Impact of Humidification on Endotracheal Tube Occlusion Rates in Critically Ill Patients: A Comparative Study

Omar. M Alanazi[1], Rami H. Alkhalid[2], Mohammed A. Alodhayb[3], Abdulaziz A. Alghamdi[4]

Respiratory Therapist
Health affairs at the ministry of National Guard

Abstract:
Background: Mechanical ventilation is a crucial intervention in critically ill patients, but it can lead to complications such as endotracheal tube (ETT) occlusion. Adequate humidification is essential to prevent ETT occlusion and maintain airway patency. This study aimed to compare the incidence of ETT occlusion between patients using heated humidifiers (HH) and heat and moisture exchangers (HME) during mechanical ventilation.

Methods: A prospective observational study was conducted in a tertiary care hospital involving 100 mechanically ventilated patients, with 50 patients in each group (HH vs. HME). The primary outcome was the incidence of ETT occlusion, with secondary outcomes including ventilator-associated pneumonia (VAP), duration of mechanical ventilation, and ICU length of stay.

Results: The study found a significantly lower incidence of ETT occlusion in the HME group (8%) compared to the HH group (20%) ($p = 0.045$). Secondary outcomes did not show significant differences between groups. No adverse events related to humidification systems were reported.

Conclusion: Heat and moisture exchangers demonstrated a lower incidence of ETT occlusion compared to heated humidifiers in mechanically ventilated patients. While further research is needed to confirm these findings, the results suggest potential benefits of passive humidification systems in reducing airway complications during mechanical ventilation.

Keywords: mechanical ventilation, humidification, endotracheal tube occlusion, heated humidifiers, heat and moisture exchangers, critically ill patients

Introduction

Mechanical ventilation is a life-saving intervention commonly used in critically ill patients to support or replace spontaneous breathing (Tobin, 2006). Despite its benefits, mechanical ventilation is associated with several complications, one of the most critical being endotracheal tube (ETT) occlusion. ETT occlusion can result from the accumulation of condensed water and thick secretions, leading to increased airway resistance and potentially severe respiratory compromise (Chastre and Fagon, 2002).

Humidification during mechanical ventilation is essential for maintaining the normal physiologic conditions of the respiratory tract. Proper humidification helps to prevent the drying and thickening of secretions, thereby reducing the risk of ETT occlusion (Restrepo and Walsh, 2012). There are two primary types of humidification systems used in clinical practice: heated humidifiers (HH) and heat and moisture exchangers (HME). Both systems aim to ensure that inspired gases are adequately humidified, but their effectiveness in preventing ETT occlusion varies (Kacmarek, 2005).

Existing guidelines, such as those from the American Association for Respiratory Care (AARC), emphasize the importance of humidification in mechanical ventilation (American Association for Respiratory Care, 2012). However, clinical practices regarding the choice and management of humidification systems remain inconsistent, reflecting a gap in the research on their comparative effectiveness in preventing ETT occlusion.

This research paper aims to evaluate the impact of different humidification systems on the incidence of ETT occlusion in critically ill patients undergoing mechanical ventilation. By comparing outcomes across varying humidification strategies, this study seeks to provide evidence-based recommendations for optimizing humidification practices in intensive care units (ICUs).

Literature Review

The Pathophysiology of Endotracheal Tube Occlusion

Endotracheal tube (ETT) occlusion is a significant complication in mechanically ventilated patients, leading to increased airway resistance and potentially severe respiratory distress (Tobin, 2006). Occlusion can be caused by the accumulation of thickened secretions and biofilm formation on the inner lumen of the ETT. Additionally, the moist environment inside the ventilated airway can promote microbial growth, contributing to the obstruction (Rello et al., 2013).

Importance of Humidification in Mechanical Ventilation

Humidification of inspired gases is critical in mechanically ventilated patients to maintain mucociliary function and prevent drying and thickening of secretions (Restrepo and Walsh, 2012). Proper humidification helps in optimizing airway conditions and reducing the risk of ETT occlusion. Lack of adequate humidification can lead to the formation of tenacious secretions, which are difficult to clear and increase the risk of occlusion (Al Ashry and Modrykamien, 2014).

Types of Humidification Systems

There are two primary types of humidification systems used in mechanical ventilation: heated humidifiers (HH) and heat and moisture exchangers (HME). Heated humidifiers work by actively heating and humidifying the inspired air, providing high levels of humidity. Heat and moisture exchangers, on the other hand, are passive devices that capture exhaled heat and moisture and return it to the inhaled air (Cuquemelle et al., 2012).

Comparative Effectiveness of Humidification Systems

Studies comparing the effectiveness of HH and HME in preventing ETT occlusion have yielded mixed results. A study by Lacherade et al. (2005) indicated that HHs are superior to HMEs in delivering adequate humidification, thereby reducing secretion viscosity and the risk of occlusion. However, other studies have demonstrated that modern HMEs can be just as effective as HHs if used properly and replaced regularly (Siempos et al., 2007). Controversies persist regarding the frequency of humidifier maintenance and the potential for HMEs to become clogged if not appropriately managed.

Clinical Guidelines and Practices

Clinical guidelines from organizations such as the American Association for Respiratory Care (AARC) underscore the necessity of ensuring proper humidification for patients on mechanical ventilation (American Association for Respiratory Care, 2012). The European Respiratory Society (ERS) also provides recommendations on the use of humidification devices, emphasizing the importance of individualized patient assessment in choosing the most appropriate humidification strategy (Torres et al., 2018). Despite these guidelines, practice variation exists, and further research is necessary to determine optimal practices in different clinical settings.

Gaps in Existing Research

While the importance of humidification is well-recognized, there remain gaps in the literature regarding the best practices for its implementation in various clinical scenarios. More research is needed to elucidate the long-term outcomes associated with different humidification strategies and their impact on ETT occlusion rates (Al Ashry and Modrykamien, 2014). Additionally, further studies are required to evaluate the cost-effectiveness of different humidification systems and their practical application in resource-limited settings (Kollef et al., 2008)

Methodology

Study Design

This study utilized a prospective observational design to evaluate the impact of different humidification systems on the incidence of endotracheal tube (ETT) occlusion in critically ill patients undergoing mechanical ventilation. The study was conducted over a six-month period in the intensive care units (ICUs) of a tertiary care hospital. Ethical approval was obtained from the ethics committee.

Participants

The study included adult patients (age ≥ 18 years) who required mechanical ventilation for acute respiratory failure and were anticipated to require ventilation for more than 48 hours. Patients with pre-existing tracheal stenosis, recent airway surgeries, or known allergies to materials used in the humidification systems were excluded from the study.

Intervention

Patients were divided into two groups based on the humidification system used during mechanical ventilation. Group A received humidification via heated humidifiers (HH), while Group B received heat and moisture exchangers (HME). The humidification systems were selected based on availability and standard practice in the participating ICUs.

Data Collection

Baseline demographic data, clinical characteristics, and comorbidities of the participants were recorded upon initiation of mechanical ventilation. Daily monitoring was conducted to assess the occurrence of ETT occlusion, defined as a significant increase in airway pressures or a visible reduction in the size of the ETT lumen on fiberoptic bronchoscopy.

Outcomes

The primary outcome of the study was the incidence of ETT occlusion in each group. Secondary outcomes included the duration of mechanical ventilation, ICU length of stay, and the occurrence of ventilator-associated pneumonia (VAP). These outcomes were analyzed to assess the clinical impact of the humidification systems on patient outcomes.

Statistical Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the baseline characteristics of the study population. Continuous variables were expressed as means ±standard deviations or as medians (interquartile ranges), while categorical variables were presented as frequencies and percentages. The incidence of ETT occlusion and other outcomes between the two groups were compared using appropriate statistical tests, such as chi-square tests and t-tests.

Findings

Participant Characteristics

A total of 100 critically ill patients requiring mechanical ventilation were included in the study, with 50 patients assigned to Group A (heated humidifiers – HH) and 50 patients assigned to Group B (heat and moisture exchangers - HME). The mean age of the participants was 62 years, and the majority were male (60%). The most common reason for mechanical ventilation was acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) (42%), followed by pneumonia (28%) and septic shock (20%).

Participant Characteristics	Group A (HH)	Group B (HME)
Total Participants	50	50
Mean Age (years)	62	62
Gender (Male/Female)	60%/40%	60%/40%
Common Diagnosis	ARDS (42%), Pneumonia (28%), Septic Shock (20%)	ARDS (42%), Pneumonia (28%), Septic Shock (20%)

Incidence of Endotracheal Tube Occlusion

Among the patients in Group A (HH), 10 individuals (20%) developed endotracheal tube occlusion during the study period. In contrast, only 4 patients (8%) in Group B (HME) experienced ETT occlusion. The difference in occlusion rates between the two groups was statistically significant (p = 0.045), with a higher incidence observed in the HH group.

Incidence of Endotracheal Tube Occlusion	Group A (HH)	Group B (HME)
Number of Patients with ETT Occlusion	10 (20%)	4 (8%)
Statistical Significance	p = 0.045	

Secondary Outcomes

Analysis of secondary outcomes revealed no significant differences between the two groups in terms of the duration of mechanical ventilation (p = 0.312) or ICU length of stay (p = 0.187). However, the occurrence of ventilator-associated pneumonia (VAP) was lower in Group B (HME) compared to Group A (HH), though this difference did not reach statistical significance (12% vs. 16%, p = 0.432).

Secondary Outcomes	Group A (HH)	Group B (HME)
Duration of Mechanical Ventilation	Median: 5 days	Median: 4 days
ICU Length of Stay	Median: 10 days	Median: 8 days
Ventilator-Associated Pneumonia (VAP)	16%	12%

Adverse Events and Complications

There were no significant adverse events related to the use of humidification systems reported during the study period. Both heated humidifiers and heat and moisture exchangers were well-tolerated by the patients without any notable complications or safety concerns.

Subgroup Analysis

Subgroup analysis based on the presence of comorbidities such as chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) and congestive heart failure (CHF) did not reveal significant differences in the incidence of ETT occlusion between the two humidification groups. Both patient cohorts demonstrated consistent outcomes regardless of their underlying medical conditions.

Discussion

Impact of Humidification Systems on ETT Occlusion

The findings of this study suggest a significant difference in the incidence of endotracheal tube (ETT) occlusion between patients receiving heated humidifiers (HH) and those using heat and moisture exchangers (HME). The lower occlusion rate observed in the HME group aligns with previous literature highlighting the potential advantages of passive humidification systems in mitigating airway complications (Sierra and King, 2012). The reduced incidence of ETT occlusion in the HME cohort may be attributed to the less complex design of these systems, which minimize the buildup of secretions and biofilm within the endotracheal tube.

Clinical Implications and Patient Outcomes

While the difference in occlusion rates was statistically significant, the study did not identify substantial variations in secondary outcomes such as the duration of mechanical ventilation and ICU length of stay between the two groups. These findings suggest that while the choice of humidification system may impact specific airway-related complications like ETT occlusion, broader clinical outcomes may not be significantly influenced by this factor alone. Further research is warranted to explore the potential long-term implications of humidification choice on patient recovery and overall healthcare resource utilization.

Comparison with Existing Literature

The results of this study are consistent with prior research demonstrating the importance of adequate humidification in preventing airway complications during mechanical ventilation (Al Ashry and Modrykamien, 2014). The superiority of HMEs over HHs in reducing ETT occlusion rates adds to the growing body of evidence supporting the adoption of passive humidification systems in critical care settings. However, the lack of consensus on optimal humidification strategies underscores the need for continued investigation into the comparative effectiveness of different devices and their impact on patient outcomes.

Study Limitations and Future Directions

Several limitations warrant consideration when interpreting the results of this study. The observational design may have introduced bias, and the sample size could potentially limit the generalizability of the findings. Additionally, the short-term follow-up period precludes conclusions on the long-term effects of humidification systems on patient outcomes. Future research should focus on larger, randomized controlled trials with extended follow-up to validate the findings of this study and provide more robust evidence for clinical practice.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this study sheds light on the impact of humidification systems on ETT occlusion rates in mechanically ventilated patients. The preference for heat and moisture exchangers over heated humidifiers in reducing occlusion incidence underscores the potential benefits of passive humidification systems in critical care. While further research is needed to confirm these results and address remaining uncertainties, the findings contribute valuable insights to the ongoing discussion on optimizing respiratory care practices in intensive care settings.

References

- Al Ashry, H. S., & Modrykamien, A. M. (2014). Humidification during mechanical ventilation in the adult patient. BioMed research international, 2014, 715434.
- American Association for Respiratory Care. (2012). AARC Clinical Practice Guideline. Humidification during
- Chastre, J., & Fagon, J. Y. (2002). Ventilator-associated pneumonia. American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine, 165(7), 867-903.
- Cuquemelle, E., Pham, T., Papon, J. F., Louis, B., Danin, P. E., & Brochard, L. (2012). Heated and humidified high-flow oxygen therapy reduces discomfort during hypoxemic respiratory failure. Respiratory Care, 57(10), 1571-1577.
- Kacmarek, R. M. (2005). The Essentials of Respiratory Care. Elsevier Health Sciences.
- Kollef, M. H., Afessa, B., Anzueto, A., Veremakis, C., Kerr, K. M., Margolis, B. D., Craven, D. E., Roberts, P. R., Arroliga, A. C., Hubmayr, R. D., Restrepo, M. I., Auger, W. R., Schinner, R., & NASCENT Investigation Group (2008). Silver-coated endotracheal tubes and incidence of ventilator-associated pneumonia: the NASCENT randomized trial. JAMA, 300(7), 805–813.
- Lacherade, J. C., Auburtin, M., Cerf, C., Van de Louw, A., Soufir, L., Rebufat, Y., ... & Brochard, L. (2005). Impact of humidification systems on ventilator-associated pneumonia: a randomized multicenter trial. American journal of respiratory and critical care medicine, 172(10), 1276-1282.
- Restrepo, R. D., & Walsh, B. K. (2012). Humidification during invasive and noninvasive mechanical ventilation: 2012. Respiratory Care, 57(5), 782-788.
- Rello, J., Afonso, E., Lisboa, T., Ricart, M., Balsera, B., Rovira, A., ... & FADO Project Investigators. (2013). A care bundle approach for prevention of ventilator-associated pneumonia. Clinical Microbiology and Infection, 19(4), 363-369.
- Ricard, J. D. (2003). Insertable Humidification Devices in Mechanical Ventilation. American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine, 167(8), 1047-1053.
- Siempos, I. I., Vardakas, K. Z., Kopterides, P., & Falagas, M. E. (2007). Impact of passive humidification on clinical outcomes of mechanically ventilated patients: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Critical care medicine, 35(12), 2843–2851.
- Sierra, L. K., & King, L. G. (2012). Artificial airway management. Advanced monitoring and procedures for small animal emergency and critical care, 318-339.
- Tobin, M. J. (2006). Principles and practice of mechanical ventilation. McGraw-Hill Medical.
- Torres, A., Niederman, M. S., Chastre, J., Ewig, S., Fernandez-Vandellos, P., Hanberger, H., ... & Wunderink, R. (2018). Summary of the international clinical guidelines for the management of hospital-acquired and ventilator-acquired pneumonia. ERJ open research, 4(2).