

Aerosols in Mechanical Ventilation: A Revolution in the Making

Thirty years ago it was common practice to administer aerosol therapy to mechanically ventilated patients, with precious little research to help guide our practice. When a ventilated patient failed to respond to a bronchodilator aerosol treatment, it was all too common to just increase the frequency of therapy, with the rationale that, compared to the price of a ventilator day, a few extra aerosol treatments couldn't hurt. The assumption was that the ventilator circuit and the endotracheal tube combined to form a "black hole" that would draw aerosol in but not allow it to reach the patient. Early studies confirmed that suspicion, and many clinicians became rather cynical and harbored low expectations for the therapeutic benefits of aerosol delivery to ventilated patients.¹⁻⁴

Whereas with a normal, spontaneously breathing subject we can expect 10% or more of a nebulizer dose to reach the lungs, we learned that only 1-3% would reach the lungs of an intubated, mechanically ventilated adult patient^{1,4} and less than 1% would reach the lungs of a ventilated infant.⁵ Since no respiratory drug designed for inhalation has been developed specifically for administration to ventilated patients, clinicians have been left to "guesstimate" comparable dosing for ventilated patients, with some advocating 5-50-fold increases above standard doses.⁶ Adapting nebulizers, which are typically designed for other applications, to the ventilator often resulted in substantial changes in ventilator parameters, as well as fouling the ventilator's expiratory valves and sensors, which are not designed to function in the presence of medical aerosols.

In the last decade we came to realize that the endotracheal tube might offer an advantage over the normal airway for delivering aerosol to the lung⁷ and that we might achieve greater aerosol delivery efficiency in intubated, mechanically ventilated patients than we achieve with our standard therapy in ambulatory patients. Early proof of this came with the discovery that the same metered-dose inhaler that delivers 10% of a dose to the lung of an ambulatory patient could deliver 11% to an intubated, ventilated patient.⁸⁻¹⁰ Soon thereafter researchers reported methods and techniques that achieve aerosol delivery ef-

iciencies of 30-80% in adult patients¹¹⁻¹⁵ and double-digit deposition in infants.

Only when we increase the efficiency and decrease the variability of aerosol delivery will the clinical world seriously consider the inhalation route a viable method for drug delivery to the critically ill patient. Systemic response times are faster with inhalation than with subcutaneous injection, so inhalation can be a more vital route for both pulmonary and systemic drugs. With drug development specifically oriented toward the ventilated patient, pulmonary drug delivery will be rivaled only by the intravenous route for speed, consistency, and efficiency.

It was my privilege to chair the symposium on Aerosol Delivery in Mechanical Ventilation at the International Respiratory Congress in Las Vegas, Nevada, on December 8, 2003. It was gratifying to have a 3-hour standing-room-only session, and the attendees enjoyed presentations from a dynamic and internationally renowned faculty. Each presenter has been a pioneer and visionary in his field, and we hope that this issue of *RESPIRATORY CARE* provides respiratory therapists a valuable resource to fine-tune their delivery of aerosols in the intensive care unit.

James B Fink MSc RRT FAARC
Aerogen Inc
Mountain View, California

REFERENCES

1. MacIntyre NR, Silver RM, Miller CW, Schuler F, Coleman RE. Aerosol delivery in intubated, mechanically ventilated patients. *Crit Care Med* 1985;13(2):81-84.
2. Ahrens RC, Ries RA, Pependorf W, Wiese JA. The delivery of therapeutic aerosols through endotracheal tubes. *Pediatr Pulmonol* 1986;2(1):19-26.
3. Crogan SJ, Bishop MJ. Delivery efficiency of metered dose aerosols given via endotracheal tubes. *Anesthesiology* 1989;70(6):1008-1010.
4. Fuller HD, Dolovich MB, Posmituck G, Pack WW, Newhouse MT. Pressurized aerosol versus jet aerosol delivery to mechanically ventilated patients: comparison of dose to the lungs. *Am Rev Respir Dis* 1990;141(2):440-444.
5. O'Riordan TG, Kleinman LI, Hughes K, Smaldone GC. Predicting aerosol deposition during neonatal ventilation: feasibility of bench testing. *Respir Care* 1994;39(12):1162-1168.
6. Manthous CA, Hall JB, Schmidt GA, Wood LDH. Metered-dose inhaler versus nebulized albuterol in mechanically ventilated patients. *Am Rev Respir Dis* 1993;148(6 Pt 1):1567-1570.

Correspondence: James B Fink MSc RRT FAARC, Aerogen Inc, 2071 Stierlin Court, Mountain View CA 94043. E-mail: jfink@aerogen.com.

FOREWORD: AEROSOLS IN MECHANICAL VENTILATION

7. Dhand R. Special problems in aerosol delivery: artificial airways. *Respir Care* 2000;45(6):636–645.
8. Fuller HD, Dolovich MB, Turpie FH, Newhouse MT. Efficiency of bronchodilator aerosol delivery to the lungs from the metered-dose inhaler in mechanically ventilated patients: a study comparing 4 different actuator devices. *Chest* 1994;105(1):214–218.
9. Duarte AG, Dhand R, Reid R, Fink JB, Fahey PJ, Tobin MJ, Jenne JW. Serum albuterol levels in mechanically ventilated patients and healthy subjects after metered-dose inhaler administration. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 1996;154(6 Pt 1):1658–1663.
10. Fink JB, Dhand R, Grychowski J, Fahey PJ, Tobin MJ. Reconciling in vitro and in vivo measurements of aerosol delivery from a metered-dose inhaler during mechanical ventilation and defining efficiency-enhancing factors. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 1999;159(1):63–68.
11. Thomas SHL, O'Doherty MJ, Page CJ, Treacher DF, Nunan TO. Delivery of ultrasonic nebulized aerosols to a lung model during mechanical ventilation. *Am Rev Respir Dis* 1993;148(4 Pt 1):872–877.
12. Taylor RH, Lerman J, Chambers C, Dolovich M. Dosing efficiency and particle-size characteristics of pressurized metered-dose inhaler aerosols in narrow catheters. *Chest* 1993;103(3):920–924.
13. Diot P, Morra L, Smaldone GC. Albuterol delivery in a model of mechanical ventilation: Comparison of metered-dose inhaler and nebulizer efficiency. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 1995;152(4 Pt 1):1391–1394.
14. O'Riordan TG, Palmer LB, Smaldone GC. Aerosol deposition in mechanically ventilated patients: optimizing nebulizer delivery. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 1994;149(1):214–219.
15. Miller DD, Amin MM, Palmer LB, Shah AR, Smaldone GC. Aerosol delivery and modern mechanical ventilation: in vitro/in vivo evaluation. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2003;168(10):1205–1209.



IPPB Aerosol Therapy. Front pages advertisement by
Puritan Compressed Gas Corporation in *Inhalation Therapy*,
Journal of the American Association of Inhalation Therapists
Vol 9, No. 3, June 1964