The Effectiveness of Prone Positioning in Improving Oxygenation and Clinical Outcomes in Patients with Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS): A Quantitative Study

Ali H. Alshehri[1], Mohammed H. Alotaibi[2], Rami H. Alkhalid[3], Yasser A. Alsuaibi[4], Abdulmajeed H. Alanazi[5]

Respiratory Therapist
Health affairs at the ministry of National Guard

Abstract: Background: Prone positioning is a therapeutic intervention used in patients with Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS) to improve oxygenation and clinical outcomes. This study aimed to evaluate the effectiveness of prone positioning in improving oxygenation and clinical outcomes in ARDS patients.
Methods: A prospective observational study was conducted in the ICU of specialized military hospital . Fifty patients with moderate to severe ARDS were included. Prone positioning was performed according to a standardized protocol. Outcome measures included changes in PaO2/FiO2 ratio, ICU mortality, ventilator-free days, and ICU length of stay.
Results: Prone positioning led to a significant improvement in oxygenation, with an increase in the PaO2/FiO2 ratio from baseline to after 16 hours of prone positioning ($p < 0.001$). Clinical outcomes included an ICU mortality rate of 28%, a median ICU length of stay of 12 days, and a median ventilator-free days of 12 at day 28.
Conclusion: Prone positioning effectively improved oxygenation and was associated with favorable clinical outcomes in ARDS patients. These findings support the use of prone positioning as part of the management strategy for ARDS.

Keywords: Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome, Prone Positioning, Oxygenation, Clinical Outcomes, ICU Mortality, Ventilator-Free Days

Introduction

Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS) is a severe form of acute lung injury characterized by rapid onset hypoxemia, bilateral pulmonary infiltrates, and respiratory failure, often requiring mechanical ventilation (ARDS Definition Task Force, 2012). Despite advancements in critical care, ARDS remains associated with high mortality rates and long-term morbidity (Bellani et al., 2016). Prone positioning, where patients are placed in a face-down position, has emerged as a promising intervention to improve oxygenation and outcomes in ARDS patients.

Prone positioning aims to optimize ventilation-perfusion matching, reduce ventilator-induced lung injury, and improve oxygenation by redistributing pulmonary perfusion and reducing alveolar collapse in dependent lung regions (Guérin et al., 2013). Several observational studies and randomized controlled trials (RCTs) have suggested a beneficial effect of prone positioning on oxygenation and mortality in ARDS patients (Sud et al., 2010; Munshi et al., 2017). However, the evidence regarding its impact on clinical outcomes such as mortality, ventilator-free days, and ICU length of stay remains inconclusive.

Given the potential benefits of prone positioning, further investigation through quantitative studies is warranted to provide more robust evidence regarding its effectiveness in improving oxygenation and clinical

outcomes in ARDS patients. Therefore, this study aims to evaluate the effectiveness of prone positioning in improving oxygenation and clinical outcomes in patients with ARDS.

Objectives :
1. To assess the impact of prone positioning on oxygenation levels in patients with ARDS.
2. To investigate the effect of prone positioning on clinical outcomes, including mortality, ventilator-free days, and ICU length of stay, in ARDS patients.

Rationale:
Understanding the effectiveness of prone positioning is crucial for optimizing the management of ARDS and improving patient outcomes. If prone positioning is found to significantly improve oxygenation and clinical outcomes, it could become a standard intervention in the management of ARDS.

This quantitative study aims to contribute to the existing literature by providing robust evidence on the effectiveness of prone positioning in ARDS patients, which may inform clinical practice guidelines and improve patient care.

Literature Review

Effectiveness of Prone Positioning in ARDS:

Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS) is a severe form of acute lung injury characterized by hypoxemia, bilateral pulmonary infiltrates, and respiratory failure. Despite advances in critical care, ARDS remains associated with high mortality rates and significant morbidity (Bellani et al., 2016). Prone positioning, where patients are placed in a face-down position, has gained attention as a potential intervention to improve oxygenation and outcomes in ARDS patients.

Oxygenation Improvement:

Prone positioning has been shown to improve oxygenation in ARDS patients by optimizing ventilation-perfusion matching and reducing lung injury. In a landmark study by Guérin et al. (2013), prone positioning significantly improved oxygenation and decreased mortality in severe ARDS patients compared to supine positioning. The physiological benefits of prone positioning include more homogeneous distribution of ventilation and perfusion, reduced alveolar overdistension, and improved lung recruitment (Gattinoni et al., 2001).

Several observational studies and randomized controlled trials (RCTs) have consistently demonstrated improved oxygenation with prone positioning in ARDS patients (Sud et al., 2010; Munshi et al., 2017). Sud et al. conducted a meta-analysis and found that prone ventilation was associated with reduced mortality and improved oxygenation in patients with severe hypoxemia and acute respiratory failure (Sud et al., 2010). These findings support the use of prone positioning as a strategy to enhance oxygenation in ARDS.

Clinical Outcomes:

While prone positioning has shown promise in improving oxygenation, its impact on clinical outcomes such as mortality, ventilator-free days, and ICU length of stay remains debated. Munshi et al. conducted a multicenter RCT and found no significant difference in 28-day mortality between prone and supine positioning groups, although prone positioning was associated with improved oxygenation and reduced barotrauma (Munshi et al., 2017). However, other studies have reported a reduction in mortality and ICU length of stay with prone ventilation (Guérin et al., 2013; Beitler et al., 2014).

Mechanisms of Action:

The mechanisms underlying the beneficial effects of prone positioning are multifactorial. Prone positioning improves lung mechanics by reducing dorsal lung compression and increasing ventilation in dependent lung regions (Gattinoni et al., 2001). It also reduces alveolar overdistension and stress on the lung parenchyma, thereby minimizing ventilator-induced lung injury (Gattinoni et al., 2016). Additionally, prone positioning improves secretion clearance and may enhance patient comfort and tolerance to mechanical ventilation (Albert et al., 2014).

Challenges and Considerations:

Despite its potential benefits, prone positioning poses challenges in clinical practice, including logistical issues, risk of dislodgement of invasive lines and tubes, and potential for pressure injuries. Proper patient selection, training of staff, and monitoring are crucial to ensure safe and effective implementation of prone ventilation (Gattinoni et al., 2016).

Methodology

Study Design:

A prospective observational study was conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of prone positioning in improving oxygenation and clinical outcomes in patients with Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS). The study was conducted in the Intensive Care Unit (ICU) of a specialized military hospital.

Participants :

Patients admitted to the ICU with ARDS, as defined by the Berlin Definition (ARDS Definition Task Force, 2012), were eligible for inclusion. Inclusion criteria were: age 18 years or older, meeting criteria for moderate to severe ARDS (PaO2/FiO2 ratio < 200 mmHg), and receiving mechanical ventilation. Exclusion criteria included pregnancy, severe hemodynamic instability, contraindications to prone positioning, and inability to obtain informed consent.

Prone Positioning Protocol:

Prone positioning was initiated in eligible patients according to a standardized protocol. Patients were positioned in the prone position for a minimum of 16 hours per day, aiming for prolonged sessions whenever feasible. Prone positioning was performed by a trained team of ICU nurses and respiratory therapists under the supervision of critical care physicians.

Data Collection :

Baseline demographic and clinical data were collected, including age, sex, comorbidities, severity of illness (APACHE II score), and ARDS etiology. Physiological data including PaO2/FiO2 ratio, arterial blood gases, ventilator settings, and hemodynamic parameters were recorded at baseline (before prone positioning) and at regular intervals during prone positioning.

Outcome Measures:

The primary outcome was improvement in oxygenation, assessed by changes in the PaO2/FiO2 ratio from baseline to after 16 hours of prone positioning. Secondary outcomes included ICU mortality, ventilator-free days at day 28, ICU length of stay, and incidence of complications such as pressure injuries and endotracheal tube displacement.

Statistical Analysis:

Statistical analysis was performed using SPSS version 26. Continuous variables were expressed as mean ± standard deviation or median (interquartile range) depending on the distribution. Paired t-tests or Wilcoxon signed-rank tests were used to compare variables before and after prone positioning. Categorical variables were presented as frequencies and percentages and compared using chi-square tests or Fisher's exact tests, as appropriate. A p-value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Ethical Considerations:

The study protocol was approved by ethics committee. Informed consent was obtained from patients or their legal representatives before enrollment. Patient confidentiality was maintained throughout the study.

The Findings

Baseline Characteristics:

A total of 50 patients with moderate to severe ARDS were included in the study. The mean age of the patients was 58.4 years (±9.7), and 60% were male. The most common ARDS etiologies were pneumonia (50%) and sepsis (30%). The mean APACHE II score on admission was 21.6 (±4.8), indicating moderate severity of illness.

Effect of Prone Positioning on Oxygenation:

Prone positioning led to a significant improvement in oxygenation as evidenced by an increase in the PaO2/FiO2 ratio from baseline to after 16 hours of prone positioning. The mean PaO2/FiO2 ratio increased from 150.4 mmHg (±30.1) at baseline to 210.8 mmHg (±40.2) after prone positioning (p < 0.001).

Table 1: Summarizes the changes in oxygenation before and after prone positioning.

	Baseline (Before Prone	After 16 Hours of Prone	p-value
PaO2/FiO2 Ratio	150.4 mmHg (±30.1)	210.8 mmHg (±40.2)	<0.001

Clinical Outcomes:

ICU mortality rate was 28%, and the median ICU length of stay was 12 days (IQR 9-18 days). Patients spent a median of 20 days (IQR 15-25 days) on mechanical ventilation, with a median of 12 ventilator-free days at day 28. Complications related to prone positioning were minimal, with no reported cases of pressure injuries or endotracheal tube displacement.

Table 2: Clinical Outcomes

	Value
ICU Mortality	28%
ICU Length of Stay	12 days (IQR 9-18 days)
Ventilator Duration	20 days (IQR 15-25 days)
Ventilator-Free Days	12 days at day 28

Discussion

Effectiveness of Prone Positioning in ARDS:

The findings of this study support the effectiveness of prone positioning in improving oxygenation in patients with Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome (ARDS). Consistent with previous research, prone positioning led to a significant increase in the PaO2/FiO2 ratio, indicating improved gas exchange and lung function (Guérin et al., 2013; Sud et al., 2010). This improvement in oxygenation is crucial for ARDS management as adequate oxygenation is essential to prevent tissue hypoxia and organ dysfunction.

Clinical Outcomes:

In addition to improved oxygenation, prone positioning was associated with favorable clinical outcomes. The ICU mortality rate of 28% observed in this study is comparable to previous reports in ARDS patients (Bellani et al., 2016). While prone positioning did not directly reduce mortality in this study, it is important to note that mortality in ARDS is influenced by various factors beyond oxygenation alone.

The median ICU length of stay and ventilator duration were consistent with previous studies, indicating that prone positioning did not prolong ICU stay or mechanical ventilation duration (Beitler et al., 2014; Munshi et al., 2017). Moreover, the median ventilator-free days at day 28 suggest that prone positioning may facilitate earlier liberation from mechanical ventilation.

Complications and Safety:

One notable finding is the minimal incidence of complications related to prone positioning. There were no reported cases of pressure injuries or endotracheal tube displacement, suggesting that prone positioning can be safely implemented with appropriate patient selection and monitoring. This aligns with existing evidence supporting the safety of prone ventilation in ARDS patients (Guérin et al., 2013).

Limitations :

Several limitations of this study should be acknowledged. First, as an observational study, causality cannot be inferred, and there may be confounding factors influencing the outcomes. Second, the sample size was relatively small, which may limit the generalizability of the findings. Additionally, the study was conducted in a single center, which may affect the external validity of the results.

Future Directions:

Future research should focus on larger multicenter studies to validate these findings and further explore the impact of prone positioning on mortality and long-term outcomes in ARDS patients. Additionally, studies comparing different prone positioning strategies, such as duration and frequency of sessions, could provide valuable insights into optimization of this intervention.

Clinical Implications:

The findings of this study have important implications for the management of ARDS. Prone positioning is a simple, low-cost intervention that can improve oxygenation and potentially enhance clinical outcomes in ARDS patients. Incorporating prone positioning into standard ARDS management protocols may help improve patient outcomes and reduce morbidity and mortality.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this study provides evidence supporting the effectiveness and safety of prone positioning in improving oxygenation and clinical outcomes in patients with ARDS. Prone positioning should be considered as part of the management strategy for ARDS patients in the ICU.

References:

Albert, R. K., Keniston, A., Baboi, L., Ayzac, L., Guérin, C., & Proseva Investigators (2014). Prone position-induced improvement in gas exchange does not predict improved survival in the acute respiratory distress syndrome. American journal of respiratory and critical care medicine, 189(4), 494–496.

ARDS Definition Task Force, Ranieri, V. M., Rubenfeld, G. D., Thompson, B. T., Ferguson, N. D., Caldwell, E., Fan, E., Camporota, L., & Slutsky, A. S. (2012). Acute respiratory distress syndrome: the Berlin Definition. JAMA, 307(23), 2526–2533. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2012.5669

Beitler, J. R., Shaefi, S., Montesi, S. B., Devlin, A., Loring, S. H., Talmor, D., & Malhotra, A. (2014). Prone positioning reduces mortality from acute respiratory distress syndrome in the low tidal volume era: a meta-analysis. Intensive care medicine, 40(3), 332–341.

Bellani, G., Laffey, J. G., Pham, T., Fan, E., Brochard, L., Esteban, A., Gattinoni, L., van Haren, F., Larsson, A., McAuley, D. F., Ranieri, M., Rubenfeld, G., Thompson, B. T., Wrigge, H., Slutsky, A. S., Pesenti, A., LUNG SAFE Investigators, & ESICM Trials Group (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.

-Gattinoni, L., Tognoni, G., Pesenti, A., Taccone, P., Mascheroni, D., Labarta, V., Malacrida, R., Di Giulio, P., Fumagalli, R., Pelosi, P., Brazzi, L., Latini, R., & Prone-Supine Study Group (2001). Effect of prone positioning on the survival of patients with acute respiratory failure. The New England journal of medicine, 345(8), 568–573.

Gattinoni, L., Tonetti, T., Cressoni, M., Cadringher, P., Herrmann, P., Moerer, O., Protti, A., Gotti, M., Chiurazzi, C., Carlesso, E., Chiumello, D., & Quintel, M. (2016). Ventilator-related causes of lung injury: the mechanical power. Intensive care medicine, 42(10), 1567–1575.

Guérin, C., Reignier, J., Richard, J. C., Beuret, P., Gacouin, A., Boulain, T., Mercier, E., Badet, M., Mercat, A., Baudin, O., Clavel, M., Chatellier, D., Jaber, S., Rosselli, S., Mancebo, J., Sirodot, M., Hilbert, G., Bengler, C., Richecoeur, J., Gainnier, M., … PROSEVA Study Group (2013). Prone positioning in severe acute respiratory distress syndrome. The New England journal of medicine, 368(23), 2159–2168.

.

Munshi, L., Del Sorbo, L., Adhikari, N. K. J., Hodgson, C. L., Wunsch, H., Meade, M. O., Uleryk, E., Mancebo, J., Pesenti, A., Ranieri, V. M., & Fan, E. (2017). Prone Position for Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome. A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Annals of the American Thoracic Society, 14(Supplement_4), S280–S288.

Sud, S., Friedrich, J. O., Taccone, P., Polli, F., Adhikari, N. K., Latini, R., Pesenti, A., Guérin, C., Mancebo, J., Curley, M. A., Fernandez, R., Chan, M. C., Beuret, P., Voggenreiter, G., Sud, M., Tognoni, G., & Gattinoni, L. (2010). Prone ventilation reduces mortality in patients with acute respiratory failure and severe hypoxemia: systematic review and meta-analysis. Intensive care medicine, 36(4), 585–599.