Time to Flip Me Over: Safe and Practical Timing & Clinical Strategies for Proning





Kathleen M. Vollman MSN, RN, CCNS, FCCM, FCNS, FAAN Clinical Nurse Specialist/Educator/Consultant ADVANCING NURSING kvollman@comcast.net Northville, Michigan www.vollman.com

- Consultant-Michigan Hospital Association Keystone Center
- Subject matter expert HRET: CAUTI, CLABSI, HAPU, Sepsis, Safety culture
- Consultant and speaker bureau:
 - Stryker's Sage business
 - Potrero Medical
- Baxter Healthcare Advisory Board



Disclaimers

- No off-label information will be presented
- This presentation was developed by Kathleen Vollman
- Do not distribute, copy, or otherwise utilize without permission

Accreditation

Stryker is accredited as a provider of continuing education in nursing by the California Board of Registered Nursing (provider number CEP 15927)

Credit designation

Stryker designates this educational activity for 1 contact hours of continuing nursing education credit

Polling Question

What is your position?

- 1. Critical care nurse
- 2. Progressive Care/Telemetry nurse
- 3. Educator
- 4. Chest Physiotherapist
- 5. Manager/Director
- 6. Clinical Nurse Specialist/Nurse Practitioner
- 7. Intensivist
- 8. Quality



Objectives

- △ Discuss the physiologic rationale and the evidence for use of the prone position in patients with ARDS
- △ Identify evidence-based strategies for determining when to turn, how to turn, and how long to allow patients to remain in the prone position
- △ Outline strategies for preventing complications during turning and while in the prone position

Prone Positioning Incidence

Prone positioning (PP) was only used in 16.3% of patients with severe ARDS in the LUNG SAFE study

Bellaini G, et al. JAMA, 2016;315(8):788-800

European Prevalence Study (APRONET): Use of PP in mild 5.9%, moderate 10.3%, severe 32.9% ARDS

Guerin C, et al. Intensive Care Med, 2018;44(1):22-37



Italy and Netherlands—60% of Mechanical Ventilated ARDS COVID 19 patient were proned, 50% in the US


Stilma W, et al. *J Clin Med*. 2021;10(20):4783. Langer T, et al. *Crit Care* 2021; **25:**128 Mathews KS, et al. Crit Care Med. 2021;49(7):1026-1037.

The Berlin ARDS Definition

TIMING	Within 1 week of a known clin symptoms	nical insult or new/wors	ening respiratory		
CHEST IMAGING (X-RAY OR CAT SCAN)	Bilateral opacities—not fully on nodules	explained by effusions, l	obar/lung collapse, or		
ORIGIN OF EDEMA	Respiratory failure not fully ex need objective assessment (e edema if no risk factors prese	eg, echocardiography) to	•		
	MILD	MODERATE	SEVERE		
OXYGENATION	<200 PaO_2/FiO_2 or <300 with PEEP/CPAP >5 cm H_2O	$<100 \text{ PaO}_2/\text{FiO}_2$ or $\leq 200 \text{ with PEEP}$ $\geq 5 \text{ cm H}_2\text{O}$	≤100 PaO ₂ /FiO ₂ with PEEP ≥5 cm H ₂ O		
MORTALITY	27% (24% to 30%)	32% (29% to 34%)	45% (42% to 48%)		





Early management of ARDS in 2019



Why Prone Positioning?¹⁻²


- Improves dependent aeration recruiting alveoli
- Reduces hyperinflation of nondependent regions dramatically
- Results in more homogenous lung aeration which reduces regional shear strain...less ventilator-induced lung injury (VILI)
- Decreases barotrauma and atelectrauma by recruiting and reducing overdistension that occurs with higher positive end-expiratory pressure (PEEP)
- \downarrow PACO2 relates to net increase in recruitment $/\downarrow$ in dead space
- Drains secretions







Proning Severe ARDS Patients



In a randomized, controlled trial of 466 patients with severe ARDS, survival was significantly higher at 28 and 90 days in the prone position group

NNT=6



Prone Positioning Meta-Analysis

9 randomized controlled trials / 2,242 patients

OUTCOMES	DECREASED 30-DAY MORTALITY	REDUCED 60-DAY AND 90-DAY MORTALITY	REDUCED 28-30-DAY MORTALITY
PATIENT POPULATION	ARDS patients with a PaO ₂ /FiO ₂ ratio ≤100 mmHg	ARDS patients ventilated with PEEP ≥10 cmH ₂ O	ARDS patients who had duration of proning >12 hours per day (n = 1,067, RR = 0.73, 95% CI = 0.54 to 0.99; P = 0.04)




Prone Positioning in COVID 19 Patients

- △ Data from Study & Treatment of Outcomes in Critical III Patients with COVID 19
- ♠ 68 hospitals (March 2020 to May 2020)
- △ Mechanical ventilated pts with P/F ratio < 200mmHg initiated prone positioning or not within first 2 days of ICU admission

Results

- △ 2338 eligible pts: 30% proned
- △ Lower in-hospital mortality if proned early
- △ 19.5% proned later in the course of illness



Case Study

- Mr. Green is a 65-year-old male 90kg male 5 feet 10 inches. Patient has a 2-day history of fever and chills. His past medical hx is hypertension and coronary artery disease. He presents to the Emergency room with a fever 39.5°C complaining of inability to catch his breath.
- His initial vital signs:
 - △ HR 120/min
 - △ RR 40/min
 - △ BP 90/65
 - △ O2 sat of 92% on room air.
 - △ He is placed on 50% HFNC

- △ ABG: (On 50% HFNC)
 - pH 7.20
 - PaCO2 28,
 - PaO2 60,
 - SaO2 93%
 - Bicarb 13
- △ Extremely labored breathing
- △ Change in LOC
- △ Lactic acid: 3.5
- △ WBC's: 24,000 with a left shift
- △ Platelets: 75,000
- △ Electrolytes WNL
- △ Chest x-ray shows bilateral infiltrates

Polling Question

- △ What should be the next step in Mr. Green's care?
 - 1. Initiate non-invasive ventilation
 - 2. Initiate intubation
 - 3. Change to 100% non-rebreather

Case Study

- Intubated and transferred to the ICU
- Settings on mechanical ventilation
 - △ Vt 528, AC 28, FiO2 of 1.0, PEEP 8cm, Plat pressures 38cm H20
- △ ABG's: 7.34, 35, 70, 94, 18
 - △ P/F ratio is 70
- △ PEEP increased incrementally over next 12 hours to 14cm
- ▲ FiO2 at 80%
- △ Plateau pressures 35cm H2O mmHg

▲ ABGs:

- △ Ph 7.35
- △ PaCO2 34
- △ PaO2 60
- △ SaO2 91
- △ Bicarb 20
- △ P/F ratio 75

What should be our next step?




Polling Question


- △ What should be the next step in Mr. Green's care?
 - 1. Switch to High Frequency Oscillation Ventilation (HFOV)
 - 2. Initiate Extra Corporeal Membrane Oxygenation (ECMO
 - 3. Initiate prone positioning
 - 4. Switch to Airway Pressure Release Ventilation (APRV)

Who to Place in Prone Position?


- Patients with severe ARDS (PaO₂/FiO₂ <150 mmHg)</p>
 - △ Per ATS/SCCM Mechanical Ventilation for ARDS guidelines, a strong recommendation for prone positioning for >12 hours /day
- △ Patients early in the course (12–24 hours)



Who Not to Place in Prone Position? Absolute Contraindications










Goals of Care: Allow for a natural death (comfort care)

Relative Considerations

- Uncontrolled intracranial pressure or poorly controlled seizures
- Massive bleeding /hemoptysis
- △ Venous thrombosis treated < 48 hours
- Increased intracranial pressure
- A Patient with hemodynamically unstable condition (as defined by a systolic blood pressure <90 mm Hg or MAP < 60) with fluid and vasoactive support in place
- Unstable chest wall, open abdomen
- Burns > 20% of the ventral body surface

- Cardiac abnormalities: life threatening arrhythmias, ventricular assist devices, intra-aortic balloon pump, ECMO, fresh pacemaker
- Bronchopleural fistula, Unstable airway, tracheal surgery within 2 weeks
- A Pregnancy second or third trimester or extremely distended abdomen (padding above and below this distention may offset unnecessary pressure)
- Weight 160 kilograms or greater (weigh the risk benefit ratio for the patient and staff)
- Advanced arthritis

Patients Who Have Been Placed in the Prone Position Successfully



Pre-Prone Position Process¹⁻⁴

- Patient and family education
- Gather staff (5) and supplies, obtain pre prone measurements
- Preoxygenate, consider hold to empty stomach (1hr) if TF rate is high
- Suction endotracheal tube (if applicable)/oral cavity,
- Secure the endotracheal tube and lines (remove ET holders if in use)
- Position tubes inserted above the waist to the top of the bed
- Position tubes inserted below the waist to the foot of the bed (except chest tubes)

- Empty ileostomy/colostomy bags before the turn
- Perform eye care
- Placement of prophylactic dressings in high pressure/shear risk areas (forehead, chin, chest, elbow, pelvic, knees, dorsal feet)
- Ensure the tongue is inside patient's mouth
- Consider capnography monitoring
- Develop an exit strategy for instability while in the prone position

^{2.} FICM Guidelines for Prone Position in Adult Critical Care 2019 accessed 5/08 /2021 https://www.ficm.ac.uk/sites/default/files/prone_position_in_adult_critical_care_2019.pdf 3.Gomaa D, et al. Respir Care 60(2):e41-e42, 2015.




^{1.} Vollman KM, et al. AACN Procedural Manual. 2016:142-163


AACN Procedural Manual-7th ed

- △ Chapter 18: Pronation Therapy
- **Authors**
 - △ Kathleen Vollman
 - △ Jan Powers
 - △ Sharon Dickinson

Updated Addition
Coming Soon







Rotoprone



Prone positioner No longer sold

Manual Proning



Mayo© 2017




Mayo© 2017



Prone Positioning with Positioning Sheet Using the Burrito Method




Disposable Slide Sheets




Chest and/or pelvic support can be done by placing a pillow/wedge before completing the turn.


Lift Assisted Prone Positioning














Positioning Schedule & Maintenance Care^{1,2}

Consider every 16hrs uninterrupted (more frequent turn back may cause decruitment)

Obtain post prone measurements

Restart feeding

Assess for pain & agitation minimum of q4

Q 2hr limb and head reposition (Swimmers), support feet in correct anatomical alignment

If hemodynamic monitoring, level the zero-reference point at the right atrium

Consider time periods in reverse Trendelenburg to address facial edema and reduce risk of vomiting

Frequent oral hygiene and suctioning and eye care as needed

^{1.} Vollman KM, Dickenson S, Powers J. AACN Procedural Manual, Chapter 19;2016:142-163

^{2.} Mitchell DA, et al. AACN Advanced Critical Care, 2018;29(4):415-425

Maintenance Care—Additional Things to Consider

- △ Consider floating the nasogastric tube to prevent pressure injuries
- △ Consider pillows, use of liter bags of IV fluids or fluidizer positioner to align the head and neck
- △ Use silicone preventive dressing under ECMO cannulas



Image courtesy of Sharon Dickinson








Image courtesy of Sharon Dickinson

CPR In the Prone Position

▲ AHA guidance


- △ If patient has advanced airway consider initiating prone CPR until team can safely turn supine
- △ Hand placement T7-T10
- △ If unable to transition patient o supine & defib is required
 - Pads in anterior and posterior position



Anez C, et. al *Anesth Analg*. 2021;132(2):285-292.




When to Stop Prone Positioning?



Research supports stopping prone positioning when PaO_2/FiO_2 has remained >150 mmHg 4 hours after supinating (with PEEP <10 cm H_2O and FiO_2 <0.6)

If there is no response after 48 hours, question whether prone positioning should continue



Does Awake Proning Impact Patient Outcomes? Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

- △ Studies reporting prone position in hypoxemic, non-intubated adults with COVID 19
- △ 25 observational studies, 758 patients
- △ Median dose 120 min, 1 to 3x per day
- 🛕 40% in ICU, 60% outside ICU
- △ Examine impact on p/f ratio, PaO2, SpO2, intubation rate & mortality
- Significant heterogeneity in location, dose & frequency & respiratory support

▲ PaO ₂ /FiO ₂									
•	-	Post Pror	ing		Pra Pron	ing		Mean Difference	Weigh
Study	N	Mean	80	N	Mean	SD		MR 98% CI	(%)
Caputo et al, April 2020	50	98.57	4.42	50	70.71	11.11		27.86 [24.55, 31.17]	5.20
Despres et al, May 2020	6	185.70	45.43	6	180.67	49.7		5.11 [-48.18, 58.48]	3.00
Dong et.al, May 2020	16	331.5	77.65	16	196.55	52.99	_	134.94 [88.85, 181.02]	3.44
Golestani-Eraghi et al, May 2020	10	119	4,57	10	105	5.23		14.00 [9.70, 18.30]	5.19
Sartini et al. May 2020	15	117.84	2.38	16	84	25.47		33.84 [29.89, 46.79]	5.01
Tu et al, May 2000		136	16	9	80.25	10		48.75 [37.51, 59.99]	5.06
Xu et al, May 2020	10	179	37.04	10	156.9	42.59	-	22.10 [-12.68, 57.08]	4.02
Coppo et al, June 2020	45	285.5	112.9	46	180.5	76.6	-	105.00 [65.57, 144.43]	3.78
Damaria et al, June 2020	10	224	1.45	10	144	2.95		80.00 [77.95, 82.05]	5.21
Lawton et al, June 2020	165	167.4	2.97	165	156.5	4.44		10.90 [10.08, 11.72]	5.22
Alba Ripoli-Gullardo et al., Ally 2020	13	188.4	70	13	115.2	13.3	-	51.20 [12.47, 89.90]	3.82
Burton-Page et al. July 2020	20	151.7	28.7	20	123	27.8		28.70 [11.19, 46.21]	4.85
Retucci et al, July 2020	26	220	64.5	26	182.9	43	-	37.99 [7.30, 66.90]	4.29
Zang et al., July 2020	23	82.29	5.61	25	64.55	5.61		17.71 [14.64, 20.78]	5.20
Paternoster et al, Aug 2000	11	214.6	73.1	11	107.5	20.8	-	107.10 [62.10, 152.01]	3.50
Selverson et al., Aug 2020	17	188.8	58.3	17	166.5	55.7	-	20.30 [+18.03, 58.63]	3.84
Kelly et al, Sep 2020	17	222.64	19	17	180.98	27.18	-	41.66 [25.80, 57.32]	4.62
Raminoz et al. Sep 2020	45	120	22	45	163	45		17.00 [2.10, 31.90]	4.95
Taboda et al, Sep 2020	50	572	27	50	359	27		13.00 [2.42, 23.58]	5.00
Wincarls of al, Sep 2020	34	252	87	24	140	7	-	109.00 [74.06, 143.00]	4.02
Ferrando et al., Oct 2020	55	103	33	55	102.7	11.25		0.30 [-8.91, 9.51]	5.11
Padrao et al. Oct 2020	67	76	3.7	67	68	3.7		8.00 [6.64, 9.36]	6.21
Overall							•	39.47 [24.85, 54.10]	
Heterogeneity: $t^2 = 1067.20$, $t^2 = 99.0$	7%, H	° = 307.2	13						
Test of 6 = 6; O(21) = 4195.72, p = 6	.00								
Test of 0 = 0: z = 5.29, p = 0.00									
Random-effects REML model						-1	0 0 100 2	90	

B PaOa

	P	tool Pro	ning		he Pror	ning		Mean Differe	nce	Weight
Study	N	Wean	50	N	Mean	50		with 95% (:1	(%)
Caputo et al. April 2020	50	69	4.42	50	49.5	11.11		19.50[16.19,	22.81]	5.35
Elhorrar et al, May 2020	24	77.6	11.5	24	72.8	14.2		4.80[-2.51,	12.11]	4.97
Solestani-Eraghi et al, May 2020	10	62.54	4.57	10	46.3	5.23		19.24 [11.94,	20.54	5.20
Sartini et al, May 2020	15	95.69	5.52	15	71.88	11.45		23.81[17.38,	30.24	5.07
Tu et al, May 2020	9	108	14	9	69	10		39.00[27.76,	50.24	4.44
Xu et al., May 2020	10	97.93	24.15	10	87.13	27.81	-	10.80[-12.00,	33.63	2.81
Coppo et al, June 2020	49	200.4	110.9	46	117.1	47,4	-	83.30[48.45,	118.15]	1.71
Damada et al, June 2020	10	112	1.48	10	72	2.96		40.00[37.95,	42.09	5.41
Jawton et al. June 2020	165	77	2.97	185	72	4,44		5.00[4.18.	5.82]	5.45
Moghedam et al, June 2020	10	86	2.18	10	54	.69		32.00[30.58,	33.42]	5.44
Thempson et al, June 2020	29	83.64	11.2	29	57.25	11.43		28.39[20.67,	32.21]	6.14
Alba Ripa I-Callardo et al. July 2020	13	99	70	13	68	13.3	-	30.00[-8.73,	68.73	1.47
Retucci et al., July 2020	26	104.5	25	26	86.5	15.1		17.60[6.37,	28.83	4.44
Zang et ell, July 2020	23	82.29	5.61	23	68	5.01		17.29[14.22,	20.36	5.36
Paternoster et al., Aug 2020	11	84	2.2	11	60	2.0		24.00[22.12,	25.86	5.42
Solverson et al, Aug 2020	17	85	2	17	60	2.8		28.00[26.36,	29.64	5.43
Rominez et al, Sep 2020	45	72	22	45	62	5.2		10.00[3.40,	16.60]	5.06
Taboda et al, Sep 2020	50	86	1	50	76	.75		12.00[11.65,	12.35	5.45
illinearis et al. Sop 2020	24	64	2	24	76	3		8.00[6.56,	9.44	5.43
Fernando et al., Oct 2020	55	54	4.4	55	55	2.9		-1.00[-2.39,	0.39	5.44
Padrae et al. Oct 2000	57	152	3.7	57	136	3.7		19.00[14.64,	17.36	5.44
Overall							•	19.72 [14.23,	25.21]	
Heterogeneity: 1 = 143.61, 1 = 99.5	76. H	- 210.1	5							
Test of 0 = 0; Q(20) = 2763.54, p = 0	.00									
Test of $\theta = 0$: $z = 7.04$, $p = 0.00$										

0 50 100 150

Cs

SpC

	Post Proning				Pre Pros	ing		Mean Difference	Weig	
Study	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD		with 95% CI	(%)	
Caputo et al, April 2020	50	93	4.42	50	83	11.11		10.00[6.69, 13.31]	4.57	
Shamar et al, May 2020	24	94	11.5	24	93	14.2	-	1.00[-6.31, 8.31]	2.43	
Golestani-Eraghi et al, May 2020	10	91	4.57	10	81	5.23		10.00[5.70, 14.30]	3.95	
Sartini et all May 2020	15	98.91	1.35	15	92.92	2.93		5.99[4.35, 7.63]	5.52	
Tu et al, May 2020	9	96	3	9	90	2		6.00[3.64, 8.36]	5.15	
Su et al, May 2020	10	99	24.15	10	97	27.81	-	2.00 [-20.83, 24.83]	0.40	
Coppo et al, June 2020	46	98.4	1.3	46	67.2	2		1.20[0.61, 1.89]	5.85	
Damaria et al, June 2020	10	98	1.48	10	93.33	2.96		4.67[2.62, 6.72]	5.32	
awton et al. June 2020	165	94	2.97	165	92.67	4.44		1.33[0.51, 2.15]	5.82	
lloghadam et al, June 2020	10	95.9	2.18	10	85.6	.69		10.30[8.88, 11.72]	5.62	
Thompson et al, June 2020	29	95.9	2.81	29	86.54	7.14		9.36 [6.57, 12.15]	4.90	
Viba Ripoli-Gallardo et al, July 2020	13	99	70	13	92	13.3		7.00 [-31.73, 45.73]	0.14	
Retucci et al, July 2020	26	97.67	.74	26	96.33	2.22		1.34[0.44, 2.24]	5.79	
Eang et al, July 2020	23	95.3	1.7	23	91.1	1.5		4.20[3.27, 5.13]	5.79	
Paternoster et al, Aug 2020	11	98	2.2	11	90	2.3		6.00[4.12, 7.88]	5.41	
Solverson et al., Aug 2020	17	97	2	17	50	2.8		7.00[5.36, 8.64]	5.52	
tamirez et al, Sep 2020	45	98	7.4	45	91.6	5.2		6.40[3.76, 9.04]	4.99	
l'aboda et al. Sep 2020	50	95.3	1	50	93.75	.75		2.55[2.20, 2.90]	5.90	
Vinearis et al, Sep 2020	24	96	2	24	94	3		2.00[0.56, 3.44]	5.61	
Ferrando et al. Oct 2020	55	87.3	4.4	55	87.5	2.9		-0.20[-1.59, 1.19]	5.63	
Padrao et al. Oet 2020	57	94	2.96	57	91	3.7		3.00[1.77, 4.23]	5.69	
Overall								4.74[3.26, 6.23]		

Heterogeneity: r² = 9.70, f² = 96.31%, H² = 27.6 Test of Q = 9; Q(20) = 299.26, p = 0.00

Random-effects REML model

Does Awake Proning Impact **Patient Outcomes?** Systematic Review and Meta-**Analysis**

Results

- Improvement in P/F ratio 20mmHg, and RR ↓ 3.2 breaths per minute
- Intubation rate 24%, mortality 13%
- No life threatening or major adverse events
- Minor: pain in the back, sternum & scrotum, general discomfort, dyspnea & coughing


$PaO_2/FiO_2 > 150$

Study	N	Post Pror Mean	ning SD	N	Pre Pron Mean	ing SD		Mean Differ with 95%		Weight (%)
Despres et al, May 2020	6	185.78	45.43	6	180.67	48.7	-	5.11 [-48.18	, 58.40]	8.77
Dong et.al, May 2020	16	331.5	77.68	16	196.56	52.99	-	134.94 [88.86	181.02]	9.58
Xu et al, May 2020	10	179	37.04	10	156.9	42.59	-	22.10 [-12.88	57.08]	10.82
Coppo et al, June 2020	46	285.5	112.9	46	180.5	76.6	-	105.00 [65.57	, 144.43]	10.33
Lawton et al, June 2020	165	167.4	2.97	165	156.5	4.44		10.90 [10.08	, 11.72]	13.16
Retucci et al, July 2020	26	220	64.5	26	182.9	43	-	37.10 [7.30	66.90]	11.38
Solverson et al, Aug 2020	17	186.8	58.3	17	166.5	55.7	-	20.30 [-18.03	58.63]	10.45
Kelly et al, Sep 2020	17	222.54	19	17	180.98	27.18		41.56 [25.80	, 57.32]	12.61
Taboda et al, Sep 2020	50	372	27	50	359	27		13.00 [2.42	23.58]	12.90
Overall	2		2				•	41.30 [13.97	, 68.64]	

Heterogeneity: T = 1477.93, I = 96.00%, H = 25.01

Test of $\theta_i = \theta_i$: Q(8) = 67.81, p = 0.00

Test of $\theta = 0$: z = 2.96, p = 0.00



Random-effects REML model

$PaO_2/FiO_2 \leq 150$

		ost Pron	ing		Pre Pror	ning		Mean Difference		
Study	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD		with 95% CI	(%)	
Caputo et al, April 2020	50	98.57	4.42	50	70.71	11.11	27	7.86 [24.55, 31.17]	8.39	
Golestani-Eraghi et al, May 2020	10	119	4.57	10	105	5.23	14	1.00 [9.70, 18.30]	8.38	
Sartini et al, May 2020	15	117.84	2.38	15	84	25.47	33	3.84 [20.89, 46.79]	8.06	
Tu et al, May 2020	9	135	14	9	86.25	10		3.75 [37.51, 59.99]	8.14	
Damarla et al, June 2020	10	224	1.48	10	144	2.96	80	0.00 [77.95, 82.05]	8.41	
Alba Ripoll-Gallardo et al, July 2020	13	166.4	70	13	115.2	13.3	51	1.20 [12.47, 89.93]	6.01	
Burton-Papp et al, July 2020	20	151.7	28.7	20	123	27.8	— 28	3.70 [11.19, 46.21]	7.78	
Zang et al, July 2020	23	82.29	5.61	23	64.58	5.01	1 7	7.71 [14.64, 20.78]	8.40	
Paternoster et al, Aug 2020	11	214.6	73.1	11	107.5	20.8	107	7.10 [62.19, 152.01]	5.48	
Ramirez et al, Sep 2020	45	120	22	45	103	46	 17	7.00 [2.10, 31.90]	7.95	
Winearls et al, Sep 2020	24	252	87	24	143	7	109	9.00 [74.08, 143.92]	6.35	
Ferrando et al, Oct 2020	55	103	33	55	102.7	11.25	-	0.30 [-8.91, 9.51]	8.23	
Padrao et al, Oct 2020	57	76	3.7	57	68	3.7	■	3.00 [6.64, 9.36]	8.41	
Overall							38	3.58 [20.80, 56.35]		
Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 977.37$, $I^2 = 99.56$	%, H ²	= 225.04	1							
Test of $\theta_i = \theta_j$: Q(12) = 3469.47, p = 0.	.00									
Test of $\theta = 0$: $z = 4.25$, $p = 0.00$										
							0 50 100 150			

Awake Prone Positioning with COVID: Open Label RCT


- Efficacy of awake proning to prevent intubation or death
- International open label RCT
- △ COVID 19 hypoxemic respiratory failure defined as: requiring respiratory support with HFNC & P/F ratio of < 315 randomized to awake prone positioning or standard care
 - △ Awake prone (567)
 - △ Standard care (559)
- Patient instructed to lie in PP as frequent and as long as can be tolerated each day
- Awake proning cease when weaning HFNC because of improve oxygenation
- Pre-defined criteria for intubation was used in both group
- Outcomes:
 - △ Tx failure define as intubation or dying within 28 days of enrolment
 - Secondary outcome: intubation, mortality, use of non-invasive vent, time to intubation, time to death, Hospital LOS




6 Countries: Mexico, US, Spain, Canada, France & Ireland

Awake Prone Positioning with COVID: Open Label RCT

Physiologic Impact of Awake Prone Positioning









Awake prone position of patients with hypoxemic respiratory failure from COVID 19 reduces the incidence of treatment failure and need for intubation without any signal of harm - NNT 14


Outcomes






Ehrmann S, et al. *Lancet Respir Med*. 2021;9(12):1387-1395.

Prone Positioning for Awake Patients



Consider prone positioning 30 min up to 4hrs. 2 to 4x daily



Seckel MA.. Crit Care Nurse. 2021;41(4):76-79




Polling Question

- What complications have occurred with use of the prone position at your hospital? Check all that apply
 - 1. Airway obstruction
 - 2. Accidental extubation
 - 3. Pressure injuries
 - 4. Loss of invasive lines
 - 5. Loss of tubes
 - 6. Cardiac arrest
 - 7. Hemodynamic instability
 - 8. Ocular injuries
 - 9. Brachial plexus injuries
 - 10. VAP

				Treatment Effect (Random-Effect Model)			Heterogeneity	
Adverse Events	No. of Trials Reporting the Outcome	Events/Prone	Events/ Supine	OR (95% CI)	р	Number Needed to Treat/Number Needed to Harm	F (%)	p
Ventilator- associated pneumonia	6	120/567	128/513	0.76 (0.44-1.33)	0.343	26	34.4	0.192
Pressure ulcers	6	294/698	218/646	1.49 (1.18–1.89)	0.001	12	0.0	0.617
Major airway problem³	9	255/1,104	180/1,063	1.55 (1.10-2.17)	0.012	16	32.7	0.167
Unplanned extubation	7	113/1,091	98/1,050	1.17 (0.80-1.73)	0.421	98	25,5	0.234
Selective intubation	2	12/642	5/615	2.73 (0.29-25.46)	0.378	95	55.9	0.132
Endotracheal tube obstruction	4	130/823	77/802	2.16 (1.53–3.05)	< 0.001	16	0,0	0.580
Loss of venous or arterial access	4	36/407	22/397	1.34 (0.29-6.26)	0.712	30	75.5	0.007
Thoracostomy tube dislodgement or kinking	4	14/407 11 .	14/397 .9% com	1.14 (0.35-3.75) iplication ra	0.827 ate	1,154	42.6	0.175
Pneumothorax	4	29/513	33/462	0.77 (0.46-1.30)	0.333	67	0.0	0.528
Cardiac arrest	3	104/718	119/675	0.74 (0.47-1.17)	0.197	32	30.3	0.238
Tachyarrhythmia or bradyarrhythmia	3	115/663	102/634	1.08 (0.78-1.50)	0.643	80	8,8	0.334



Does your ICU have a process for assessing P/F ratios routinely?








Pressure Injury Risk in the Prone Patient^{1,2}




- △ Prone position for ARDS increased odds of pressure injury
 - Ranges 1.22- 1.37 (95% CI 1.05 to 1.79)
 - PI 37% more common in prone pts





Pressure Injury Prevention: Prone Positioning

- Redistribution surface
- A Positioning devices to offload pressure points (Do not use ring or donut-shaped positioning devices)
- Avoid shear and friction during the turning process
- △ Small micro turns while prone/swimmer position shifts q 2-4 hrs
- Assess skin with when doing small positioning shifts
- A Placement of prophylactic dressings over all potential pressure injury risk areas




Green areas represent pressure sources while lying prone

Head Specific Interventions to Reduce PI while

Proning

- Apply soft silicone multilayered foam prophylactic dressings to pressure points on the face (cheeks, forehead, chin and consider strips around the corners of the mouth)1
- Turn the head q 2 hrs¹
- Manage moisture /oral & nasal secretions^{1,2}
 - Liquid skin protected or sealants on the face
 - Change form dressings PRN
 - Consider applying hydro fiber or calcium alginate dressings under prophylactic dressings to manage excess moisture (chin, mouth area and cheeks)
- Consider removing commercial ETT holder and use tape or twill. Places patients at risk for pressure injuries^{1,2}
- Apply thin foam dressings under medical devices—including ETT securement (tape-twill)^{1,2}













Smart H. Adv Skin Wound Care.2021;34(7):390-391.



Ocular Injury

- △ Meta-analysis of prone positioning studies examining ocular injury occurrences, they found only a 1.3% incidence in prone patients while 1.9% in supine patients¹
- △ Corneas at most risk: ²
 - △ Blinking issues
 - △ Reduction in tear production
 - △ Failure of eye closure

Global Eye Rupture from Prolonged Prone Positioning



Leuzinger-Dias, M et al. Ophthalmol Ther 10, 691–697 (2021)

- 1.Patterson TJ, at al. Am J Ophthalmol. 2021 Mar 3:S0002-9394
- 2. Sansome SG, et al. British Journal of Hospital Medicine. 2020;81(6):1-10.

Evidence –Based Strategies to Reduce Injury^{1,2}

- Perform eye assessment daily and prior to proning.
- △ Clean the eyes with saline soaked gauze, apply ointment then horizontally tape the eye lids closed.
- In the presence of conjunctival or corneal exposure increase the frequency of eye ointment application as per institutional policy.
- △ Use of reverse Trendelenburg to reduce eye conjunctival edema

Sansome SG, et al. British Journal of Hospital Medicine. 2020;81(6):


Torso

- ▲ EKG leads on the back while prone
- △ Apply prophylactic dressing to pressure points and high shear areas
- Secure all tubes and devices away from the skin
 - △ protect surrounding skin with prophylactic dressings & bridged areas with positioning devices
 - △ Create channels for tubes with positioning aids
- Breast & genitalia
 - △ Should be offloaded and protected



Brachial Plexus & Ulnar Safety

- △ Maintain straight spine alignment & avoid excessive arm rotation¹⁻³
- Avoid positions of extension of the shoulders and support the chest well to ensure shoulder is forward flexed or falling forward^{1,3}
- Avoid positioning arm in abduction beyond 70 degrees with elbow extension and external rotation of the shoulder beyond 60 degrees³
- Avoid hyperextension of the neck by adjusting height of head chest and pelvic supports^{2,3}



Physio-pedia.com


^{1.} Bamford P, et al. Available from https://www.ficm.ac.uk/sites/default/files/prone_position_in_adult_critical_care_2019.pdf.

^{2.} Simpson AI, et al. J Intensive Care Med. 2020;35(12):1576-1582

^{3.} Miller C, et al. Phys Ther. 2021 Jan 4;101(1)

Legs & Feet


- △ Apply Prophylactic foam dressings to the Patella and pretibial area
- A Remove securement devices and align urinary catheter & fecal management devices towards the foot of the bed
- Ensure there are no unsecured devices under the legs
- △ Offload the feet




















List various equipment available for prone (Fourie A, et al. *J Tissue Viability*. 2021;30(4):466-477.



The Role of Hemodynamic Instability in Positioning¹

- △ Lateral turn results in a 3%-9% decrease in SVO₂, which takes 5-10 minutes to return to baseline
- Appears the act of turning has the greatest impact on any instability seen
- △ Minimize factors that contribute to imbalances in oxygen supply and demand
- △ Factors that put patients at risk for intolerance to positioning:
 - △ Elderly

Right ventricular function improves in PP/ ↑ preload & Cl²

- △ Diabetes with neuropathy
- △ Prolonged bed rest
- △ Low hemoglobin and cardiovascular reserve
- △ Prolonged gravitational equilibrium




Neuromuscular Blockade in Early ARDS



- Multicenter, double blind trial
- 340 patients with ARDS within 48hrs of admitted to ICU
- △ ARDS defined as P/F ratio of < 150 ≥ PEEP 5cm & Vt of 6-8 ml/kg PBW
- Randomized to receive 48hrs of cisatracurium or placebo
- Study did not use train of 4

Results:

- △ After risk adjustment NMB group showed improved mortality at 90 days (31.6% vs. 40.7%)
- △ Also significant at 28 days
- △ ↑time off vent
- △ No difference in muscle weakness



ROSE Trial: Re-evaluation of Systemic Early Neuromuscular Blockade

- Protocol: moderate to severe ARDS < 48hrs / P/F ratio < 150 with > PEEP 8 cm
- Cisatracurium for 48hr or usual care
- Protocol changed mid-study, removed RM

The ROSE trial at 90-day follow-up in patients with moderate-to-severe ARDS, 42.5% of the intervention group and 42.8% of the control group died before hospital discharge (between group difference -0.3%, 95% CI -6.4 to 5, *P*=0.93), -study stopped early.

Petal Network. N Engl J Med. 2019 May 23;380(21):1997-2008.

Prone Positioning used 15.8%. Equal use in both groups




Questions That Remain

- Mhat is optimal PEEP management in the prone position?
- △ Does effective prone positioning necessitate neuromuscular blockades for several days?
 - △ And, what impact does that have on ICU-acquired weakness?
- △ How do we incorporate what we learned about the impact of prone positioning during the COVID 19 pandemic into our practice?

Summary

- Use the prone positioning
- Implement early—don't wait
- △ Develop a process or protocol to minimize complication risk
- Training all providers to mastery is critical









Earn 1 CE credit

To get started:

- Register on
 FocusRN.stryker.com
 Please access on desktop, laptop, or tablet
- Check your email the week following your event. You'll receive an evaluation to complete.
- On your next visit to the website, you'll see a message prompting you to complete your evaluation. This will allow you to access your downloadable certificate of completion.



FocusRN.stryker.com





Kathleen M. Vollman MSN, RN, CCNS, FCCM, FCNS, FAAN Clinical Nurse Specialist / Educator / Consultant ADVANCING NURSING kvollman@comcast.net Northville, Michigan www.vollman.com

