

UC San Diego

UC San Diego Previously Published Works

Title

Prone positioning might reduce the need for intubation in people with severe COVID-19

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3p78j6ds>

Journal

The Lancet Respiratory Medicine, 9(12)

ISSN

2213-2600

Authors

McGuire, W Cameron

Pearce, Alex K

Malhotra, Atul

Publication Date

2021-12-01

DOI

10.1016/s2213-2600(21)00437-9

Peer reviewed



Since January 2020 Elsevier has created a COVID-19 resource centre with free information in English and Mandarin on the novel coronavirus COVID-19. The COVID-19 resource centre is hosted on Elsevier Connect, the company's public news and information website.

Elsevier hereby grants permission to make all its COVID-19-related research that is available on the COVID-19 resource centre - including this research content - immediately available in PubMed Central and other publicly funded repositories, such as the WHO COVID database with rights for unrestricted research re-use and analyses in any form or by any means with acknowledgement of the original source. These permissions are granted for free by Elsevier for as long as the COVID-19 resource centre remains active.

Prone positioning might reduce the need for intubation in people with severe COVID-19

We applaud the recent Article in *The Lancet Respiratory Medicine* by Stephen Ehrmann and colleagues¹ regarding awake prone positioning in patients with COVID-19. Safely avoiding endotracheal intubation is important for patient wellbeing and resource allocation. The findings of this study raise important questions.

Five participants withdrew consent after randomisation and were not included in the intention-to-treat analysis, which is relevant given the fragility index of 5 for the primary outcome. If both control patients avoided intubation or death and all three awake prone positioning patients were intubated or died, this result would have yielded non-significance for the primary outcome. 44 (8%) of 564 patients in the overall awake prone positioning group had a do-not-intubate order. If five awake prone positioning patients were not intubated but did not die during the study period, this could have nullified statistical significance.

As the authors acknowledged, the Mexican trial results drove the positive outcome of the study. As the Mexican

trial had the largest study population and effect, this trial warrants further discussion, particularly since the trial joined after a standardised protocol was implemented. Nearly 80% of the Mexican awake prone positioning patients were outside the intensive care unit, where access to endotracheal intubation was presumably restricted. Meanwhile the French and American trials had more than 80% of awake prone positioning patients in the intensive care unit. The Mexican protocol diagram shows a markedly different SpO₂ threshold (SpO₂ ≤80%) for intubation compared with the other trials. Presumably this protocol variation could have resulted in fewer intubations and thus statistical non-significance. We recommend use of objective intubation criteria to the extent possible, particularly in the context of an unmasked study.

Remarkably, the baseline ratio of SpO₂:FiO₂ (135) in the Mexican awake prone positioning group was 17 points lower than the SpO₂:FiO₂ in any of the other trials. This SpO₂:FiO₂ ratio corresponds to a PaO₂:FiO₂ ratio of 85 if imputed linearly.² Not only is this value consistent with severe acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS), but it is also below the intubation threshold (PaO₂:FiO₂ <100) of the French trial where prone positioning would have been declared a failure.

Although some data suggest that prone position-induced improvements in gas exchange do not predict mortality in ARDS in ventilated patients,³ it would be interesting to test prospectively if prone positioning in non-intubated patients with COVID-19⁴ prevents intubation or improves mortality. Either way, we believe, based on these new data and previous prone positioning trials,⁵ that prone positioning probably protects the lung mechanically, particularly when implemented early in disease and when sustained for long periods of time each day.

We declare no competing interests.

*W Cameron McGuire, Alex K Pearce, Atul Malhotra
wmcguire@health.ucsd.edu

UC San Diego School of Medicine, La Jolla, CA 92037, USA (WCM, AKP, AM)

- 1 Ehrmann S, Li J, Ibarra-Estrada M, et al. Awake prone positioning for COVID-19 acute hypoxaemic respiratory failure: a randomised, controlled, multinational, open-label meta-trial. *Lancet Respir Med* 2021; **9**: 1387–95.
- 2 Rice TW, Wheeler AP, Bernard GR, Hayden DL, Schoenfeld DA, Ware LB. Comparison of the SpO₂/FiO₂ ratio and the PaO₂/FiO₂ ratio in patients with acute lung injury or ARDS. *Chest* 2007; **132**: 410–17.
- 3 Albert RK, Keniston A, Baboi L, Ayzac L, Guérin C. Prone position-induced improvement in gas exchange does not predict improved survival in the acute respiratory distress syndrome. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2014; **189**: 494–96.
- 4 Paul V, Patel S, Roysse M, Odish M, Malhotra A, Koenig S. Proning in non-intubated (PINI) in times of COVID-19: case series and a review. *J Intensive Care Med* 2020; **35**: 818–24.
- 5 Beitler JR, Shaeff S, Montesi SB, et al. Prone positioning reduces mortality from acute respiratory distress syndrome in the low tidal volume era: a meta-analysis. *Intensive Care Med* 2014; **40**: 332–41.

