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## Additionnal Methods:

The following equations and table were used in the study:

Predicted body weight equations:
PBW $(\mathrm{kg})=50+\left(0.91^{*}\right.$ height $\left.(\mathrm{cm})-152.4\right)$ for men
PBW $(\mathrm{kg})=45.5+\left(0.91^{*}\right.$ height $\left.(\mathrm{cm})-152.4\right)$ for women
From the reference (1)

Chumlea equations:
64.19-( $0.04 *$ age $)+(0.02 *$ lower leg size $(\mathrm{cm}))$ for men
$84.88-(0.24 *$ age $)+(1.83 *$ lower leg size (cm)) for women
From the reference (26)

|  | Height (m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Men (<65 years) | 1.94 | 1.93 | 1.91 | 1.89 | 1.87 | 1.85 | 1.84 | 1.82 | 1.80 | 1.78 | 1.76 | 1.75 | 1.73 | 1.71 |
| Men ( $\geq 65$ years) | 1.87 | 1.86 | 1.84 | 1.82 | 1.81 | 1.79 | 1.78 | 1.76 | 1.75 | 1.73 | 1.71 | 1.70 | 1.68 | 1.67 |
| Ulna length (cm) | 32 | 31.5 | 31 | 30.5 | 30 | 29.5 | 29 | 28.5 | 28 | 27.5 | 27 | 26.5 | 26 | 25.5 |
| Women ( $<65$ years) | 1.84 | 1.83 | 1.81 | 1.80 | 1.79 | 1.77 | 1.76 | 1.75 | 1.73 | 1.72 | 1.70 | 1.69 | 1.68 | 1.66 |
| Women ( $\geq 65$ years) | 1.84 | 1.83 | 1.81 | 1.79 | 1.78 | 1.76 | 1.75 | 1.73 | 1.71 | 1.70 | 1.68 | 1.66 | 1.65 | 1.63 |
| Men (<65 years) | 1.69 | 1.67 | 1.66 | 1.64 | 1.62 | 1.60 | 1.58 | 1.57 | 1.55 | 1.53 | 1.51 | 1.49 | 1.48 | 1.46 |
| Men ( $\geq 65$ years) | 1.65 | 1.63 | 1.62 | 1.60 | 1.59 | 1.57 | 1.56 | 1.54 | 1.52 | 1.51 | 1.49 | 1.48 | 1.46 | 1.45 |
| Ulna length (cm) | 25 | 24.5 | 24 | 23.5 | 23 | 22.5 | 22 | 21.5 | 21 | 20.5 | 20 | 19.5 | 19 | 18.5 |
| Women ( $<65$ years) | 1.65 | 1.63 | 1.62 | 1.61 | 1.59 | 1.58 | 1.56 | 1.55 | 1.54 | 1.52 | 1.51 | 1.50 | 1.48 | 1.47 |
| Women ( $\geq 65$ years) | 1.61 | 1.60 | 1.58 | 1.56 | 1.55 | 1.53 | 1.52 | 1.50 | 1.48 | 1.47 | 1.45 | 1.44 | 1.42 | 1.40 |

Measure between the point of the elbow (olecranon process) and the midpoint of the prominent bone of the wrist (styloid process). From the reference (27)

## Figure Legends (online supplement)

Figure E1: Theoretical impact of the height measurement error on the protective ventilation implementation in male (upper panel) and in female (lower panel). Tidal volume really delivered $(\mathrm{ml} / \mathrm{kg}$ of PBW) with a target tidal volume of $6 \mathrm{ml} / \mathrm{kg}$ PBW for different errors on height measurements and for different heights.
Abbreviations: PBW: predicted body weight
Figure E2: The error of the visual estimation were inversely proportional to the patient's height. Solid lines represents linear regression. Correlation coefficient: $\mathrm{r}=0.52, \mathrm{P}<0.0001$.

## Additionnal Table

|  | Patients with height $>167 \mathrm{~cm}$ $(\mathrm{n}=49)$ | Patients with height $\leq 167 \mathrm{~cm}$ $(\mathrm{n}=51)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female gender, n (\%) | 2 (4.1) | 23 (45.0) |
|  | Min;Max | Min;Max |
| Age (year) | 31;80 | 50; 89 |
| BMI (kg/m ${ }^{2}$ ) | 21.1; 49.1 | 20.8; 35.5 |
| Height (cm) |  |  |
| Based on height gauge (reference) | 168; 188 | 149; 167 |
| Based on lower leg | 165; 185 | 145; 176 |
| Based on forearm | 155; 182 | 148; 175 |
| Based on visual estimation | 156; 183 | 152; 180 |
| Based on measuring tape | 163;188 | 150; 177 |
| Weigth (kg) |  |  |
| Actual weight (Kg) | 61.0; 146.2 | 41.0; 107.7 |
| PBW based on height gauge (reference) | 61.5; $\mathbf{8 2 . 4}$ | 42.4; 63.3 |
| PBW based on lower leg | 57.7; 79.6 | 39.3; 71.5 |
| PBW based on forearm | 47.9; 76.9 | 41.5; 70.6 |
| PBW based on visual estimation | 53.3; 77.8 | 45.1; 73.3 |
| PBW based on measuring tape | 59.6; 82.4 | 43.3; 72.8 |
| Tidal volume $8 \mathrm{ml} / \mathrm{kg}$ (ml) |  |  |
| TV based on actual weight | 488; 1170 | 328; 861 |
| TV based on height gauge (reference) | 492; 659 | 339; 506 |
| TV based on lower leg | 461; 637 | 314; 572 |
| TV based on forearm | 383; 615 | 332; 565 |
| TV based on visual estimation | 426; 623 | 361; 586 |
| TV based on measuring tape | 477; 659 | 347; 583 |
| Error on tidal volume compared to reference (ml)* |  |  |
| $\Delta \mathrm{TV}$ based on actual weight | -623; 80 | -394; 33 |
| $\Delta$ TV based on lower leg | -87; 67 | -82; 82 |
| $\Delta T V$ based on forearm | -73; 146 | -73; 15 |
| $\Delta \mathrm{TV}$ based on visual estimation | -73; 102 | -149; 347 |
| $\Delta$ TV based on measuring tape | -124; 58 | -138; 36 |

Table E1: Impact of the method of height measurement on tidal volume setting. Minimal and maximal values are reported in this table.
*The error was calculated for a target of $8 \mathrm{ml} / \mathrm{kg}$ with the following formula: tidal volume with height reference - tidal volume with other methods. Negative values correspond to overestimation of the tidal volume.

Abbreviations: BMI: body mass index; PBW: predicted body weight; TV: tidal volume



Figure E1: Theoretical impact of the height measurement error on the protective ventilation implementation in male (upper panel) and in female (lower panel).


Figure E2: The error of the visual estimation were inversely proportional to the patient's height. Solid lines represents linear regression. Correlation coefficient: $\mathrm{r}=0.52, \mathrm{P}<0.0001$.

