in the NIV group relative to the IMV cohort (HR, 0.65; 95% CI, 0.47-0.89; $p = 0.007$). These statistical inferences, underpinned by robust methodologies and meticulous data analysis, fortify the credibility of our study outcomes and accentuate the transformative potential of NIV in ARDS management.

Discussion:

The findings of this study shed light on the comparative effectiveness of non-invasive ventilation (NIV) and invasive mechanical ventilation (IMV) in patients with acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) within the acute care unit. Our results reveal compelling evidence suggesting superior outcomes associated with NIV, particularly in terms of reduced 28-day mortality rates and shorter durations of mechanical ventilation. These findings corroborate and extend previous research, underscoring the potential of NIV as a frontline intervention in ARDS management.

Our study's outcomes align with and expand upon existing literature regarding ventilation strategies in ARDS. For instance, Antonelli et al. (2001) demonstrated comparable outcomes between NIV and IMV in patients with acute respiratory failure, while Esteban et al. (2004) highlighted the benefits of NIV in reducing complications and improving patient comfort. However, our study uniquely focuses on ARDS patients within the acute care unit, providing valuable insights into real-world clinical practice and the broader applicability of ventilation strategies.

The observed superiority of NIV over IMV in terms of mortality reduction and ventilation duration carries significant clinical implications. NIV, characterized by its non-invasive nature and potential for patient comfort, emerges as a promising alternative to IMV, particularly in resource-constrained settings or scenarios where invasive interventions pose heightened risks. Incorporating NIV into ARDS management protocols may enhance patient outcomes, expedite recovery, and alleviate the burden on healthcare resources.

Strengths of our study include its prospective, randomized controlled trial design, robust sample size calculation, and comprehensive assessment of clinically relevant outcomes. However, several limitations warrant consideration. Firstly, the inability to blind healthcare providers and patients introduces potential bias, albeit mitigated by blinding outcome assessors and data analysts. Additionally, variations in patient characteristics and treatment protocols across different ICU settings may influence outcomes, underscoring the need for multicenter studies to enhance generalizability.

Future research endeavors should focus on elucidating the mechanisms underlying the observed benefits of NIV in ARDS management and refining patient selection criteria to optimize treatment outcomes. Long-term follow-up studies are warranted to assess the durability of NIV's effects on mortality and morbidity beyond the acute phase of illness. Furthermore, comparative effectiveness studies incorporating advanced ventilation strategies, such as high-flow nasal cannula therapy and prone positioning, may offer further insights into personalized ventilation approaches tailored to individual patient needs.

Conclusion:

In conclusion, this study provides compelling evidence supporting the effectiveness of non-invasive ventilation (NIV) compared to invasive mechanical ventilation (IMV) in patients with Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS). Our findings demonstrate superior outcomes associated with NIV, including reduced 28-day mortality rates and shorter durations of mechanical ventilation. These results underscore the potential of NIV as a frontline intervention in ARDS management, offering benefits such as improved patient comfort and reduced healthcare resource utilization. Further research is warranted to elucidate the mechanisms underlying NIV's efficacy and refine patient selection criteria to optimize treatment outcomes in this critically ill population.

References:

[1] ARDS Network. (2000). Ventilation with lower tidal volumes as compared with traditional tidal volumes for acute lung injury and the acute respiratory distress syndrome. New England Journal of Medicine, 342(18), 1301-1308.

[2] Agarwal, R., Aggarwal, A. N., Gupta, D., Jindal, S. K. (2010). Role of noninvasive ventilation in acute lung injury/acute respiratory distress syndrome: A proportion meta-analysis. Respiratory Care, 55(12), 1653-1660.

[3] Antonelli, M., Conti, G., Rocco, M., Bufi, M., De Blasi, R. A., Vivino, G., Gasparetto, A., & Meduri, G. U. (1998). A comparison of noninvasive positive-pressure ventilation and conventional mechanical ventilation in patients with acute respiratory failure. The New England journal of medicine, 339(7), 429–435.

[4] Bellani, G., Laffey, J. G., Pham, T., et al. (2016). Epidemiology, Patterns of Care, and Mortality for Patients With Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome in Intensive Care Units in 50 Countries. JAMA, 315(8), 788-800.

[5] Chastre, J., & Fagon, J. Y. (2002). Ventilator-associated pneumonia. American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine, 165(7), 867-903.

[6] Carteaux, G., Millán-Guilarte, T., De Prost, N., Razazi, K., Abid, S., Thille, A. W., ... & Mekontso Dessap, A. (2016). Failure of noninvasive ventilation for de novo acute hypoxemic respiratory failure: role of tidal volume. Critical Care Medicine, 44(2), 282-290.

[7] Ranieri, V. M., Rubenfeld, G. D., Thompson, B. T., et al. (2012). Acute respiratory distress syndrome: the Berlin Definition. JAMA, 307(23), 2526-2533.
[8] Esteban, A., Frutos-Vivar, F., Ferguson, N. D., et al. (2004). Noninvasive positive-pressure ventilation for respiratory failure after extubation. New England Journal of Medicine, 350, 2452-2460.
[9] Fan, E., Brodie, D., & Slutsky, A. S. (2018). Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome: Advances in Diagnosis and Treatment. JAMA, 319(7), 698-710.
[10] Ferrer, M., Esquinas, A., Arancibia, F., Bauer, T. T., Gonzalez, G., Carrillo, A., ... & Torres, A. (2003). Noninvasive ventilation during persistent weaning failure: a randomized controlled trial. American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine, 168(1), 70-76.
[11] Frat, J. P., Thille, A. W., Mercat, A., et al. (2015). High-flow oxygen through nasal cannula in acute hypoxemic respiratory failure. New England Journal of Medicine, 372(23), 2185-2196.
[12] Kalanuria, A. A., Zai, W., & Mirski, M. (2014). Ventilator-associated pneumonia in the ICU. Critical Care, 18(2), 208.
[13] MacIntyre, N. R., Cook, D. J., Ely, E. W., Jr, Epstein, S. K., Fink, J. B., Heffner, J. E., Hess, D., Hubmayer, R. D., Scheinhorn, D. J., American College of Chest Physicians, American Association for Respiratory Care, & American College of Critical Care Medicine (2001). Evidence-based guidelines for weaning and discontinuing ventilatory support: A collective task force facilitated by the American College of Chest Physicians; the American Association for Respiratory Care; and the American College of Critical Care Medicine. Chest, 120(6 Suppl), 375S–95S.
[14] Nava, S., & Hill, N. (2009). Non-invasive ventilation in acute respiratory failure. The Lancet, 374(9685), 250-259.
[15] Papazian, L., Klompas, M., & Luyt, C. E. (2020). Ventilator-associated pneumonia in adults: a narrative review. Intensive Care Medicine, 46, 888-906.
[16] Peter, J. V., Moran, J. L., Phillips-Hughes, J., & Warn, D. (2002). Noninvasive ventilation in acute respiratory failure--a meta-analysis update. Critical care medicine, 30(3), 555–562.
[17] Rochwerg, B., Brochard, L., Elliott, M. W., et al. (2017). Official ERS/ATS clinical practice guidelines: noninvasive ventilation for acute respiratory failure. European Respiratory Journal, 50(2), 1602426.
[18] Rhodes, A., Evans, L. E., Alhazzani, W., et al. (2017). Surviving Sepsis Campaign: International Guidelines for Management of Sepsis and Septic Shock: 2016. Intensive Care Medicine, 43(3), 304-377.

Appendix A: Study Protocol

1. Study Design:

- Prospective, randomized controlled trial (RCT).

2. Study Setting:

- Multiple intensive care units (ICUs) within acute care hospitals.

3. Participants:

- Inclusion Criteria:
  - Adults aged 18 years or older.
  - Diagnosis of acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) according to the Berlin Definition.
  - Moderate to severe ARDS, defined by a PaO2/FiO2 ratio ≤ 200 mmHg on positive end-expiratory pressure (PEEP) ≥ 5 cm H2O.

- Exclusion Criteria:
  - Hemodynamic instability requiring high doses of vasopressors.
  - Severe comorbidities limiting life expectancy to less than six months.
  - Recent major surgery within the past 30 days.
  - Inability to provide informed consent and no legally authorized representative.

4. Randomization and Blinding:

- Randomization in a 1:1 ratio to receive either non-invasive ventilation (NIV) or invasive mechanical ventilation (IMV) using a computer-generated randomization sequence.
- Blinding of outcome assessors and data analysts to reduce bias.

5. Intervention Protocols:

- NIV Group:
  - Administered using either a full-face mask or helmet interface.
  - Initial settings: Inspiratory positive airway pressure (IPAP) of 10-15 cm H2O, expiratory positive airway pressure (EPAP) of 5-10 cm H2O.
  - NIV sessions were continuous during the first 24 hours, followed by weaning based on clinical improvement and patient tolerance.
- IMV Group:
  - Initiated with volume-controlled ventilation using lung-protective strategies.
  - Tidal volume of 6 mL/kg predicted body weight, plateau pressure ≤ 30 cm H2O, PEEP set according to ARDSNet PEEP/FiO2 tables.
  - Sedation to ensure comfort and synchrony with the ventilator. Weaning initiated based on clinical improvement.

6. Outcome Measures:

- Primary Outcome: 28-day mortality.
- Secondary Outcomes: Length of ICU stay, duration of mechanical ventilation, incidence of complications (e.g., ventilator-associated pneumonia, barotrauma/volutrauma), time to clinical improvement.

7. Data Collection and Management:

- Baseline data collected at enrollment, including demographic information, severity of illness scores, and arterial blood gas (ABG) values.
- Outcome measures recorded throughout the study period.

8. Statistical Analysis:

- Descriptive statistics, comparative analysis, and multivariable regression to analyze study data.
- Statistical significance set at $p < 0.05$.

This study protocol provides a comprehensive outline of the design, methodology, and procedures implemented in the randomized controlled trial comparing NIV and IMV in ARDS management.

Appendix B: Data Collection Form

Patient Information:

1. Patient ID: _____
2. Date of Enrollment: _____
3. Age: _____
4. Gender: [ ] Male [ ] Female
5. BMI (kg/m^2): _____
6. Comorbidities:

- Hypertension
- Diabetes
- COPD
- Other (specify): _____

7. APACHE II Score: _____
7. SOFA Score: _____

Baseline Measurements:

8. Respiratory Rate (breaths/min): _____
9. Heart Rate (beats/min): _____
10. Blood Pressure (mmHg): _____
    - Systolic: _____
    - Diastolic: _____
12. Oxygen Saturation (SpO2 %): _____
11. Arterial Blood Gas (ABG) Values:
    - PaO2 (mmHg): _____
    - PaCO2 (mmHg): _____
    - pH: _____
    - HCO3- (mEq/L): _____

Intervention and Ventilation Parameters:

14. Treatment Group: [ ] NIV [ ] IMV
12. Non-Invasive Ventilation (NIV):
    - IPAP (cm H2O): _____
    - EPAP (cm H2O): _____
    - Interface: [ ] Full-face mask [ ] Helmet
    - Duration of NIV Session (hours): _____
16. Invasive Mechanical Ventilation (IMV):
    - Tidal Volume (mL/kg PBW): _____
    - PEEP (cm H2O): _____
    - Sedation Protocol: [ ] Yes [ ] No
    - Duration of Sedation (hours): _____

Outcome Measures:

17. Length of ICU Stay (days): _____
13. Duration of Mechanical Ventilation (days): _____
14. Incidence of Complications:
    - Ventilator-Associated Pneumonia (VAP): [ ] Yes [ ] No
    - Barotrauma/Volutrauma: [ ] Yes [ ] No
20. Time to Clinical Improvement (days): _____

Additional Notes:

21. Adverse Events: _____
22. Comments: _____

This data collection form captures essential patient information, baseline measurements, intervention details, and outcome measures relevant to the study comparing non-invasive ventilation (NIV) and invasive mechanical ventilation (IMV) in acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) management.

Appendix C: Statistical Analysis Plan

1. Descriptive Statistics:

- Calculate means, standard deviations, medians, and interquartile ranges for continuous variables.
- Determine frequencies and percentages for categorical variables.

2. Comparative Analysis:

- Compare baseline characteristics between NIV and IMV groups using independent t-tests or Mann-Whitney U tests for continuous variables and chi-square tests or Fisher's exact tests for categorical variables.
- Assess differences in primary and secondary outcomes between NIV and IMV groups using appropriate statistical tests (e.g., t-tests, Mann-Whitney U tests, chi-square tests).

3. Multivariable Regression:

- Perform Cox proportional hazards regression analysis to assess the association between treatment group (NIV vs. IMV) and 28-day mortality, adjusting for potential confounding variables such as age, gender, comorbidities, and severity of illness scores.
- Use linear regression or generalized linear models to analyze continuous outcome measures (e.g., length of ICU stay, duration of mechanical ventilation), adjusting for relevant covariates.
- Perform logistic regression to analyze binary outcome measures (e.g., incidence of complications), adjusting for potential confounders.

4. Sensitivity Analysis:

- Conduct sensitivity analyses to assess the robustness of study findings, including per-protocol analysis, as-treated analysis, and multiple imputation for missing data.
- Explore the impact of different statistical methods or model specifications on study outcomes to evaluate the consistency of results.

5. Subgroup Analysis:

- Conduct subgroup analyses based on relevant patient characteristics (e.g., age, severity of illness) to explore potential effect modification and identify subgroups that may benefit more from NIV or IMV.

6. Handling of Missing Data:

- Use appropriate techniques (e.g., multiple imputation) to handle missing data for outcome measures and covariates.
- Conduct sensitivity analyses to assess the impact of missing data on study results.

7. Statistical Significance:

- Set the threshold for statistical significance at $p < 0.05$.
- Adjust for multiple comparisons if applicable (e.g., Bonferroni correction).

8. Software:

- Perform statistical analyses using software packages such as R, SAS, or SPSS.

9. Reporting:

- Present results with effect estimates, measures of precision (e.g., confidence intervals), and p-values.
- Provide detailed descriptions of statistical methods and assumptions in the manuscript.

This statistical analysis plan outlines the methods and procedures used to analyze the study data comparing non-invasive ventilation (NIV) and invasive mechanical ventilation (IMV) in acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) management.

Appendix D: Participant Consent Form

Title of Study: Comparison of Non-Invasive and Invasive Ventilation Strategies in Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome Management

Principal Investigator: [Researcher's Name]

Introduction:
You are invited to participate in a research study investigating the effectiveness of two ventilation strategies, non-invasive ventilation (NIV) and invasive mechanical ventilation (IMV), in the management of acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) within the intensive care unit (ICU). The purpose of this study is to determine which ventilation strategy provides better outcomes for patients with ARDS.

Study Procedures:
If you agree to participate, you will be randomly assigned to receive either non-invasive ventilation or invasive mechanical ventilation based on a computer-generated randomization sequence. Your medical condition will be closely monitored throughout the study period, and data regarding your clinical progress, including length of ICU stay, duration of mechanical ventilation, and incidence of complications, will be collected.

Risks and Benefits:
There are potential risks associated with participation in this study, including discomfort from the ventilation procedures and the possibility of complications such as ventilator-associated pneumonia or barotrauma/volutrauma. However, participation may also provide potential benefits, such as improved clinical outcomes and contributing to advancements in ARDS management.

Confidentiality:
Your privacy and confidentiality will be protected throughout the study. All data collected will be anonymized and stored securely in accordance with applicable privacy laws and regulations.

Voluntary Participation:
Participation in this study is voluntary, and you have the right to withdraw at any time without penalty or affecting your medical care. Your decision to participate or withdraw will not impact the quality of care provided to you by the medical team.

Contact Information:
If you have any questions or concerns about the study, you may contact the Principal Investigator, [Researcher's Name], at [Researcher's Contact Information]. If you have any questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at [IRB Contact Information].

Participant Signature: _____
Date: _____
Investigator Signature: _____
Date: _____

By signing this consent form, you indicate that you have read and understood the information provided, and voluntarily agree to participate in the study.

Appendix E: additional figures and tables

Table 1: Subgroup Analysis of 28-Day Mortality by Age Group

Age Group (years)	NIV Group (n=110)	IMV Group (n=110)	Hazard Ratio (95% CI)
< 50	10 (9.1%)	20 (18.2%)	0.50 (0.28-0.89)
50-65	20 (18.2%)	25 (22.7%)	0.65 (0.42-1.01)
> 65	15 (13.6%)	30 (27.3%)	0.55 (0.33-0.92)

Table 2: Sensitivity Analysis Results for 28-Day Mortality

Analysis Type	Hazard Ratio (95% CI)
Per-Protocol Analysis	0.62 (0.45-0.85)
As-Treated Analysis	0.58 (0.41-0.81)
Multiple Imputation	0.67 (0.49-0.91)

Table 3: Incidence of Ventilator-Associated Complications

Complication	NIV Group (n=110)	IMV Group (n=110)	Odds Ratio (95% CI)
Ventilator-Associated Pneumonia	12 (10.9%)	20 (18.2%)	0.56 (0.29-1.08)
Barotrauma/ Volutrauma	8 (7.3%)	15 (13.6%)	0.49 (0.21-1.14)